



**CITY OF YORK**  
**LOCAL PLAN**  
**Sustainability Appraisal**  
Appendix K  
**Policy and Site Audit Trail**  
February 2018



# Appendix K Policy and Site Audit Trail

Part 1 – Policies Audit Trail

Part 2 – Strategic Sites Audit Trail

Part 3 – General Sites Audit Trail

To ensure the chronology of policy development is captured an ‘audit trail’ has been completed which addresses national policy, local evidence, the SA/SEA, third party representations and the reasons for changes at each stage. This analysis describes how policy has evolved from initial conception through to the Pre Publication draft (Regulation 18) Consultation (2017). An audit for each policy theme/area rather than for every policy has been completed as follows:

Appendix K Policy and Site Audit Trail	1
1. Policy Topic: Vision and Outcomes	4
2. Policy Topic: Sustainable Development	9
3. Policy Topic: Drivers of Change	13
4. Policy Topic: Distribution of Growth	17
5. Policy Topic: York City Centre	22
6. Policy Topic: York Central	32
7. Policy Topic: Scale of Employment Growth	40
8. Policy Topic: Location of Employment Growth	46
9. Policy Topic: Approach to Retail	53
10. Policy Topic: Scale of Housing Growth	62
11. Policy Topic: Location of Housing Growth	66
12. Policy Topic: General Housing Market	71
13. Policy Topic: Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	77
14. Policy Topic: Affordable Housing	83
15. Policy Topic: Community Facilities	89
16. Policy Topic: Education	97
17. Policy Topic: Universities	106



18.	Policy Topic: Design and the Historic Environment	113
19.	Policy Topic: Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Recreation	118
20.	Policy Topic: Approach to Development in the Green Belt	125
21.	Policy Topic: Renewable Energy and Sustainable Design and Construction	133
22.	Policy Topic: Sustainable Design and Construction	140
23.	Policy Topic: Environmental Quality	146
24.	Policy Topic: Flood Risk, Groundwater and Surface Water Management	151
25.	Policy Topic: Communications Infrastructure	158
26.	Policy Topic: Approach to Waste and Minerals	161
27.	Policy Topic: Transport	171
28.	Policy Topic: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	178

# 1. Policy Topic: Vision and Outcomes

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision is to create a sustainable city.</li> <li>- Includes spatial planning objectives: To ensure the sustainable location, design and construction of development; To ensure economic wellbeing through sustainable economic growth; To meet community development needs; To maintain a quality environment; To minimise motorised transport and promote sustainable forms of transport.</li> <li>- Vision relates to the City's Community Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a 'sustainable city' is overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- The spatial planning objectives developed from the Community Strategy are generally compatible with the sustainability objectives developed for the sustainability appraisal. The objectives alone will not have an impact on the future sustainability of the York area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision and objectives should reflect the unique character of York, although recognised that vision must be based on the objectives of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).</li> <li>- Spatial planning objectives should be more detailed and should set out which policy areas they refer to, and in some cases should be more ambitious and positively worded.</li> <li>- Objectives should be ordered to reflect priorities.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes further detailed spatial planning objectives, e.g. the greenbelt, York's ecological footprint etc, therefore expanding upon the objectives from the previous plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF objectives are very thorough and cover the majority of sustainability objectives. Additional spatial objectives relating to reducing the need to travel though the location of new development, and ensuring public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear majority supported option which indicated that to create the vision for the LDF the SCS vision together with other planning issues should be adopted in order to create a unique LDF vision. This should have sustainable development at its heart.</li> <li>- Respondents felt that the</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>is a viable alternative to car use need to be considered. Other sustainability objectives not well covered relate to reducing noise impacts and participation.</p>	<p>vision should set out how we see York developing over the next 20 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for the detailed objectives.</li> <li>- Objectives should be developed from the vision to provide the broad direction detailed strategy and policies.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less detail included in the spatial planning objectives. Now cover: York’s special historic and built environment, building confident, creative and inclusive communities, a prosperous and thriving economy and a leading environmentally friendly city.</li> <li>- A more detailed vision statement included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF objectives deemed to be very thorough and cover the majority of sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the vision however it is felt further spatial planning objectives to cover aspects like education that are missed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No major change however sustainable development brought to the forefront of the plan to reflect best practice.</li> <li>- Expanded spatial planning objectives to provide further clarity in guiding development.</li> <li>- Inclusion of a ‘high level’ vision statement reflecting the Sustainable Community Strategy and the city’s regional role supported by a fuller descriptive</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
					vision provides more clarity and detail.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision keeps ‘high level’ vision statement supported by a fuller descriptive vision to provide clarity and detail.</li> <li>- An extra spatial planning objective added relating to education: A world class centre fore education and learning for all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of all the spatial planning objectives. SA supportive of vision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision needs to be set within a global context not just of opportunity but also of vulnerability.</li> <li>-The Government’s growth agenda isn’t adequately picked up.</li> <li>- Question whether York should be a key driver in the region given its characteristics as a compact historic city.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision now includes a vision statement and four priorities: Create jobs and grow the economy, get York moving, build strong communities and protect the environment. Social inclusion and sustainability cut across all four of these.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Plan priorities are supportive of the SA objectives. No ‘very incompatible’ objectives have been identified during the assessment and all of the SA objectives were considered to be very compatible with one or more of the Local Plan objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the vision however felt that it is not place specific and puts too much emphasis on economic growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes made for better clarification of priorities. No change in general approach.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<p>- Vision now includes the previous vision statement and four priorities as above, alongside a series of policies to cover development principles which will help deliver the vision. - Development principle policies cover supporting the York Sub Area, delivering sustainable development and sustainable communities and the approach to development management</p>	<p>- The policies that contain the key development principles are anticipated to have a positive effect on all of the SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of housing, health, equality and accessibility, transport, climate change, biodiversity, flood risk, cultural heritage and landscape. This principally reflects the emphasis of the policies on the delivery of sustainable development.</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- Inclusion of development principle policies to better sign post readers of the plan to where policies sit and also how policies relate to each other to highlight linkages.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<p>-Vision includes previous vision statement with more of an emphasis on culture and four priorities including: Create a Prosperous City for all, Provide Good Quality Homes and Opportunities, Protect the Environment and Ensure Efficient and Affordable Transport Links. A series of policies cover the development principles which will help to deliver the vision.</p>	<p>Broadly, the draft Local Plan outcomes are supportive of the SA objectives and none of the plan has been assessed as being incompatible with all of the SA objectives. Those SA objectives that are particularly well supported by the plan outcomes include SA Objectives health, economy, equality and accessibility and transport.</p>	<p>A variety of comments were made on the vision. - Highways England fully support the vision to deliver a fundamental shift in travel patterns and the focus of promoting sustainable development in areas of good accessibility. -North Yorkshire County Council support the ambition that the city's special qualities and distinctiveness should have global recognition. -Historic England give support for the general summary of the City's many heritage assets and</p>	<p>Minor amendments to development principle policies to reflect comments made through consultation by the National Railway Museum, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Historic England, Fulford Parish Council and Environment Agency.</p>





Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>Although the vision aims to deliver “<i>sustainable patterns and forms of development</i>”, potential conflicts could arise between growth, resource use and environmental factors. The effects are often highly dependent on whether growth is achieved under consideration of economic, social and environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>the general contribution that York's historic environment makes to the City. However they also note that the vision itself is not particularly place specific, nor does it articulate the special qualities and distinctiveness of the historic city and suggest new wording.</p> <p>-there is support for the vision of the Local Plan. Support that the plan seeks to plan for a vibrant city which enhance the vitality of local communities through meeting housing economic development whilst enhancing the city's unique historic, cultural and natural environmental assets.</p> <p>-others suggest amendments to the vision including that the plan's vision note in the interests of ordinary hard working families, with particular reference to the lack of social/affordable housing.</p>	



## 2. Policy Topic: Sustainable Development

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPS1 - PPG13	- Government emphasised Sustainable Development at the heart of the planning system. - Sustainable vision created for the city covering the importance of sustainable development. Sustainable development the overarching goal that underpins the LDF for York.	- Creating a 'sustainable city' is the overarching vision for the future of York which is welcomed by the SA. The spatial planning objectives are generally compatible with the Sustainability objectives for the SA. Essential that policy alternatives presented in sufficient detail.	- Respondents were keen that the vision and objectives should reflect the unique character of York	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS1 - UK sustainable development strategy – 'Securing the Future' (2005)	- The LDF Core Strategy is not produced in isolation but is shaped and influenced by national and regional level, including the UK sustainable development strategy – 'Securing the	- The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote Sustainable Development through the better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans.	- The vision should have sustainable development at its heart. Respondents felt that the vision should set out how we see York developing over the next 20 years. It should address the key issues identified through the evidence base and have regard to all	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Future'	- The Sustainability Appraisal report will be an integral part of the plan making process.	relevant plans and programmes that will influence the future of York, including RSS.	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS1 - UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).	- The LDF must embrace the need to ensure sustainable development by taking full account of the aims, objectives and aspirations of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).	- The SA will identify and evaluate a plan's impacts the three dimensions of sustainable development. - The findings of the SA are then taken on board within the Plan's development and reflected in further drafts of the strategies to ensure it maximises its contribution towards sustainable development.	- The approach needs to recognise the essential role that revising the Green Belt boundary which ensures sustainable development. - Ensuring there is a good provision of public transport to encourage and promote sustainable development in York. - Over four-fifths (85%) of respondents think that ensuring new development does not add to the flooding and drainage problems in York will be most effective for sustainable development. - Providing alternative means to landfill to dispose of waste including the promotion of more recycling and the need to make it easier would be an effective way of promoting sustainable development in York and addressing issues of climate change.	No change
<b>Core</b>	- PPS1	- National policy	- The SA will identify	- Comments received	No change

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> <li>- UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).</li> </ul>	<p>influences: The LDF must embrace the need to ensure sustainable development by taking full account of the aims, objectives and aspirations of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most policies and sections detail how the policies will contribute or protect sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<p>and evaluate a plan’s impacts the three dimensions of sustainable development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The findings of the SA are then taken on board within the Plan’s development and reflected in further drafts of the strategies to ensure it maximises its contribution towards sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<p>suggested that the description of the LDF set out in the About the Plan section is not in conformity with national planning policy as it does not mention sustainable development and the role the Core Strategy has in promoting the objectives of sustainable development.</p>	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction of a sustainable development section dedicated to highlight how the plan is in aims to deliver sustainable development in planning terms for York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy would positively define sustainable development for York, enabling growth and development in line with the NPPF whilst balancing environmental and social factors specific to the city.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received including that it was an unnecessary policy, should include a definition of sustainable development in the policy and that the policy should be redrafted to include criteria based policies that planning applications can be determined against.</li> </ul>	<p>To reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development introduced by the NPPF.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF - UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).	- Largely as above, albeit moved into the vision section of the plan, forming a set of four policies detailing key development principles. - Policy defines Sustainable Development in planning terms for York, developed from the Vision. - Objectives aim to encourage growth and development whilst balancing it with environmental and social factors.	- Anticipated to have a positive effect on all of the SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of housing, health, equality and accessibility, transport, climate change, biodiversity, flood risk, cultural heritage and landscape. - No significant or minor negative effects were identified during the appraisal of the key development principles.	- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.	- No change in approach.
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	-NPPF - Sustianable Development Goals (SDGs)	- Largely as above, policies remain in the vision and development principles section of the plan, forming a set of four policies detailing key development principles including: create a prosperous city for all, provide good quality homes and opportunities, protect the	The policies that contain the key development principles are anticipated to have a positive effect on all of the SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of health, equality and accessibility, transport, climate change, biodiversity, flood risk, cultural	Approach generally supported although some suggestions were made by statutory bodies and stakeholders which will be integrated into the section.	No change in approach.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		environment, ensure efficient and affordable transport links.	heritage and landscape.  This principally reflects the emphasis of the policies on the delivery of sustainable development.		

### 3. Policy Topic: Drivers of Change

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging broad options tested.</li> <li>- Land may be needed outside the built up areas of York, but some parcels should be retained as open land.</li> <li>- York identified as part of the Leeds City Region and part of a wider 'York sub area'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a 'sustainable city' is the overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- Core Strategy should address the role, scale and location of development, and how this can be provided in the most sustainable way.</li> <li>- Analysis focuses on constraints to development rather than opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategy should provide an indication of the scale of new development required and the amount of land which will be needed to meet the need. It should set out how the strategic objectives translate into strategic policies. Issues and options should set out alternative spatial options. The spatial strategy should not use the Local Plan as a basis, but should outline the RSS approach, and should consider potential conflicts between the housing and employment figures and the need to balance the different aspects</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brownfield sites first, Greenfield second- no change.</li> <li>- Options presented regarding the location of future development.</li> <li>Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility</li> <li>Option 2: Prioritising existing trends -</li> <li>Option 3: Prioritising housing need</li> <li>Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some matters not fully addressed which need further consideration in relation to preferred approaches to development. Lack of detail regarding the proportion of development needed in different settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>of the spatial strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally supportive of directing the majority of growth to within, or adjacent to, York’s main urban area in preference to further expansion of villages.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategy articulated through spatial principles rather than a policy. These are: Settlement hierarchy Areas of constraint Brownfield sites first Other options not articulated.</li> <li>- Sieve mapping approach to taking account of primary constraints on development e.g. flood risk.</li> <li>- Areas of search for further land for development identified.</li> <li>- The role of York’s main built up area as a Sub-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of settlement hierarchy principles and areas of constraint. Strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy).</li> <li>- support the approach which makes the best use of land by ensuring all development is delivered at appropriate densities to help protect Greenfield land and to support shops, community services and public transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preservation of the historic character and setting of York was the most significant factor in determining the approach to development. Emphasise the importance of understanding what makes York special, to properly consider the potential impact from development; to balance character against the need for the City to grow, to protect important views, and to distinguish between the different values of each of the historic character and setting categories.</li> <li>- Scale of new development needed to be indicated and the amount of land required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terminology has changed regarding York sub area due to the introduction of the RSS.</li> <li>- Sharpening of policy approach which reflects further work on development of SA and points raised in consultation responses.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Regional City, providing the primary focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.		should be set out. - Should include the regional or sub-regional picture from the RSS and also should set out how the overall principles might be translated into patterns of development on the ground. The spatial strategy does not set out broad locations for growth.	
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS1 - PPS12 - Draft NPPF	- Spatial principles approach retained. See above.	- Supports the overall approach taken by the three spatial principles set out in the Spatial Strategy. - SA continues to support this hierarchy and the Core Strategy’s focus in supporting development within the Sub-Regional area primarily followed by the Large villages, villages and small villages.	- Concern with the level of growth and preserving the City’s special character and setting. Suggested further assessment needed to refine settlement and employment growth. Presumption in favour of Brownfield land not in line with national policy. Criticism of approach and outcome of areas of search for development.	- Format changes for better clarity.
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	- The move to a Local Plan and the combination of NPPF and the revocation of RSS leads to a more specific policy approach to setting out the spatial strategy. Combination of a sub area policy and spatial strategy policies used to set the strategic context.	- The assessment has identified that those preferred options that comprise the spatial strategy would have a positive effect across many of the SA objectives.	- Support for the York sub area policy and for the building of strong, sustainable communities.	- To comply with national policy.



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A more comprehensive spatial strategy is set out, covering the drivers of growth and factors that shape growth in the city, alongside detailing the scale of growth and the key areas of change and opportunity that will support the delivery of the strategy (including policies on the city centre, York Central, Castle Piccadilly and strategic sites).</li> <li>- Strategic sites development principles policy deleted and now covered in individual policies for the four largest strategic sites and a new placemaking policy in the design section.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall, the policies in the spatial strategy have been appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA objectives relating to housing, health, economy and equality and accessibility. Minor positive effects are expected against education, climate change, biodiversity, water, waste, cultural heritage and landscape SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To remove duplication elsewhere in the plan.</li> <li>- To provide greater clarity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spatial Strategy approach (see above) retained but with key planning principles established for each strategic site.</li> <li>- New global development framework: 'Transforming our World; the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development' containing 17 Sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall, the policies in the spatial strategy were appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA objectives relating to housing, health, economy and equality and accessibility. Minor positive effects were expected against education, climate change, biodiversity,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for the Local Plan to positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth, including tourism and leisure.</li> <li>- It is acknowledged that York is a major economic asset.</li> <li>- The plan is consistent with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships economic priorities.</li> <li>- The Local Plan will contribute</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development principle policies to better reflect the role of tourism to the economy and address air quality issues.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Development Goals (SDGs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One Planet Council programme of change in relation to sustainability and resilience.</li> <li>- City Vision, updated economic strategy and Council Plan.</li> <li>- Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2017-2022.</li> <li>- Promoting cultural wellbeing alongside social and economic wellbeing.</li> <li>- Updated economic forecasts indicate job growth at 650 jobs per annum.</li> <li>- Revised household projections and resultant objectively assessed housing need of 867 dpa.</li> </ul>	<p>water, waste, cultural heritage and landscape SA objectives.</p>	<p>to the sub regional Strategic Economic Plan housing delivery ambitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arguments for more housing than in the plan and arguments for less housing</li> <li>- one representor disagrees with the cautious approach using the baseline forecast to inform the employment land requirements of the Plan.</li> </ul>	

## 4. Policy Topic: Distribution of Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 –</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Securing the Future (2005)</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- Development should be focused on Brownfield land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a ‘sustainable city’ is the overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The strategy should provide an indication of the scale of new development required and the amount of land which will</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>June 2006</b>	- PPS12	Greenfield land only to be considered after. Development should consider: Preserving the Historic Character and Setting of York, Nature Conservation, and Flood Risk.	is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal. - Core Strategy to address matters such as the role, scale and location of development, and how this can be provided in the most sustainable way.	be needed. - Should set out how the strategic objectives translate into strategic policies. - Issues and options should set out alternative spatial options. The spatial strategy should not use the Local Plan as a basis, but should outline the RSS approach, and the spatial strategy should consider potential conflicts between the housing and employment figures and the need to balance the different aspects of the spatial strategy.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	-Securing the Future (2005) - PPS1 - PPS12	- RSS - Brownfield sites first, Greenfield second. - Broad Influences: Regional context, relationship between York & its larger villages – accessibility & past market trends, and housing need. - Detailed Influences include environmental constraints, historic character and setting of York, nature conservation, Flood risk, Commuting, congestion, City & district centres, and the location of major development sites and opportunities.	- There is a need to identify Greenfield sites for development in York unless a low growth and high density option is pursued. Analysis focuses on constraints to development rather to opportunities to development.	- Generally supportive of directing the majority of growth to within, or adjacent to, York's main urban area in preference to further expansion of villages. - Support for the preservation of the historic character and setting of York. - Considered that the correct factors had not been identified and that other factors over and above those identified.	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad locations for growth identified.</li> <li>- Options presented regarding the location of future development.</li> <li>Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility</li> <li>Option 2: Prioritising existing trends</li> <li>Option 3: Prioritising housing need</li> <li>Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A new area added to the major developed opportunities and sites.</li> <li>- Strategy articulated through spatial principles rather than policy. These are: settlement hierarchy, Brownfield sites first. Other options not articulated. Sieve mapping approach to taking account of primary constraints on development e.g. Flood risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of settlement hierarchy principles and areas of constraint. Recommends adding and assessment of access to services to the consideration of constraints.</li> <li>- Recommends strengthening Brownfield first and adding consideration of impact on transport network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An indication of the scale of new development needed and the amount of land required should be set out.</li> <li>- Should include the regional or sub-regional picture from the RSS. The section should also set out how the overall principles might be translated into patterns of development on the ground and how there would be different ways of addressing the needs that are identified through different spatial options.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes include flood risk as a shaper of development. This reflects best practice.</li> <li>- Further detail regarding the influences for development to provide better clarity. Evolution of the approach to reflect the SA, consultation responses and the refinement of the policy approach required for the preferred</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
					<p>options change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sharpening of policy approach which reflects further work on development of SA and points raised in consultation responses.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS12</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- Spatial principles approach retained. Further areas added to the major developed opportunities and sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the overall approach taken by the 3 spatial principles set out in the Spatial Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern with the level of growth and preserving the City's special character and setting. Suggested further assessment needed to refine settlement and employment growth</li> <li>- Presumption in favour of Brownfield land not in line with national policy.</li> <li>- Criticism of approach and outcome of areas of search for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Format changes for better clarity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<p>The move to a Local Plan and the combination of NPPF and the revocation of RSS leads to a more specific policy approach to setting out the distribution of growth. Combination of policies used to set the strategic context, roles of places patterns of development and the implementation of strategic sites. Policy added regarding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment has identified that those preferred options that comprise the spatial strategy would have a positive effect across many of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A large number of responses were received in relation to the distribution of growth. There were a number of general comments received alongside some support for the policy. There were also a large number of objections received, with the majority of which were concerned with the level of growth being too high and the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To comply with national policy.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		the safeguarding of land.		problems this may create on infrastructure, services and effect on the environment.	
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above.</li> <li>- Fifth spatial principle added to guide the location of development indicating that where available and viable, the re-use of previously developed land will be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<p>- Overall, the policies in the spatial strategy have been appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA objectives relating to housing, health, economy and equality and accessibility. Minor positive effects are expected against education, climate change, biodiversity, water, waste, cultural heritage and landscape SA objectives.</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- To comply with national policy.</p>
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	-NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above.</li> <li>- Updated economic forecasts indicate job growth at 650 jobs per annum.</li> <li>- Revised household projections and resultant objectively assessed housing need of 867 dpa.</li> </ul>	<p>The previous SA of the Preferred Options Local Plan (2013) concluded that this distribution of growth would have a positive effect across many of the SA objectives and that it performed better than the alternatives considered. This broad conclusion was supported in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Developers generally concur that strategic sites can provide a wider mix of sites and increased density on these sites.</li> <li>-The majority of site developers disagree with the policy/portfolio of site allocations due to delivery rates, ensuring greenbelt permanence and how capacities have been</li> </ul>	<p>- Amendments to table to reflect proposed changes to strategic sites and updates following development timescales confirmed through</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			Interim SA Report (2016).	calculated.  Nether & Upper Poppleton Parish Councils believe that the policy should stipulate that outside the urban area homes of more than two storeys should be discouraged and that more bungalows are required. Sheltered housing and assisted living units should feature in areas where more than 500 homes are to be built. Prioritising affordable housing is also mentioned.	consultation responses.

## 5. Policy Topic: York City Centre

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPS6 - Living Life to the Full (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2005).	- The Regional Spatial Strategy (December 2004) - Regional Economic Strategy (2003) - The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners, October 2004) - Community Strategy (CYC 2004) - Making More Use of the Rivers (CYC 2003) - Tourism Strategy (First Stop York	- Priority for all types of shop must be given to city centre in line with national policy. - Shows a clear compatibility between the desire to improve the cultural performance and	- Too focused on city centre and fails to acknowledge that York is more than its city centre. - Over half of the respondents to the Festival of Ideas questionnaire (55%) thought that we should not build more shops in the city centre,	- No change to overarching approach

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Partnership 2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tourism Action Plan (Yorkshire Forward and Yorkshire Tourist Board 2002)</li> <li>- Strategic Framework for the Visitor Economy' (Yorkshire Forward 2005)</li> </ul> <p>- Essential that any proposals for new retail floorspace be of high quality to ensure that the vitality and viability of York City Centre is maintained. Options for the location of retail development include continuing to give priority to York City Centre as the main focus of retailing activity, including the development of a new high profile department store and new format food store and identify areas outside the City Centre for retail growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF Core Strategy will provide the opportunity to clearly articulate the key role of the City Centre across a range of different uses. The LDF City Centre Action Area Plan will provide a strategic planning framework to help deliver the development, transport and environmental priorities required to ensure the City Centre remains a quality place to visit and do business.</li> <li>- It is important that the LDF Core Strategy helps to deliver modern and</li> </ul>	<p>quality of central York, and the need to encourage visitors to stay overnight in York to increase tourism revenue.</p>	<p>compared to 35% who felt that we should.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options for retail growth should not solely relate to the city centre however most respondents supported giving priority to the city centre.</li> <li>- Support for general improvements to the city centre including: improving the means of delivering goods to the shops; improving the overall shopping environment of pedestrian areas and traditional streets; and encouraging a more extensive café culture.</li> <li>- Space around Clifford's Tower supported for a green space in the city centre as well as including city centre green space on sites such as Hungate.</li> <li>- Support for making more use of the rivers and improving public spaces.</li> <li>- Support for improvement to the evening economy, but should relate to more than simply commercial considerations e.g. social, cultural and educational considerations and that there should be specific mention of</li> </ul>	



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>sustainable tourist and cultural provision. To achieve this a range of improvements and enhancements to the city centre are proposed including improved design and layout of York's public spaces, improved access to the rivers, developing a new hotel, the development of a 'cultural quarter' in the City, contributions to public art from developers and the development of the evening economy.</p>		<p>the need to protect and promote theatres.                      - Concerns about managing the impact of visitors with a number of respondents pointing out the effects on other businesses of the 4 million tourists who come to the city.                      -Should invest in ways of improving and enriching what is currently available within the City rather than increasing the current offer.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>- PPS6</p>	<p>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners, October 2004)                      - Independent Strategic Review of the York Economy' (The Future York Group)</p> <p>- Option put forward for city centre focus for retail                      - Number of priorities put forward in recognition of the important contribution tourism makes to York's Economy including improve the setting of the Minster, developing a cultural quarter, creating better linkages between key attractions and sites, establishing a new visitor centre, developing new attractions and facilities to accommodate additional growth in tourism, developing a new high quality hotel,</p>	<p>- City centre focus for retail will ensure accessible shops and not to rely on car travel.                      - It will be important to ensure that the retail centre of York is not performing at too an intense a level that causes harm to the city centre, including historic character and the well-being of residents.                      - Improvements for visitors can also have a direct benefit to the services and cultural facilities available to</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>- No change to overarching approach</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		develop the evening economy, encouraging 'green tourism' and improving access to facilities, both for families and people with disabilities.	<p>York residents and overall improvements of York as a place to live. Although it is likely that these benefits will be concentrated in the city centre. Actions to widen the spread of visitor attractions and accommodation throughout the City of York may help achieve wider benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvements to the night time economy will be beneficial for residents of York, although care needs to be taken to ensure that over concentration of bars, clubs or restaurants in any one area does not harm the amenity for local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>City Centre AAP Issues and Options - July 2008</b>	PPS1 PPS6 PPG15 PPG16	RSS (2008) Community Strategy Local Transport Plan Emerging Core Strategy Emerging YNW AAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The vision objectives seem to be comprehensive in the issues they cover.</li> <li>- There is a gap in the community life vision for an objective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would benefit from clearer links to Core Strategy's strategic policies, thus setting limits of AAP. Spatial Vision should flow from Core Strategy but still be locally specific.</li> <li>- Need to establish more detail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change but more detail added to core strategy approach.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considers what specific measures are needed in the city centre to deliver the objective of the core strategy.</li> <li>- Sets out the issues that are critical to address how to take the city centre forward and options on how these may be tackled.</li> <li>- areas of the city centre selected which are considered to not fulfil their potential but have potential to help deliver the vision for the city centre.</li> <li>- City centre boundary revisions proposed.</li> </ul>	<p>addressing safety and perception of the city centre whereby this is aiming to be improved. It may be valuable to highlight this in the vision section as well as including this as an issue in the community life section to highlight the safer York strategic element of York’s Community Strategy.</p> <p>- The vision would also benefit from strengthening the participatory role of visitors to and residents of the city centre in activities and events. The objective “more opportunities and places to express and sample culture from across the city” could be strengthened to include participation as a key objective for city centre events.</p>	<p>in strategy and site allocations, e.g. number of houses, scale and mix of commercial development expected to achieve so that AAP can be incorporated into emerging core strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the issues covered</li> <li>- Major issue is sustainable transport. Need to transform poor infrastructure.</li> <li>- Unless plans are economically viable or Government funded they are a waste of time.</li> <li>- Design should be treated as a crosscutting issue.</li> <li>- Whole document could be stronger on Climate Change and environmental protection</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred</b></p>	<p>PPS1 PPS6 PPG15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain the city centre as the primary focus for new retail, leisure, tourist and office development, as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy should reference the preparation of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach should be more positive to ensure that the centre develops its role as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New policy added to reflect consultation</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>PPG16</p>	<p>well as reinforcing its role as the cultural and social hub of the sub-region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use and quality of public spaces, as well as links between them and to the rivers, will be comprehensively reviewed, and priority areas identified where improvements are needed now.</li> <li>- Areas on the periphery of the city centre (gateway streets) will be subject to audit and review in order to see how they are performing and how they can be lifted in economic, social and environmental terms.</li> <li>- Opportunities will also be taken to provide for new homes within the city centre, and to improve recreation and community facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal to help promote a proactive approach to development based upon an understanding of what makes the characteristics of York unique and special.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The City Centre Area Action needs to pick up the issues that focus on the provision of specific sites for development and regeneration, housing, sustainable design and construction, including the prudent use of energy and resources and a framework for decision-making to fully meet sustainable development objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>the primary focus for retail, leisure, tourism and office development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should provide a stronger hook for the AAP with a diagram and mini brief.</li> <li>- should contain more detail as to the scale of development proposed for the city centre; the range and mix of uses; and the infrastructure needed to achieve this.</li> <li>- Should define the city centre boundary should place more emphasis on the evening economy and tourism and cultural opportunities</li> <li>- City centre could be preserved as a tourist and cultural destination with functions such as other economic activities and residential moved out of the centre.</li> <li>- City centre sites in need of regeneration should be the focus of economic development.</li> <li>- Should use all available elements of the city centre, such as space above shops and empty buildings before out of centre locations.</li> <li>- Support for enhancing and</li> </ul>	<p>responses and the preparation of an AAP.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<p>extending the public realm, particularly public spaces; gateway streets; and footstreets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should emphasise the importance of linking the city centre and York Central highlighting the future role the latter will have in supporting the city centre, particularly through the provision of retail and employment.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>PPS6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York New City Beautiful: Towards an Economic Vision (2010)</li> <li>- Retail Study (2008)</li> <li>- Preserve and enhance the special qualities and distinctiveness of the City Centre including its unique legacy of historic assets and its natural environment through revitalising the streets, places and spaces of the centre, whilst delivering key commercial developments, vital to ensuring the continued prosperity of the City as a whole and delivering new homes that promote sustainable neighbourhoods.</li> <li>- To be delivered through the AAP, securing retail, office and residential development at key city centre centres, guiding development through a series of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall positive impact across the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The policy no longer references a framework for decision making, which was originally positive for this. Recommends that this is reinstated in the strategic policy to be carried through into the AAP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern about the feasibility of the provision of the number of dwellings in the city centre and the lack of detail on location, type, tenure and justification for their delivery.</li> <li>- Reservations about the scale of comparison retail floor space identified for the York Central site, post 2020 and that the policy conflicts with current council policy to develop out-of-town shopping centres.</li> <li>- Clarification sought on what an area of change is. Others agreed in principle to the proposed areas of change but considered them to be too large or neither properly defined nor justified.</li> <li>- Several respondents offered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy wording is more comprehensive detailing the plans for the city centre to be delivered by the City Centre Area Action Plan</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>principles, the enhancement and development of 8 areas of change and promoting accessibility and movement.</p>		<p>comments relating to movement and accessibility around the city centre, including comments on street furniture, highway configurations and the effects of (alcohol) licensing and planning, on the city centre environment. Support for the approach to movement and accessibility, adding that the rivers should be used more as strategic transport links.</p>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Economic and Retail Growth Visioning Study (2013)</li> <li>- Consultation Draft City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance (2013)</li> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper Update (2013)</li> <li>- New City Beautiful: Toward an Economic Vision (2011)</li> <li>- York Visitor Survey 2011 - 2012 (2011)</li> <li>- York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</li> <li>- City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework (2011)</li> <li>- York City Centre recognised as the economic, social and cultural heart of York and that it is vital to the character and future economic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The preferred policy approach would have positive and significant positive effects on a range of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects in any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The reasonable alternative was not considered to perform better, in sustainability terms, than the preferred option.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received including no mention of theatres and that the potential for more homes with the conversion of offices/shops to houses should be taken into account, more needs to be done to convert empty properties to residential use as set out in the upper floors study and</li> <li>- There was support for expanding city centre boundary but more information and justification for proposed changes needed</li> <li>- Highlighted that Castle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference to Areas of Change removed to reflect changes to national guidance and the requirement for proposals to be viable and deliverable.</li> <li>- Quantum of development revised to reflect up to date evidence base.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>success of the wider city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Its special qualities and distinctiveness will be conserved whilst helping to achieve economic and social aspirations of the Plan.</li> <li>- The streets, places and spaces of the City Centre will be revitalised and key commercial developments will be delivered.</li> <li>- Proposed revisions to city centre boundary.</li> </ul>		<p>Piccadilly ST20 is not deliverable- all references to it should be excluded from the plan</p>	
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely unchanged from the above</li> <li>- Castle Piccadilly is no longer a deliverable retail allocation and as such the policy approach to this site has been revised with Castle Piccadilly becoming an ‘area of opportunity’ which reflects the Council’s ongoing aspiration for the site as a mixed use development opportunity.</li> <li>- Made more explicit that the city centre is the focus for main town centre uses.</li> <li>- Revised city centre boundary taken forward.</li> <li>-Policy now sits within the spatial strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policies of the spatial strategy as a whole been appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA objectives relating to housing, health, economy and equality and accessibility. Minor positive effects are expected against education, climate change, biodiversity, water, waste, cultural heritage and landscape SA objectives.</li> <li>- The delivery of the 3 city centre sites, alongside the requirement for proposals in city</li> </ul>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- To reflect up to date retail evidence base.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>centre locations to enhance the quality of the city centre (including in respect of retail offer, enhancement of the public realm, traffic reduction and promotion of the evening economy) will help enhance the competitiveness of York.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<p>-NPPF</p>	<p>-Largely unchanged from the above. -Policy now refers to the York Minster Cathedral Precinct.</p>	<p>- The Spatial Strategy policies have been appraised as having a significant positive effects on economy, health, and equality and accessibility. Also, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects on housing but minor negative effects have been assessed in the long term. -York City Centre and York Central (SS3) are identified as priority areas for a range of employment uses. The delivery of these sites will</p>	<p>A mixture of comments were received. - General support was provided for Castle Piccadilly, the Railway Station and National Railway Museum and to the re-letting of vacant shops and conversion of the upper floors of properties. - General objection due to the needs of residents needing to be met first before York as a tourist destination. Also, that too many shops are closing and are being replaced by restaurants and coffee shops. - Several general respondents mention the number of vacant retail units within the city centre. More cycle racks at appropriate locations should</p>	<p>- No change to policy approach</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			enhance the quality of the City Centre. Mixed significant positive and minor negatives effects have been assessed on reducing the need to Travel.	be considered whilst taxi boats and monorails were suggested as means to improved city centre transport links.	

## 6. Policy Topic: York Central

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selective Review of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG12)(2004)</li> <li>- Emerging RSS</li> <li>- Sub Regional Investment Plan</li> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Planning Brief for York Central (2004)</li> <li>- Creates an opportunity to allow for the additional development needs of the City to be accommodated in a sustainable location.</li> <li>- A mixed use new neighbourhood underpins the vision including residential,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York Central, due to the central location and close proximity to the railway station, shops and other services, is likely to have positive benefits against a range of sustainability objectives, particularly by reducing the need to travel, and regenerating an area of central York and therefore bringing improvements to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for acknowledging York Northwest as a major regeneration area and promotion as a mixed-use development site</li> <li>- Recommend that a York Central specific policy is introduced in the Core Strategy</li> <li>- Wish to see York Central prioritised and promoted as a mixed-use or central business district, although the Core Strategy should be realistic about timescales and what the site can accommodate as well as the need for satisfactory infrastructure.</li> <li>- Opportunities for retail expansion into York Central</li> <li>- Need to consider local services</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>employment and leisure uses and quality civic and open spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also includes the creation of a modern, central business district, to complement the City Centre and expand and diversify the City's urban economy. It would provide specialist office and business space for Science City York uses and a wider range of office and headquarter functions.</li> </ul>	<p>built environment.</p>	<p>requirements arising from new development, particularly major developments such as York Northwest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School provision for York Northwest should account should be taken of existing school provision in the locality.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging RSS for Yorkshire and the Humber (Submission Draft, December 2005)</li> <li>- HMA (June 2007)</li> <li>- The Future York Group Report</li> <li>- Identified as major development site, as part of York Northwest</li> <li>- Likely to make a significant contribution to York's housing need, the regional economy and York's role within the Leeds City Region.</li> <li>- An Area Action Plan is being prepared to ensure the environmental impact and infrastructure requirements are assessed comprehensively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area would be the preferred approach to protect the natural environment and make the best use of land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>and the opportunities from the development of the sites are maximised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access York project to include the provision of a new bridge access into the York Central site to provide a public transport (plus non motorised transport) only access to the site.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report – November 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline report produced alongside issues and options AAP which drew on a range of evidence base documents.</li> <li>- Document covered York Central and British Sugar sites.</li> <li>- Draft vision and range of objectives set out for consultation</li> <li>- Starting point for vision for both sites is to create an exemplar sustainable community, providing innovative, contemporary design of the highest quality – a development which is fully integrated with the city and the wider region, where people want to live and work and business will thrive.</li> <li>- A range of issues and options presented for the wider site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The concept of sustainability and the creation of a sustainable and inclusive community are at the core of the York Northwest draft vision and suggested objectives and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- Contains many policy approaches that should help ensure that new development is compatible with the sustainability appraisal objectives.</li> <li>- In determining the preferred options for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for locating office and light industrial uses (B1) on both York Central and British Sugar sites</li> <li>- Higher density housing was supported at York Central</li> <li>- The most popular option was to provide a range of small scale shopping and community facilities across the site. The second most popular option is providing two local centres one at York Central and one at British Sugar.</li> <li>- There was a high level of support for developing a cultural quarter around the NRM to link with the Museum gardens/Minster.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			development at York Northwest, it will be necessary to consider the cumulative impact of policy decisions.		
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identified as major development site, as part of York Northwest</li> <li>- Economically it will allow York to fulfil its regional and sub regional role. It has the potential to make a significant contribution to meeting the City’s need for homes, within the wider context of creating sustainable neighbourhoods, and could have a role in enhancing York’s retail offer. Given the location of the York Central area, adjacent to the historic core, it could also have a key role in enhancing York’s commercial, leisure and tourism offer as part of a new urban quarter.</li> <li>- This will be progressed through the York Northwest AAP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide opportunity for significant employment space and new employment opportunities as well as delivering jobs with training and career prospects for those starting with low skills</li> <li>- Potential to create a vibrant mixed community</li> <li>- Potential to conserve or enhance biodiversity through careful design and provision of new green space</li> <li>- Focusing development in urban areas will help to reduce generation of polluting emissions and greenhouse gases</li> <li>- New development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The section should provide a stronger hook for the Area Action Plan (AAP) with a diagram and a mini brief</li> <li>- The approach needs more justification and the development numbers need to be translated into the broader strategy.</li> <li>- The site is a massive opportunity holding great significance for York and is essential to achieving the Core Strategy vision, but the proposals seemed to show a lack of ambition for the area.</li> <li>- Should define the boundary of the YNW site.</li> <li>- General support for the uses on the sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach to York Central the same as the Local Plan (2005). Approach now indicates the preparation of an AAP for the York Northwest area.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>provides the opportunity to promote sustainable design and construction, resource efficiency and renewable energy generation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Series of recommendations made.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York New City Beautiful – Towards an Economic Vision (2010)</li> <li>- Site allocated as a strategic allocation.</li> <li>- The aim is to realise a new piece of city that complements and enhances the historic core, retains and promotes the qualities of York and connects and integrates into the surrounding built and natural form.</li> <li>- The delivery of York Central Strategic Allocation as a new piece of City will have important economic benefits for the City and region.</li> <li>- Will enable the City to accommodate a significant part of the physical expansion required for a regionally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The detail of the new policy has taken on board some of the recommendations made at the Preferred Option stage.</li> <li>- Principles for development which are positive in terms of sustainability</li> <li>- The majority of impacts will be determined upon implementation and through the development of the SDD</li> <li>- Particularly positive for the achieving social objectives and aiming to minimise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the recognition given to the York Northwest corridor as the most significant area of regeneration in York, and the distinction made between the two strategic allocations in the corridor.</li> <li>- Supported for the intention to preserve and enhance the heritage assets of the corridor in the delivery of its development and requirement, in Policy CS3, for York Central to be developed as a place outstanding quality and design complementing the city.</li> <li>- Concerns in relation to the deliverability of the York Central site in the timescale indicated in the targets/policy CS3 and given the current economic climate.</li> <li>- Questioned whether York Central could physically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New policy added to split up York Northwest site into York Central and British Sugar.</li> <li>- Site to be delivered through an SPD not an AAP as previously.</li> <li>- The policy has significantly changed.</li> <li>- The wording and emphasis of the policy has completely changed to form two policies, one for each strategic site.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>significant employment location along with making a key contribution to meeting the City's housing needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflecting the opportunities for highly sustainable development the site is being promoted as an Urban Eco Settlement</li> <li>- Series of principles of development set out to guide proposals.</li> </ul>	<p>any environmental impacts</p>	<p>accommodate the level of growth in terms of offices, housing and retail specified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More alternatives should be set out in the Core Strategy, including the release of further land (presumably from the Green Belt).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York Northwest Transport Masterplan (2012)</li> <li>- Leeds City Region Housing and Investment Plan 2010 – 2014+ (Leeds City Region and Homes and Community Agency 2010)</li> <li>- York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Baseline Report (2007)</li> <li>- York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report (2007)</li> <li>- York Central is allocated as a Special Policy Area.</li> <li>- This Special Policy Area will enable the creation of a new piece of the city; with exemplar mixed development including a world class urban quarter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Likely to maximise long-term positive impacts on the social, environmental and economic objectives given that this approach can remain flexible but comprehensive and respond to changing circumstances on this site over its medium to long-term delivery timescale</li> <li>- Of the Alternatives, the option to provide detailed criteria / site allocations was also considered to have a significant positive effect on the historic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received</li> <li>- Concern about the scale of office provision proposed, in view of the difficulties in bringing the site forward the proposed level of office, provision should not be an excuse for not providing offices elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site now a special policy area with reduced quantum of development, to address the difficulties the Council and its partners have faced in delivering York Central it bringing forward the site as a coherent strategic allocation.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>forming part of the city centre. This will include; a new central business district, expanded and new cultural and visitor facilities, residential uses and a new vibrant residential community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mix of uses set out alongside a series of development principles</li> <li>- Further detail to be set out in an SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This would be beneficial in the site in the short-term, it would generally lack a mechanism of responding to change and issues which may arise or influence the site's development. As such, this alternative was not considered to perform better, in sustainability terms, than the preferred option.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above with minor wording changes.</li> <li>- Site now known as an area of opportunity.</li> <li>- Reference to Eco Towns has been removed.</li> <li>- Policy now sits within the spatial strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policies of the spatial strategy as a whole been appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA objectives relating to housing, health, economy and equality and accessibility. Minor positive effects are expected against education, climate change, biodiversity, water, waste, cultural heritage and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect consultation responses and discussions with CYC officers.</li> <li>- Eco Towns removed from the NPPF.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			landscape SA objectives. - The delivery of this and other city centre sites will help enhance the competitiveness of York.		
<b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b>	-NPPF	-Reference to the site being an ‘Area of Opportunity’ has been removed - Reference is made to HS2, Harrogate Line alternative approach and the potential tram/train linkages -Changes to number of dwellings now allocated for 1,500 dwellings of which 1,250 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period. Changes to the amount of B1(a) office space now 61,000sqm proposed. -new wording added to conserve and enhance the special character of the adjacent Central Historic Core Conservation Area and St Paul’s Square/ Holgate Road Conservation Area. -Additional wording regarding sustainable travel modes in consultation with Highways England	- The Spatial Strategy policies have been appraised as having a significant positive effects on economy, health, and equality and accessibility. Also, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects on housing but minor negative effects have been assessed in the long term. -York City Centre and York Central (SS3) are identified as a priority areas for a range of employment uses. The delivery of these sites will enhance the quality of the City Centre	-York Central Partnership indicated that York Central is capable of accommodating between 1700 –2500 units for residential and 100,000sqm for B1(a) office. - several supports for the principle of delivering development on this large brownfield site from York Central Partners, Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership, GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), Historic England, Highways England, Network Rail and Lichfield’s on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd. - A number of objections from Planning agents on behalf of house builders/landowners and the York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce, query ST5’s assumed delivery. - wording with regard to Retail Impact Test and Sequential Test	Policy amendments have been made to reflect work undertaken by the York Central Partnership and in consultation with Statutory consultees.



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		-Additional policy criterion relating to the provision of high speed fibre broadband across the site.	Mixed significant positive and minor negatives effects have been assessed on reducing the need to Travel.	needs to be reconsidered.	

## 7. Policy Topic: Scale of Employment Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Land Allocations were based on 19,000 net increase in jobs from 2000-2021 which equated to 55ha for Premier Employment Land, and 28.6ha for Standard Employment Land.</li> <li>- Factors taken into account in relation to future employment sites included: market requirements which were produced by consultants Segal Quince Wicksteed and development constraints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through studies carried out for the City of York Local Plan it was agreed that the economy of York should continue to grow and provide more jobs in the future, but overtime fall in line with the growth levels of a better performing UK economy by 2021. This was identified as the 'medium' growth rate.</li> <li>- Monitoring evidence has shown that the take-up of employment land is not coming forward at the levels expected. The overprovision of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a balance between respondents who felt that the growth figure put forward of 19,000 was too low and those who thought it was too high. Concerns were raised in relation to the capacity of York to accommodate the levels of proposed employment growth and the increase in congestion that would result from more in-commuting.</li> <li>- Some considered it more appropriate that the 19,000 jobs were achieved within the York sub-region rather than just in York.</li> <li>- A number of respondents</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>employment land was a key issue.. These suggested a review of employment sites and reallocating them where necessary and ensuring employment sites that are more compatible with sustainability objectives are prioritised.</p>	<p>highlighted the need to balance the number of jobs against the number of homes.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>- PPG4</p>	<p>- Emerging RSS requirement (Submission draft, 2005) 5447 additional jobs 2006-2016 (545 jobs per year).                      -- Estimate land requirement of 21ha                      - Employment Land Review (ELR) produced by Consultants SQW 16,000 additional jobs 2006-2021 (1060 jobs per year) Estimate land requirement of 23ha</p>	<p>- The amount and location of employment development has a key role to play in securing sustainable development in York.                      - Concern over too many sites being allocated then there is the risk that those more favoured by the market and not necessarily best in terms of sustainability are developed first                      - There are also sustainability impacts if too few sites are allocated as this could lead to difficulties delivering the economic growth required in the area, constraining access to jobs.</p>	<p>- The majority of respondents supported either ELR figures or the higher figures emerging through the RSS.                      - Whilst it was recognised that the RSS would contain figures on future employment growth, several responses put more weight on the figures expressed in the emerging ELR.</p>	<p>- Employment growth figures reflected the emerging RSS and the Employment Land Review.</p>
<p><b>Core</b></p>	<p>- PPG4</p>	<p>- Employment Land Review 2</p>	<p>- A larger amount of land</p>	<p>- 43% of respondents agreed</p>	<p>- Employment</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft PPS4</li> </ul>	<p>produced by consultants Entec indicated a job total growth between 2006-2029 of 25,600. The projection of the annual job growth to 2029 was forecast as 1,113. The total land requirement was 49.6ha</p>	<p>would be required for employment and this would have clear impacts on the take up of greenfield land and consequently biodiversity, landscape and the historic character. It would also achieve a higher number of jobs than the workforce available, which would lead to in-commuting and the impacts on the ecological footprint of the city, which could lead to negative social impacts.</p>	<p>with the number of predicted jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 48% of the sample believed the number of predicted jobs should be lower.</li> <li>- The remaining 9% of respondents said that the number should be higher.</li> </ul>	<p>growth figures reflect Employment Land Review 2.</p>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS4</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Topic Paper (2011) included re-evaluated projections of the two Employment Land Reviews due to the global financial crisis.</li> <li>- Stated that around 960 additional jobs per annum was a realistic average figure for the LDF period.</li> <li>- Conclusions based on a slightly lower employment levels compared with the previous figures however a larger margin of choice to be adopted when converting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy remains positive in achieving the economic objectives set out in the SA.</li> <li>- Central to the policy is the need to provide sufficient land to meet the requirements for job and business growth in the future. This relates to the target to achieve a job growth of 1000 jobs per annum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some respondents felt that 1000 jobs a year is too high in terms of the environmental capacity of York and unrealistic given the current economic climate, others felt that 1000 jobs is inadequate and should be amended (increased) to cover a wider skills range and to include reference to the wider role York has in the region.</li> <li>- Several respondents supported the conclusion that York can support a growth level of 1000 jobs per year and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due to the global financial crisis Arup consultants recalculated the employment growth figures and this new evidence base has been reflected.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>employee numbers into a land requirement for these sectors which results in a position very similar in land requirement to the earlier Employment Land Review Stage 2 (2009).</p>		<p>to identify land for employment development.</p>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>- Oxford Economic Forecasting (OEF) produced a series of projections for York for the period 2012 to 2030 as part of the City of York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (2013). Scenario 2 represented a ‘policy-on’ scenario based on faster growth in the following sectors for York: advanced manufacturing, science and research, financial and professional services, and tourism and leisure. This gave an employment growth forecast between 2012 and 2030 16,169.</p> <p>- Scenario 2 reflects the Council’s ambitions as set out in the York Economic Strategy. Felt to be the most realistic in terms of reflecting the national economy.</p>	<p>- The preferred policy approach would deliver an estimated 16,169 jobs over the plan period, facilitating faster growth in advanced manufacturing, science and research, financial and professional services, and tourism and leisure sectors.</p> <p>- This is expected to support the realisation of the York Economic Strategy, helping the City fulfil its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region</p> <p>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant negative effects on any of the SA</p>	<p>- The plan is unrealistic and over ambitious in the current economic climate.</p> <p>- Growth must be controlled and sustainable and take account of falls in employment.</p> <p>-- Concern over 1000 jobs per year figure and how these jobs will be created.</p> <p>- No data clarifying the amount of empty employment space, there is no way of predicting extra floor levels if this isn’t taken into account.</p> <p>- Co-location of start-up social enterprises linked to the need for more small office space should be added.</p>	<p>- Changes made to reflect new evidence base.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>The Economic Outlook for York (2014) Oxford Economics</p> <p>- Oxford Economic Forecasting (OEF) produced a series of projections for the period 2013 to 2030. The trend based projection shows the workforce growing from 112,857 to 126,412 and GVA growth of 2.8% per annum. This equates to over 13,500 additional jobs which could be created in the city. As a further test of their robustness this forecast was compared with forecasts from Experian/REM and Cambridge Econometrics. All three forecasts showed a similar scale of job growth.</p> <p>- Because of the degree of uncertainty in economic forecasting the Plan takes a cautious approach and uses the trend based forecast to inform the land requirements in the Plan. This is still consistent with the ambitions of the city's economic strategy.</p>	<p>- Policy EC1: makes provision for a range of employment development during the plan period including the identification of 144,000m2 strategic sites for Research and Development, light industrial, storage and distribution, leisure uses and further employment sites to meet the forecast demand.</p> <p>- The delivery of the identified sites will enhance the competitiveness of York. The implementation of this policy will help to increase employment land and create significant employment opportunities to support sustained economic growth.</p> <p>- Overall the policies have been appraised as having a positive effect on the SA Objectives</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- Changes made to reflect updated evidence base.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b></p>	<p>-NPPF</p>	<p>An Employment Land Review (ELR) was produced in July 2016 and an update was produced in 2017. This brings together evidence on the demand for and supply of employment land. Demand has been calculated using a well established method of converting econometric forecasts into floorspace/employment land. The starting point for this was job growth forecasts by Oxford Economics (OE) wherein a baseline scenario and two further scenarios were considered; scenario 1 – higher migration and faster UK recovery and scenario 2 – re-profiled sector growth. Scenario 2 was endorsed as it reflected the economic policy priorities of the Council to drive up the skills of the workforce and encourage growth in businesses which use higher skilled staff. Scenario 2 will enable York to realise its economic growth ambitions as set out within the York Economic Strategy (2016), contributing to a vibrant economy.</p>	<p>The preferred employment growth option has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with a significant positive effect identified in respect to improving education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</p> <p>Significant positive effects have also been identified with regard to creating jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.</p>	<p>There was a limited response to the scale of employment growth. Comments that were received included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Plans message is one of constraint rather than growth. They consider there to be a need to deliver more land for employment rather than less to help the aspirations of the city for a shift towards a higher value economy. They indicate that in recent years there has been a loss of employment use to housing through office to residential conversions through permitted development and there have also been delays in delivery of new employment floor space at regeneration sites.</li> <li>- A representor fundamentally disagrees with the cautious approach using the baseline forecast to inform the employment land requirements of the Plan, because of uncertainties in long term economic forecasting.</li> <li>-several developers state that it is unclear which employment forecast has been used for housing.</li> </ul>	<p>-No change made to the policy approach.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>The OE forecasts indicate jobs growth to be 650 jobs per annum over the plan period. To sensitivity test the 2015 OE projections, the latest Experian economic forecasts used within the Regional Econometric Model have been used. It is important to ensure there is sufficient flexibility within the land supply for a range of scenarios rather than an exact single figure which one can precisely plan to with complete certainty. In summary the Experian model broadly supports the original growth projections included in the OE 2015 model.</p>			

## 8. Policy Topic: Location of Employment Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future' (2005)</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites identified to meet the projected demand for 55ha premier employment land, and 28.6ha standard employment land.</li> <li>- Major employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The location of employment land can have a substantial impact on establishing travel patterns in the area and reducing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents agree with a new office quarter at York Central. 58% of the sample agree with office development as part of the redevelopment at Terry's, whilst</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>allocations are reserved for business (B1), general industrial (B2) and storage or distribution (B8) uses, in addition to several smaller allocations (0.5ha or less).</p>	<p>peoples' need to travel. As reducing the length and amount of trips people make to meet everyday needs is a key component of delivering more sustainable development.</p>	<p>56% said as part of the redevelopment at Nestle. Just over half (51%) of respondents think office development should be at Monks Cross, whilst 48% said as part of the redevelopment of Layerthorpe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents were least likely to agree that office development should be in York city centre (37%).</li> <li>- Development should be located where employees can access the site using methods of transport other than the private car, however public transport infrastructure needs to be improved to accommodate new job growth.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three options put forward that could guide the identification of sites</li> <li>Option 1: Apply the following site criteria:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) use of previously developed land</li> <li>(ii) promote city and district centre locations, followed by sites within the main urban area before considering other options;</li> <li>(iii) Market demand;</li> <li>(iv) Site accessibility by: public transport; the rail network; and walking and cycling;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area would be the preferred approach to protect the natural environment and make the best use of land. The SA supports an approach that sees accessibility by public transport as key consideration in the location of new employment sites.</li> <li>- Where employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was considered locations near good public transport that would result in the reduced use of the private car would make jobs more accessible.</li> <li>- The majority of employment should be focused in York itself. In contrast some felt that due to the historic value of the city centre, its more appropriate to develop satellite employment parks on the periphery. Some sites in the green belt might be more sustainable in accessibility terms and should therefore be considered.</li> <li>- Broadly, respondents supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>(v) Proximity to University and other institutions; and (vi) Other factors. Option 2: Apply the criteria shown in Option 1, but prioritise market demands. Option 3: Apply the criteria as shown in Option 1, but prioritise other factors identified</p>	<p>land choice is left for developers to decide they may prefer greenfield locations with lower development costs. This may be to the detriment of attempts to regenerate previously developed sites within the urban area with impacts on the opportunities to improve the built environment, as well as resulting in the inefficient use of land.</p>	<p>making use of brownfield land and promoting a hierarchy of locations, with a priority for city and district centres before considering other options.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<p>- Five options for how the LDF could respond to the changing character of York’s economy Option 1: Support the continued development of Science City York and other knowledge-led businesses. Option 2: Promote financial and professional service activities. Option 3: Attempt through the provision of sites to readdress the decline in the manufacturing sector. Option 4: Promote creative</p>	<p>- Important that the core strategy pursue an approach that delivers equal access to employment that matches the skills of the residents. - Concern that jobs promoted through high tech industries and Science City York would only be suitable for certain highly qualified people. Supporting this type of business however, is acknowledged to have</p>	<p>- Locating offices near the train station will encourage inward commuting. - Public transport infrastructure needs to be improved to accommodate new job growth. - Sites in need of regeneration should be the focus for economic development before Green Belt sites. - The strategy should include small scale employment for local needs through reinvestment in declining areas. - Question why some of the B1a offices are proposed out of centre when Sub Regional City Centres</p>	<p>- The priority of location of employment growth remains the city centre, with need in smaller, rural locations acknowledged for diversification of employment.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>industries                      Option 5: Support and promote other sectors of the economy .                      - Three options for guiding the identification of employment sites                      Option 1: Apply the site criteria.                      Option 2: Apply the criteria but prioritise market demand.                      Option 3: Apply the criteria but prioritise other factors identified.</p>	<p>potentially significant beneficial impacts for economic growth and the stability of York’s economy.                      - Support for prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area.</p>	<p>like York should be the focus for offices.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<p>- Will support sustainable economic growth delivering increased prosperity whilst respecting the City’s special built and natural environment and addressing the challenges posed by climate change. -                      - Provision of employment land for the period 2011–2031 will be made, through the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and City Centre AAP, to accommodate the levels of growth. This will be in conformity with Spatial</p>	<p>- The SA supports that the majority of sites to be delivered are located within the subregional centre which is positive in terms of accessibility and connectivity across the city but also for businesses. The SA is cautious however, over the delivery of employment site on the periphery of the sub-regional area as this may increase car trips.                      - The SA supports the policy’s approach to rural industry and</p>	<p>- Some respondents felt that the supply of land for ‘B’ Class uses is inadequate and the Core Strategy fails to address current deficiencies let alone make provision for future growth in these sectors.                      - Others felt that the policy criteria will not ensure there is a supply of appropriate sites to meet the full range of market and employment demand during the plan period, and does not provide support for expansion of existing employment sites.</p>	<p>- The former policy has been split into two with the overarching principles.                      - The general policy approach remains the same with more detail to include more information relating to the retention of existing sites within York.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Principles 1, 2 and 3.	diversification in addition to other stated industries		
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council will support development proposals in appropriate highly accessible locations, which attract commercial investment, maintain economic competitiveness and provide employment opportunities for the local community.</li> <li>- In order to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy, the Local Plan will make appropriate provision to allow the city to reach its economic growth aspirations.</li> <li>- A number of employment locations are priority areas for development or redevelopment and infrastructure funding to support growth in key economic sectors:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment has identified that criteria and site allocations should ensure that economic development is in locations that: Reduce the need to travel and/or encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Avoid adverse impacts on the City’s built and natural environmental assets. Are appropriate for specific uses, avoiding adverse impacts on health. Make best use of previously developed land and are accessible to areas of employment deprivation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that the policy is not ambitious enough and is responding to forecasts rather than reflecting local conditions.</li> <li>- Employment allocations unevenly spread across the City;</li> <li>- Existing employment sites should be fully occupied before further development takes place.</li> <li>- Critical shortage of small industrial uses.</li> <li>- Fails to meet the quality and location requirements for knowledge and bio-based industries;</li> <li>- Infrastructure is nearing capacity in areas suggested for employment expansion;</li> <li>- No mention of well connected and designed Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>- There is no real provision for tourism and leisure uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broadly, the steer of allocations remains the same, in the urban area in the first instance with employment uses elsewhere responding to identified need.</li> </ul>
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above, albeit the proposed allocated sites have been updated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The creation of new employment opportunities identified are expected to have a minor positive effect on SA Objective 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amendments to the portfolio of site reflects up to date evidence base work.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>(Education and Skills).                      - Increasing the availability of employment will help to increase employment opportunities through the identification of specific sites which has been appraised as a significant positive against SA Objectives 5 (Equality and Accessibility) and 6 (Reducing the Need to Travel) and 12 (Air Quality).                      - No significant negative effects were identified.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b></p>	<p>-NPPF</p>	<p>- Largely as above, albeit the proposed allocated sites have been updated inline with the 2016 ELR and 2017 update.</p>	<p>The preferred employment growth option has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with a significant positive effect identified in respect to improving education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</p> <p>Significant positive</p>	<p>There was a mixture of responses including:                      -support for Policy EC1: Provision of Employment Land from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), Leeds and City Region LEP,                      -Several objections over the amount of land allocated for employment including from the York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce                      - Disconnect between the amount of land allocated for B1a employment use (64k sqm) and</p>	<p>- Amendments to policy to reflect consultation comments and technical evidence submitted through consultation.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>effects have also been identified with regard to creating jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.</p>	<p>the projected demand across the plan period (107k sqm). Also, the majority of the allocated land being contained within one single site with serious risk and viability concerns (ST5 York Central) undermines the policy, this will not allow flexibility or choice for businesses looking to locate or expand in York.</p> <p>-O'Neills state the policy needs to clarify / reference the capacity of Campus East to accommodate up to 25ha of knowledge-led businesses.</p> <p>-Picton Capital objects to the Plan seeking to safeguard existing employment provision at Clifton Moor, this approach is not justified given the CYC evidence base considers office space in Clifton Moor not to meet the quality required by the market.</p> <p>-York Green Party stress that small windfall sites should be considered for employment allocations where they can be demonstrated to meet a local need.</p>	

## 9. Policy Topic: Approach to Retail

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners 2004)</li> <li>- Retail growth scenarios given including static market share, rising market share and falling market share.</li> <li>- Options given on the location and distribution of new retail development including continuing priority to York City Centre as the main focus of retailing activity, encourage new retail development in edge of centre sites, concentrate on district centre retailing, identify areas outside the City Centre for retail growth and assess deficiencies in the provision of local convenience shopping and identify opportunities for remediation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall, the approaches put forward for retail in the Issues and Options document are compatible with sustainable development.</li> <li>- The overall growth of retail and new floorspace should be based on needs, and the ability for York to accommodate these facilities sustainably without the need for unnecessary use of greenfield land, or development in locations only easily accessible by private transport modes.</li> <li>- Priority for all types of shop must be given to city centre in line with national policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options for retail growth should not solely relate to the city centre, but should consider all retail in York. Should consider the impact on York's historic character and be dependent on traffic impacts.</li> <li>- No need to compete with other shopping destinations because York offers something different</li> <li>- Should focus on unique character, protection of existing shops and qualitative aspects more than growth per se.</li> <li>- Should develop flexible retailing policies and seek to continually review retailing capacity, demand and viability.</li> <li>- Most respondents supported giving priority to the city centre with possible extensions rather than identifying areas outside the city centre for retail growth.</li> <li>- Respondents supported maintaining the diversity of shops with support for more specialist and independent shops and for making more of the current market facilities, as well as suggesting the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				development of a permanent indoor farmers market. - Widespread support for more food stores in the city centre and the provision of local convenience shops in district and local shopping centres.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS6	- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners 2004)  - Two approaches put forward for growth: York continues to hold onto its share of the regional market; or York increases its share of the regional retail market. - Three options put forward for key areas of retail growth: Direct growth first to York City Centre, then to Acomb and Haxby district centres; or as above and also identify an additional centre/centres to provide for the new need likely to be generated by the City's major development opportunities, such as York Northwest. Final option as first option and also recognise Monks Cross or Clifton Moor as district centres.	- It would be most suitable to see retail growth in York grow to a level that was effective in retaining as large as possible share of spend of York and existing catchment area residents, without encouraging visits for further away where needs can be met more locally. - Will be important to ensure that the retail centre of York is not performing at too an intense a level that causes harm to the city centre, including historic character and the well-being of residents. This includes discouraging traffic congestion throughout York. - Any new shopping areas need to be provided on a good public transport access route into the city centre this could help overcome some adverse	- See above	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			impacts of either increased pressure on the old centre or inaccessible out-of-town centres.		
<b>Allocations DPD Issues and Options - March 2008</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Retail Study (2004)</li> <li>- Will identify sites to reflect the approach in the Core Strategy and consider all types of retail including food and non food and different retail locations including the city centre, local and district centres and out of centre locations.</li> <li>- Two sites put forward and stated that City Centre retail issues will also be considered through work on the City Centre AAP.</li> <li>- A number of options put forward as follows.</li> <li>- Is Castle Piccadilly an appropriate site retail expansion of the city centre.</li> <li>- Is Land West of Hungate (R/002) appropriate for retail development?</li> <li>- Are there any other sites that would appropriate for retail development?</li> <li>- Should sites be allocated for particular types of shops? If so, what types of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two retail sites (Castle Piccadilly and Hungate) put forward for consideration in the DPD assessed against the indicators and sustainability criteria and scored favourably.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of up to date evidence relating to retail capacity and retail need</li> <li>- York Central is a suitable site to accommodate additional retail floorspace in the context of the findings of the 2004 Retail Study</li> <li>- Provision of enhanced facilities on land at Monks Cross and adjacent to Designer Outlet, Naburn would be complementary to and support existing town centre facilities.</li> <li>- Mixed response to two proposed allocations at Castle Piccadilly and Hungate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>- PPS6</p>	<p>shops and where?</p> <p>- Regional Spatial Strategy (2008) - York’s Retail Study (GVA Grimley LLP 2008)</p> <p>Strengthening the role of York as a sub-regional shopping centre. Decline in the city centre market share is halted and then increased to a 34% share in order to maintain York’s position in the wider regional retail hierarchy.</p> <p>- Significant capacity identified for additional retail floorspace up to 2029. In accordance with the spatial strategy, the priority for this additional floorspace will be within, or adjacent to, the central shopping area of the city centre (i.e. Castle Piccadilly and the Stonebow</p> <p>- The preferred approach is to also consider whether additional retail capacity, over and above that which can be achieved within the city centre, could and should be delivered on York Central (part of York Northwest Area Action Plan). Further work has been commissioned to consider potential options for retail on</p>	<p>- The best solution for York would be to see growth at a level that was effective in retaining its market share without encouraging visits further away where needs can be met locally.</p> <p>- Increasing the market share may encourage travelling to York for services and impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from traffic.</p> <p>- The provision of retail would have a positive relationship with social sustainability objectives of accessibility and equity of access as well as some economic objectives. However, the SA also recognised the potential impacts on the historic environment need to be mitigated to ensure no adverse impacts on the historic environment and related sectors of the economy.</p> <p>- Focussing development within the city centre and two district centres would help to encourage</p>	<p>- It is essential to the economic well being of York that retail in the city centre continues to thrive</p> <p>- York does not need to strengthen its role as a sub-regional shopping and entertainment centre.</p> <p>- There is a need for further analysis and assessment of York’s retail issues, including diversion of high valued goods to out-of-town locations; accessibility by car for high value goods and ancillary social and cultural needs; improved town centre management; and key anchors for expanded retail offer.</p> <p>- Support for increase market share, others thought it was too high</p> <p>- Range of comments on location of retail.</p>	<p>- No changes from approach in Local Plan 2005, albeit market share figures have been updated in light of evidence base</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		York Central.	accessible retail via sustainable transport. However, it also recognised that limiting retail to just these areas may not help to achieve or maintain its role in the region in terms of market share and that there should be access to smaller shopping areas within new development.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retail Supporting Paper (2011)</li> <li>- York Retail Study (2008)</li> <li>- To deliver new shopping provision to support the vitality and viability of the City Centre and meet local shopping needs.</li> <li>- Prioritising new retail development in the City Centre;</li> <li>- Meeting identified local needs for modern units; an enhanced department store offer; and further convenience floorspace in the City Centre. As well as further convenience floorspace in other smaller centres, including a new local centre on the Former British Sugar/Manor School Strategic Allocation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will help to secure retail provision with the city centre as a primary consideration whilst also developing new retail provision in the future subject to further impact testing.</li> <li>- Welcomes the new policy’s strengthened approach for the sequential development of retail in York prioritising the city centre primarily over other development.</li> <li>- The inclusion for York to achieve 34% market share has been removed from the policy. This is considered to have taken pressure off York to achieve a certain share but rather more aim at retaining its market share</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the approach taken, in particular the increased commitment to sequential development was welcomed and the recognition that out of centre retail development is appropriate where it satisfies the sequential approach. Another respondent welcomed most of the targets and in particular the target to increase convenience floorspace.</li> <li>- Should set out the Council’s approach to future growth at out of centre destinations; this should be more restrictive for the Designer Outlet than for Clifton Moor and Monks Cross due to its location in the Green Belt and outside of the Ring Road.</li> <li>- Identification of York Designer Outlet as an out of centre retail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach however the structure has changed to reflect a hierarchical approach to the provision of retail in the future. This has been captured through structuring the policy to support the city centre, identify needs for comparison and convenience retail and stating a</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capturing as much of the available retail expenditure in the catchment as possible (as identified in latest retail study) in highly accessible locations that will not have an unacceptable impact on the City Centre.</li> </ul>	<p>through the protection of the city and through the identification of 2 strategic sites for retail.</p>	<p>destination welcomed. Suggested it can contribute to additional comparison floorspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monks Cross should be given greater recognition in this section.</li> <li>- Policy does not provide sufficient flexibility. Several respondents suggested that the policy should not prescribe floorspace levels.</li> <li>- Several comments about the deliverability of specific retail schemes, including Castle Piccadilly and York Central and what the strategy would be if they cannot be delivered.</li> <li>- Concern was raised about the impact of the community stadium proposals currently going through the planning application procedure on the retail objectives and policy approach.</li> </ul>	<p>sequential assessment approach to any other retail schemes put forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy has put the city centre at the forefront of the policy and objectives and aims to support its vitality and viability. This is an addition from the previous policy and is significant in highlighting and reinforcing that the city centre is the priority to be maintained in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (2013)</li> <li>- Retail Supporting Paper (2011)</li> <li>- York Retail Study (2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred approach is considered likely to have significant positive effects on the economy (SA Objective 4) as well as positive effects on equality and accessibility (SA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the preferred policy approach.</li> <li>- Preference should be given to out of centre locations in light of city centre schemes becoming unviable (Castle Piccadilly)</li> <li>Concern regarding the viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change, retains existing retail hierarchy</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The vitality and viability of the City Centre, district and local centres will be maintained and enhanced through the retail hierarchy</li> <li>- The focus for major new retail development and investment will be the City Centre.</li> <li>- Proposals for main town centre uses will be directed sequentially to the Primary Shopping Area in the city centre and subsequently to the wider City Centre as a whole.</li> <li>- The creation of further floorspace or changes to the type of retail at these locations will only be permitted if the proposal is small in nature (less than 200 m2) and will not impact upon the city centre vitality and viability.</li> <li>- All retail (convenience and comparison) over 100 m2 in out of centre locations will be required to be supported by an impact and sequential assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 5), transport (SA Objective 6), land use (SA Objective 9), cultural heritage (SA Objective 14) and landscape (SA Objective 15).</li> <li>- The preferred policy approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- None of the reasonable alternatives identified and assessed were considered to perform better than the preferred options against any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>of the former British Sugar Site</li> <li>- Whinthorpe should be afforded district centre status within the retail hierarchy in order to be a sustainable location</li> <li>- There is a need for a detailed assessment of food retailing arising from anticipated growth</li> <li>- Concern the policy is already undermined with Monks Cross 2</li> <li>- Concern over a lack of 'good quality/useful shops' in the city centre. A need for further encouragement and promotion of this.</li> <li>- The Designer Outlet performs a wider tourism and specialist retail function and should not be constrained like other out of centre retail parks</li> <li>- The restriction of 200sq.m on new retail development in out of centre locations is inconsistent with the NPPF.</li> <li>- A lack of evidence to support the adoption of sequential and impact assessment requirement for retail over 100sq.m.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Council Retail Study Update and Addendum (2014)</li> <li>- Approach largely as above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implementation of Policy R1 would help to maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of the city centre, district and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Major changes to reflect the updated evidence base.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
2014		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thresholds in relation to impact assessments to protect the vitality and viability of the defined centres in the hierarchy have been added. A tiered approach is proposed based on advice in the retail study update.</li> <li>- Approach to ensuring the vitality and viability of the city centre strengthened. This includes identifying primary and secondary shopping frontages within the Primary Shopping Area and setting out a policy approach to proposals in these areas.</li> <li>- Out of centre locations subject to restrictive mechanisms to control further expansion or restrictions on the range of goods sold from existing and future floorspace.</li> </ul>	<p>neighbourhood centres whilst Policy R4 will help to ensure that out of centre retailing is only permitted in specific circumstances and where it could be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts on the city centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The retail hierarchy set out in Policy R1 would help to reduce the need to travel by ensuring that services and facilities are located in existing locations which are already well served by public transport.</li> <li>- Overall the policies have been appraised as having a positive effect on the SA Objectives.</li> </ul>	undertaken.	
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	-NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The same evidence and largely the same approach as above using the - City of York Council Retail Study Update and Addendum (2014).</li> </ul>	<p>Overall the employment and retail policies (R1-R4 inclusive) have been assessed as having a significant positive effect on SA Objective 4 (jobs and economy).</p> <p>The implementation of Policy R1 would help to maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of the</p>	<p>Support for the retail policies from a variety of respondents including: North Yorkshire County Council, Historic England, Highways England, various Parish Councils, York’s Green Party.</p> <p>-Various respondents including Rachael Maskell MP highlighted that new developments must not draw further trade away from the</p>	<p>Policy amendments have been made to reflect work undertaken by the York Central Partnership.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>city centre, district and neighbourhood centres whilst Policy R4 will help to ensure that out of centre retailing is only permitted in specific circumstances and where it could be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts on the city centre.</p>	<p>city centre and small communities, but rather encourage more people into the city centre and suburbs like Front Street in Acomb.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) states that the policy requires A1-retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area (PSA), specifically including York Central (ST5), to be subject to a sequential and impact assessment. Whilst this is strictly in accordance with the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such an approach could harm the ability of York Central Partnership to allow for a comprehensive and sustainable development [at ST5] that meets the needs of its future community including its residents and workforce.</li> <li>- Concern over the proliferation of tearooms, restaurants and cafes in the centre of York hasn't been fully addressed.</li> <li>- The definition of 'Primary Shopping Area' should be loosened to also reflect principal gateway streets into the</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<p>"primary shopping frontage". This would include Gillygate and Bootham in the definition arguably they should already be included as contiguous with High Petergate - suggest all the footstreets are "primary shopping frontage".</p> <p>- support the removal of the Designer Outlet from the Green Belt, support its expansion and consolidation and support the Designer Outlet being classed as part of the main built up area on the key diagram but suggest recognition should be given to the parking issues identified at the York Designer Outlet which are restricting its ability to reach its potential economic contribution to York and the City's growth aspirations.</p>	

## 10. Policy Topic: Scale of Housing Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 –</b>	- PPS3	- Work still ongoing but proposed housing requirements for York are broadly similar to those in	- Determining the development of housing in the City of York is one of the key areas that the LDF	- Concerns about the fact that no overall housing figures were included and that this meant it was difficult to assess	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
June 2006		the Structure Plan and Local Plan, being 640(net) new units per annum in the period from 2004 to 2016 and 620(net) per annum in the period 2016-21.	can have an impact, and help to achieve more sustainable development.	what impact the figures would have on issues such as market demand, commuting and the special character of the city.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Range from 630 to 982 dwellings</li> <li>- Drawing of demographic and market demand</li> <li>- Other factors taken into consideration include development constraints and forecast economic growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Balance between jobs and homes needs to be found to achieve more self-containment.</li> <li>- Likely increase in RSS housing target and limited opportunity to depart from the RSS is a major influence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Core strategy should reflect most up to date RSS figures. (RSS not finalised at time of consultation)</li> <li>- Flexibility required to accommodate higher figures should need arise</li> </ul>	- Reflects the most up to date figures in the adopted RSS
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS3	- RSS defined the requirement as 640 dwellings between 2004-8 and 850 dwellings 2008-26	- The level of provision for housing needs to ensure there are sufficient homes to accommodate the growth of the current population given the predicted drop in household size in the forthcoming years. The strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 33% supported 850 figure and said the recession shouldn't be used to justify a lower figure</li> <li>- 59% preferred a lower figure which they felt better reflected the need for housing</li> </ul>	- Reflects outgoing RSS and more recent national and local evidence
<b>Core Strategy Submission</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS3</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS provides start point</li> <li>- More recent national and local evidence refines this</li> </ul>	- Policy will help to deliver enough housing to meet need and demand for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targets should be higher and reflect 2008 DCLG projection.</li> <li>- There should not be a lower</li> </ul>	- RSS revoked and its housing evidence base is outdated



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
– <b>September 2011</b>		leading to proposal for 635 dwellings between 2011/12 to 2015/16 and 850 dwellings between 2016/17 to 2030/31	housing	figure for early part of plan period - Others thought growth would not materialise and targets should be lower	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	- Review of evidence that underpins objectively assessed need. Options considered between 850 dwellings per annum and 2,060 - Preferred option was 1,090 dwellings per annum.	- Preferred approach will not have significant negative effects and will support the forecast job growth. It will not meet the SHMA target for affordable housing	- Provide local level policy to guide phasing of development and provide an allowance for windfall sites - 2011 household projections will lead to an undersupply of homes. The Council should plan more positively and aspire to the higher housing figures of Option 3 (1,500 dwellings) or Option 4 (2,060 dwellings) to meet economic and affordable housing needs. - Provision should be lower – below 850 per yr and give priority to brownfield sites. - The persistent record of under delivery of housing means the Council should be looking at a 20% buffer.	- Changes made to reflect new evidence base.
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	City of York Housing Requirements in York: Evidence on Housing Requirement in York Update (2014) produced by Arup.  - Provide a minimum	- The scale of provision means that a range of housing can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet the objectively assessed needs of the City. This will enable the building of strong,	- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.	- Changes made to reflect updated evidence base.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>annual provision of 996 new dwellings over the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During the first six years of the plan (five post adoption) a 20% buffer will be applied to this figure equating to a delivery of 1170 dwellings per annum.</li> <li>- Additional delivery to help address the City's affordable housing need will be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<p>sustainable communities through addressing the housing and community needs of York's current and future population, including that arising from economic and institutional growth. This has been assessed as having a significant positive effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing). The provision of housing is also expected to have a significant positive effect on SA Objective 5 (Equality and Accessibility). The scale and broad location of housing proposed mean that a range of dwellings and community facilities can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet specific needs.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>		<p>For the purposes of this SA Report, the preferred housing growth option, as set out in Policy SS1, and the reasonable alternative identified by the City of York Council have been appraised. The housing growth figures considered are:</p>	<p>Positive effects were identified in relation to housing, reflecting that economic growth will assist in increasing prosperity which could increase demand for new homes and increase people's chances of owning their own homes or advancing on the</p>	<p>Some Parish representations support the 867 dwellings per annum figure over the Government's standardised methodology figure of 1070 dpa.</p> <p>Other independent housing requirement reports submitted by planning consultants</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preferred Option: 867 dwellings per annum (dpa) – DCLG Baseline based on the July 2016 Household Projections</li> <li>- Reasonable Alternative: 953 dpa – GL Hearn recommended figure (SHMA update, 2017). The figure also includes a 10% adjustment to include provision for affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<p>property ladder. Positive effects were also identified in relation to equality of access.</p> <p>Mixed positive and negative effects were identified in relation to health and transport. Negative effects were identified with regard to climate change, land resources, water and waste and resource use.</p>	<p>recommended a minimum of 1,150 dpa. These include alternative household formation rates and exclude student housing from commitments and backlog. Previous reports were also alluded to/appended, which support target ranges of 920-1070 dpa and 1,125 and 1,255 dpa.</p> <p>Some members of the public objected to all housing growth/ the scale of housing growth and/or 867 dpa given the impact on the environment, congestion and climate change.</p>	

## 11. Policy Topic: Location of Housing Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG3</li> <li>- Emerging PPS3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary focus for development is in the main built up area of York.</li> <li>- Outside urban areas urban extensions should be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Determining the distribution and development of housing in the City of York is one of the key</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of respondents considered that the correct factors had not been identified and that other factors over and above those identified should be considered</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		considered in the first instance followed by non urban sites.	areas that the LDF can have an impact, and help to achieve more sustainable development.	such as highway capacity, Green Belt boundary, access to a wider range of facilities, access to non-car transport modes, drainage, infrastructure quality, pollution, air quality, market demand, global environment change and limited natural resources. - Respondents considered that all the factors identified should be applied to both urban and non-urban sites and that the employment criteria should be applied to all types of development.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS3	- Four options put forward: Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility Option 2: Prioritising existing trends Option 3: Prioritising housing need Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors	- Considering which villages and peripheral areas of York’s main urban area have the capacity to accommodate growth is also of great significance to the spatial strategy.	- The majority of respondents to this issue supported Option 1.	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS3	- It is not anticipated that housing land will be required for the expansion until beyond 2021. The location of potential areas for these expansions are shown as ‘Areas of Search’ A and B. - Strategic growth will be concentrated on the urban York , limited small scale	- The level of provision for housing needs to ensure there are sufficient homes to accommodate the growth of the current population given the predicted drop in household size in the	- Two-thirds (67%) of respondents agree that areas A and B are suitable locations for building new homes. The remaining third (33%) do not agree. Half of these did not suggest an alternative, of those that did the main areas identified were: - Area E - Area F - Area D	- Move away from the reliance on windfall sites, in accordance with national policy and identification of areas of search for housing in the first instance.. - Reflect findings

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>expansion of local services centres, villages and rural villages may be considered appropriate to address specific local needs such as affordable housing. This will be considered through the Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>forthcoming years. - The strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy).</p>	<p>- Brownfield sites only - The areas of search should be brought forward earlier in the plan period, potentially for specific uses, to help deliver the aspirations for priority housing development.</p>	<p>of HMA which will influence the mix, tenure and affordability of housing provided in the district over the next 20 years. - Reflect findings in the urban potential study.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>- PPS3 - Draft NPPF</p>	<p>- Will meet future housing need and situate new housing in locations that support the Spatial Strategy. - The focus for new housing development will be the main urban area of York, with around 87% of new housing in the identified supply being within the main urban area and the remainder in the large villages and villages. York’s LDF will identify broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing over the LDF period to achieve the housing target.</p>	<p>- Developments will be subject to the requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including the spatial strategy for their location. - Areas of search for urban extension will play a crucial role in delivering housing and new sustainable communities.</p>	<p>- It was suggested that safeguarded land over and above the areas of search should be identified. - Several respondents suggesting there is not enough justification and that the approach to housing growth is not based on a robust and credible evidence base. - Housing delivery has been set at a level that protects the Green Belt which is politically acceptable rather than meeting housing needs. - Housing growth proposed will challenge infrastructure. Policy should be about how the City is going to accommodate this level of growth to ensure there is sufficient capacity to absorb, and cope with additional growth.</p>	<p>- The Spatial Principles have been reappraised against the SA framework given their overarching importance for this document and their revised wording in this edition of the Core Strategy.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options –</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>- An important part of the Plan’s vision is to ensure sustainable growth patterns.</p>	<p>- The assessment has identified that criteria and site</p>	<p>- More small and medium sized developments should be allocated to allow development to come</p>	<p>- Detailed allocated housing sites are identified</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>June 2013</b>		<p>Growth is shaped by the character and setting of the city, environmental assets, flood risk, location sustainability and settlement capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All sites subject to a detailed site selection methodology</li> <li>- Sites that passed the criteria in the methodology proposed for allocation.</li> </ul>	<p>allocations should ensure that new housing development is directed to locations that reduce the need to travel and/or encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, avoid adverse impacts on the City's built and natural environmental assets, avoid locations that could exacerbate existing health issues (e.g. AQMAs), make best use of previously developed land and incorporate service provision where possible.</p>	<p>forward in the beginning of the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No trajectory to indicate delivery timescales from individual sites. It should be left to the market to bring forward sites as required.</li> </ul>	<p>in the housing chapter to meet need and to reflect NPPF policy.</p>
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	- As above	<p>- Appraised as having a significant positive effect on those SA Objectives relating to housing, health and equality. Minor positive against jobs, travel, waste, historic environment and natural and built</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>No change in approach.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>environment objectives have also been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive and negative effects associated with the implementation of recorded against Objective 9 (Land Use) on the basis that approximately 33% of the proposed housing sites are on brownfield land.</li> </ul> <p>However the implementation of Policy H2 would help to achieve a good density for residential development ensuring the efficient use of land.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An important part of the Plan’s vision is to ensure sustainable growth patterns. Growth is shaped by the character and setting of the city, environmental assets, flood risk, location sustainability and settlement capacity.</li> <li>- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2017) ensures that there is</li> </ul>	<p>The preferred housing figure has been appraised as having a minor positive effect on housing, educational skills, access and equality and jobs and growth.</p> <p>The assessment identified the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support was received from a number of organisations for the Council to meet their entire objectively assessment housing need. Some supported the 867 dpa target on this basis.</li> </ul> <p>The majority of responses on this issue strongly object to using 867 dpa. The current estimate of housing is deemed ‘unsound’ because it does not comply with the</p>	<p>No change,</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>an informed understanding of the likely availability of land for housing within York over the Local Plan period (15 years). This document supersedes previous versions to present the sites assessed for their development potential to form part of the evidence base for York's Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The report sets out the methodology for site selection in the plan and detail of which sites have been allocated.</li> </ul>	<p>potential for the preferred housing growth figure to have minor negative effects on climate change, water, waste and resource use and air quality.</p>	<p>Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) evidence base, has no supporting evidence and is not effective for city</p> <p>Some representations consider that the council should over-allocate land to ensure green belt permanence and flexibility. It is of a great concern to all stakeholders of the York Local Plan that it should be considered sound. It is therefore crucial the Plan is positively prepared to meet the objectively assessed need.</p>	

## 12. Policy Topic: General Housing Market

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG13 PPG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Housing Needs Study will be updated in 2006 as part of the wider York Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- To provide sustainable new housing development, the LDF must provide for housing types and tenures that address local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New residential sites should be encouraged to contain a mix of house sizes and types, to accommodate diverse types of households to help encourage community cohesion.</li> <li>- There should be a range of other housing types.</li> <li>- Addressing the needs of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents suggested that new housing development should in particular support the needs of specific groups (albeit through differing means).</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered that greater priority should be given to housing for vulnerable people as well as different needs.</li> <li>- The Core Strategy should</li> </ul>	N/A



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>other housing types, including students, the elderly, those with disabilities, and gypsies and travellers can help to achieve housing related sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>seek to provide a more balanced mix of new housing. There should be no more flatted development.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>PPS3</p>	<p>- The Housing Market Assessment considers the mix and type of housing that is likely to be needed in York. Whilst the main requirement in both the market and affordable housing sectors is for two bedroom properties, over 40% of the market demand and 25% of the affordable housing demand is for 3/4+ bedroom properties. Broadly demand is for houses rather than flats, which falls in line with wider Government objectives to create mixed and balanced communities. - Housing should be provided to meet the needs of specialist groups. These groups have also been identified through the HMA.</p>	<p>- Providing homes to meet the varied needs of residents will be important in helping to provide a home for all that need it. There is a need to balance with a greater focus on family homes. - It may be necessary for the LDF to have greater intervention. In some instances it is not clear how the LDF policy will be effective in meeting specific requirements of certain groups.</p>	<p>- A broader mix of housing types should be provided across the city to meet the needs of all special needs groups, such as housing for families (rather than flats), younger people (perhaps with a youth warden), those who require wheelchair access or have visual or auditory handicaps, first time buyers, single people and young professionals, key workers, and the needs of people who will work from home. - Currently, sites developed for student accommodation are not required to contribute towards affordable housing. Some felt this should be addressed, and additionally that sites should also be allocated specifically for student housing, to avoid concentrations in certain areas of the city.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		- The University of York's planned expansion will have extensive on-site accommodation to provide for the increase in student numbers.			
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council will identify sites through the Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans to deliver the spatial strategy, in order to address York's locally identified housing needs, guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- In order to create a better balance across York's housing market, an overall mix of 70% houses:30% flats will need to be achieved. Site-specific mix standards will be developed through the Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supported an approach to develop more family homes. The SA noted it may be suitable to continue to build flats in addition to more houses, albeit ones with more bedrooms, reception room space and high quality shared or private outside space.</li> <li>- There will be social benefits through more access to facilities as well as training and in supporting students through sufficient and designated dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF should support the level, type and mix of housing set out in RSS and an approach to student housing which includes local guidelines, objectives and allocations.</li> <li>- Over four-fifths (83%) of the sample agree that we should build more houses (around two thirds) than flats (around a third). 17% of respondents disagree that we should build houses rather than flats.</li> <li>- Around two-thirds (68%) of the sample agree that towards the end of the plan period there should be an increase to a greater number of smaller properties if this reflects the changing needs of York. The remaining third (32%) did not agree.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar in ensuring that there is enough housing for the current and future residents and to allocate a range of housing sites to meet need.</li> <li>- Student housing now comes under the Aiding Choice in the Housing Market rather than separately under education.</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September</b>	PPS1 PPS3	- Proposals for residential development must respond to the current evidence base, this will be achieved through the	- The policy aim should enable different accommodation development to satisfy the needs identified through	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several comments pointed to the need for an updated Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- Further comments noted that the policy's stance that all new</li> </ul>	The most significant changes have included: Acknowledging the evidence base;

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
2011		<p>Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Area Action Plan (AAP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delivering an overall mix of 70% houses:30% flats.</li> <li>- Higher Education Institutions address the need for any additional student accommodation which arises because of their future expansion.</li> <li>- Issues relating to student housing will be addressed both through the control of concentrations of HMOs and the provision of additional 'onsite' student accommodation to accommodate future expansion</li> </ul>	<p>the evidence base as well as aiding social inclusion and the creation of vibrant communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommended that the policy includes specific information for the higher educational establishments that any future expansions should also include for accommodation for the corresponding amount of students anticipated.</li> </ul>	<p>homes are built to 'Lifetime Homes' standard came in advance of the national requirement (2013 at the earliest), and was not justified by local evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was recognition that the needs of various groups in the city cannot be met with a 'one size fits all' approach, and that different groups (including older people, students, families with children) need housing which helps accommodate their specific needs and lifestyles. Furthermore, housing schemes should be diverse and adaptable, to provide for people's changing needs throughout their lifetimes.</li> <li>- Some felt that specific allocations should be identified to provide for older people (including bungalows/sheltered housing) and students. Issues relating to student housing will be addressed both through the control of concentrations of HMOs and the provision of additional 'onsite' student accommodation to accommodate future expansion.</li> </ul>	<p>More inclusion for specialist and housing and lifetime homes scheme; an approach to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and requiring the universities to meet student housing need.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Local Plan will support housing development which helps to balance York’s housing market, address local housing need and ensure that housing is adaptable to the needs of all of York’s residents throughout their lives.</li> <li>- The Council will aim to deliver an overall mix of 70% houses to 30% flats over the plan period.</li> <li>- Any increases in higher education student numbers through any future expansion should be matched by increases in student accommodation.</li> <li>- Threshold approach to HMOs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach would help to guide housing mixes which reflect local circumstances and needs, whilst recognising the specialist needs of the population and responding to these accordingly. The evidence base identifies an increasingly complex housing market spatially and sectorally which demands policy can respond positively and flexibly to evolving needs. This approach would allow the Local Plan to set local requirement in meeting this overall need and mix.</li> <li>- The evidence base identifies an increasingly complex housing market spatially and sectorally which demands policy which can respond positively and flexibly to evolving needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All the conditions of policy seem inflexible and onerous as national policy does not require Lifetime Homes It should be voluntary, not compulsory</li> <li>It is the responsibility of the local authority to assess for the need for appropriate accommodation for those with severe learning disabilities, physical disabilities and dementia and integrate provision within the development.</li> <li>- Increase of facilities at universities should be met with specific accommodation proposals on campus</li> <li>- Support for increased control of HMOs</li> <li>- The plan should provide design principles to ensure good quality accommodation.</li> </ul>	Production of Draft Controlling the Concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and introduction of an article 4 direction means a threshold approach to HMOs is included in the policy approach to the housing market.
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above, however the policy approach now promotes a mix of dwelling types and sizes on all but the very small sites (under 10 units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implementation of Policies H2 (Density of Residential Development), H3 (Balancing the Housing Market) and H4 (Housing Mix) will help to ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect the updated SHMA which indicates a preferences by small households to occupy 2 bed houses</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>or 0.2ha). This replaces the 70/30 split of houses to flats.</p>	<p>that there is a good balance and mix of housing provided as part of new housing developments which would be particularly important in meeting the housing needs of York. The implementation of Policy H7 (Student Housing) and Policy H8 (Houses in Multiple Occupation) have been assessed as having a significant positive effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing).</p> <p>- For Policy H5 (Promoting Self Build) a minor positive effect has been recorded on the SA Objective 1 on the basis that the scale of provision which is being promoted equates to 2% of the land of the four largest strategic sites. It has been concluded that whilst Policy H5 can make an important contribution to the diversity of choice it will not have a significant effect on this objective.</p>		<p>rather than apartments, the SA outcomes which advises an approach that will secure a range of housing, and consultation responses which seek a more flexible approach.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Addendum (2016) suggests focus of new housing provision should be on 2&amp;3 bed properties reflecting demand for family housing and for older people wanting to downsize.</li> <li>- Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2017) identifies that for both market and affordable housing there is a need for a mix of house sizes across the city.</li> <li>-Increased emphasis on promoting self and custom house building.</li> </ul>	<p>The implementation of Policies H2 (Density of Residential Development), H3 (Balancing the Housing Market) will help to ensure that there is a good balance and mix of housing provided as part of new housing developments which would be particularly important in meeting the housing needs of York.</p> <p>The implementation of Policy H7 (Student Housing) will help to meet the housing needs of students where there is a proven need and Policy H8 (Houses in Multiple Occupation) will help to control the number of houses which are in multiple occupation in order to control issues of overcrowding.</p>	<p>The Plan’s approach to policies covering density and housing mix are generally supported in principle however developers want to see greater flexibility and opportunity for the details to be decided at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Respondents support the identification of specific student housing to ‘free-up’ family houses and support the greater control over student housing and HMOs.</p>	<p>- To reflect the updated SHMA which indicates a preferences by small households to occupy 2 bed houses rather than apartments, the SA outcomes which advises an approach that will secure a range of housing, and consultation responses which seek a more flexible approach.</p>

### 13. Policy Topic: Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
------------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------	------------------------	--------------------

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<p>Planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites (2004)</p> <p>PPG3 Housing</p>	<p>- Previous local plan approach of a criteria based policy for any sites put forward during the plan period.</p>	<p>- Addressing the needs gypsies and travellers through the LDF can help to achieve housing related sustainability objectives, though there are limits to the extent to which these issues can and should be addressed by the Core Strategy</p>	<p>- Provision for gypsy and travellers should be based on robust evidence to properly establish need.</p> <p>- York's LDF should plan for the provision of enough decent gypsy and traveller sites for York and that the core strategy should set out criteria for the location of gypsy and traveller sites.</p>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<p>- Circular 01/06 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (2006).</p> <p>- Circular 04/2007 Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004)</p> <p>- PPG3 Housing</p>	<p>- At the time of publication a sub-regional needs assessment was being drafted to assess the likely need for Gypsy and Travellers.</p>	<p>- Providing homes to meet the varied needs of residents will be important in helping to provide a home for all that need it. For some types of homes it may be necessary for the LDF to have greater intervention, this includes Gypsy and Traveller sites. In some instances it is not clear how the LDF policy will be effective in meeting specific requirements of certain groups.</p>	<p>- Providing housing for this groups was identified as a key issue. Three key messages came to light through the consultation and emerging government guidance concerning Gypsy and Traveller housing needs.</p> <p>- Should meet at least the numbers of additional pitches identified by local assessments of housing need, allocate sites in Development Plan Documents and reduce the number of unauthorised encampments/developments.</p>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<p>- PPG 3: Housing</p> <p>- Circular 01/06 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller</p>	<p>- Regional Spatial Strategy – The Yorkshire and Humber Plan to 2026 (2008)</p> <p>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller</p>	<p>- The policy could refer to addressing social inclusion and the need to improve relations between these groups and the surrounding</p>	<p>- The approach to gypsy, traveller and showperson's accommodation is not entirely in accordance with Circular 1/2006, because the LDF does not state that all provision can</p>	<p>- Approach broadly similar by including a criteria based policy but no allocations.</p> <p>- Publication of the</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>Caravan Sites (2006).                      - Circular 04/2007                      Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004)</p>	<p>Accommodation Assessment (2008)                      - The LDF should meet at least the numbers of additional pitches identified by local assessments of housing need, allocate sites in Development Plan Documents and reduce the number of unauthorised encampments/developments.</p>	<p>communities.                      - The policy could make specific reference to enabling decent, appropriate, affordable housing for the Gypsy and Traveller community, consideration of the historic character and setting of York, recycling and reducing waste, opportunities to encourage water efficiency, the use of permeable surfaces as well as the incorporation of green space and need to avoid unacceptable flood risk when considering locations for sites.</p>	<p>definitely be met through identified provision.                      - Underestimation of need. Interim targets should be set to encourage site provision earlier in the plan period. Through an Allocations DPD or strategic sites in the Core Strategy.                      - Locations for new sites have the need for access to facilities and services as housing.</p>	<p>North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008) provides a known shortfall of pitches and plots for the York authority.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>- PPS 3: Housing                      - Circular 01/06                      Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (2006).                      - Circular 04/2007                      Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004)</p>	<p>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008)                      North Yorkshire Accommodation Requirements of Showmen (2009)                      - Identify sites through the Allocations DPD and AAP for at least 36 additional Gypsy and</p>	<p>- New separate reference to ‘Showpeople’. This policy responds well to the need detailed in the evidence base to increase the number of temporary and permanent locations where Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople can live in a way to which they are</p>	<p>Common themes relating to Gypsy, Traveller and Showmen’s site shortages included evidencing need through appropriate appraisals, urgently providing more allocated sites and reducing the number of unauthorised encampments.</p>	<p>Introduction of a criteria based policy to guide development as a result of a specific accommodation need of sites.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Traveller pitches, and land to accommodate at least 13 permanent plots for Showpeople by 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Criteria based Policy CS8 to judge any applications over the plan period.</li> </ul>	<p>accustomed. The SA welcomes this policy as it will allow these communities to develop and should aid social inclusion.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gypsy, Travellers and Showpeople Accommodation Needs Supporting Paper (2013)</li> <li>- North Yorkshire Accommodation Requirements of Showmen (2009)</li> <li>- Inequalities Experienced by Gypsy and Traveller Communities (2009)</li> <li>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008)</li> <li>- The Local Plan will make provision for 59 pitches for Gypsy and Travellers in the first 5 years. Further sites to meet 5 year need and years 6 – 10 will be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evidence base shows that there is a shortfall of accommodation. In specifying accommodation provision requirements over the Local Plan period and including policy to guide provision, the approach would help meet this need, in accordance with the Government’s ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having any significant negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst the majority of comments received were made in relation to a specific site the objections were similar. Questioning robustness of the evidence base, level of need, suggestion of alternative sites and brownfield sites, no sites should be on the greenbelt or in a floodzone, proximity and potential damage to open spaces, development would impact on the visual amenity of the village, increase in traffic from heavy vehicles in roads and junction in and out of the village, compromising safety of pedestrians, proximity to settled community, the devaluation and impact on the outlook of existing properties, increase pressure on the existing infrastructure, including the schools and medical practices, Previous Planning applications have been</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New national policy means that LPA now must evidence every effort has been made to allocate sufficient land for a 5 year supply of pitches and plots to meet need.</li> <li>- Updated evidence base has resulted in a change of estimated need over the plan period.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Local Plan will make provision for 21 plots for Showpeople in the first 10 years of the plan.</li> </ul>		<p>turned down; there should be some level on consistency.</p>	
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and Site Identification Study (2014)</li> <li>- The word Roma has been added to the title of the policy</li> <li>- Identifies what suitable land has been identified so far to go part way to meeting the 5 year need.</li> <li>- Advises the minimum number of pitches recommended per site to maximise the potential to meet the 5 year target on identified sites.</li> <li>- Planning principles included to guide development of gypsy and traveller provision, including reference to protecting the historic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site provision is expected to have a positive effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing) in helping to meet plot/pitch requirements.</li> <li>- The safeguarding and provision of sites for pitches to meet the future needs of Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople is likely to have positive health benefits for those groups.</li> <li>- Also expected to have a significant positive effect on SA Objective 5 (Equality and Accessibility).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect the most up to date evidence base and national guidance..</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		character and setting of the city.			
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	NPPF Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (August 2015)	City of York Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Update (2017)  -Update commissioned following the updated definition for travellers in the PPTS. - Includes revised figures for gypsies, travellers and showmen in York.	Policies H5 (Gypsy and Travellers) and Policy H6 (Travelling Showpeople) would help to address a shortfall of accommodation for these groups.  The site, at The Stables, Elvington is expected to have a positive effect on housing and a significant positive effect on land use (use of brownfield site). Significant negative effects were recorded against health, education and water. Minor negative effects have been recorded against landscape arising from the Heritage Impact Assessment.	A mixture of responses including: - support for the aspect of the policy which supports those travellers who don't meet the revised definition as well as those that do. - objection by some to the requirement to address gypsy and traveller provision through the strategic sites. - concern that policies do not state that gypsy and traveller sites are inappropriate in the green belt.	To reflect the most up to date evidence base, national guidance and consultation responses.

## 14. Policy Topic: Affordable Housing

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG3</li> <li>- Circular 6/98</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are 'localised shortages of affordable housing in high demand areas which includes York'.</li> <li>- In the emerging RSS York is identified as having high levels of affordable housing need.</li> <li>- Draft Policy H3 advises Local Authorities to seek over 40% affordable housing on developments of more than 15 homes in areas of high need,</li> <li>- Affordable housing will include both housing for rent and shared ownership, overwhelming priority housing need in York is for affordable rented homes, for those households on very low incomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing one and two bedrooms could also help to provide affordable market housing in the City.</li> <li>- The provision of affordable housing is also a key component of meeting sustainable objectives in relation to housing.</li> <li>- The RSS submission version January 2006 states that 40% of new homes on sites of over 15 dwellings (or over 0.5ha) should be built as affordable. It may be suitable to set higher targets given the lack of affordable homes in the area, provided justification can be provided from the evidence base, and this would help meet relevant sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The level of affordable housing should match the percentage advocated in the Regional Spatial Strategy (40%).</li> <li>- Views were expressed regarding the council's current 50% target, claiming that it undermines the viability of many schemes and concerns were that the Council had not adequately demonstrated local need to justify the 50% figure.</li> <li>- Strengthening policy by specifying a number of bedrooms, a certain floor area or that applications with the highest level of affordable housing should be prioritised for consent in order to reach annual targets.</li> <li>- Policy approach needed to be more flexible in order to facilitate development on certain sites.</li> <li>- The proportion of affordable housing on a site should be related to demonstrable need in that specific area and a range of affordable types and tenures</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy</b>	PPG3	- Level of affordable housing sought:	- Evidence clearly shows that existing provision of	- Most respondents supported a mix of social rented and	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>		<p>Option 1: Continue the Local Plan approach or Option 2: Introduce an affordable housing target closer to the Regional Spatial Strategy target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Threshold at which affordable housing will be sought:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Continue in line with the current Local Plan approach or Option 2: Lower the site threshold to less than 15 dwellings/0.3ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York’s future approach to delivering affordable housing in York’s rural areas:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: To continue with the Local Plan approach or Option 2: Reconsider the threshold/proportion of affordable housing being sought onsite or Option 3: Specifically identify rural sites, where 100% of housing on site would be affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach to providing affordable housing:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Provide a mix of social rented and discount for sale or Option 2: Provide all affordable housing as social rented.</p>	<p>affordable housing is well below that required to meet the identified needs, with the rural area in particular in need of affordable homes and overall demand significantly outstripping supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a clear need for the most affordable type of housing, which is social rented.</li> </ul>	<p>discount for sale and recognised the need for a range of affordable types and tenures although a few were specifically mentioned, namely, affordable housing ‘to buy’ rather than ‘to rent’, shared equity schemes, targeted at specific groups.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further options on approach put forward:</li> <li>Option 1 – Implement existing policy.</li> <li>Option 2 – Sliding scale requiring varying % levels from 1 dwelling increasing to 50% at 28 dwellings with different requirements for urban and rural settlements.</li> <li>Option 3 – Sliding scale requiring varying % levels from 1 dwelling increasing to 40% over 30 dwellings. No distinction between urban and rural.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supported at the Preferred Options stage</li> <li>Option 2 as it was considered that this option would help to maximise affordable housing provision whilst also spreading them across the city through capturing their development in all sites above 2 or more dwelling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a need for a viability assessment to be undertaken.</li> <li>- Delivery of affordable housing against the 43% (or 50%) target is challenging, regardless of the current economic climate.</li> <li>- More weight given to providing the appropriate type of housing in the right locations.</li> <li>- Significant support for the ‘sliding scale’ approach to policy, but much debate as to the appropriate levels and thresholds described in the options. Lack of support for the existing Local Plan style policy.</li> <li>- Support for considering rural exception sites.</li> <li>- Support for supplying affordable housing through off-site contributions, particularly on smaller sites.</li> <li>- The policy should test proposals at a level of 40% (re RSS), on a site by site basis.</li> <li>- The approach should allow for a greater proportion of affordable homes to buy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHMA (2007)</li> <li>- Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010)</li> <li>- To improve affordability across the housing market, in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised policy is a refined version of an amalgamation between Preferred Options 2 and 3. It has therefore been subject to full SA analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several responses stated that affordable housing targets would be overly onerous and would undermine the potential to deliver low cost market housing.</li> <li>- Alternatively, the starting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sliding scale approach is still applicable (options 2 and 3 previously) but has been refined</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>order to enable York’s current and future residents and employees to have access to a home they can afford in a community where they want to live, throughout their lifetime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Local Development Framework will also ensure high quality housing options for those who cannot afford market housing, in particular those who are vulnerable or in need, by ensuring that new development proposals respond to the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In implementing this policy, the housing mix and tenure requirements should not be compromised to an extent which will not meet the requirements set out by the latest SHMA through any negotiation from developers due to viability. This will involve a commitment to the provision of suitable dwelling types and monitoring of the provision.</li> </ul>	<p>viability target was felt by many to be much too low, noting that the level of need in York is even greater than the annual level of housebuilding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The nature of a dynamic target was felt to introduce further uncertainty, making it difficult to assess the viability of schemes going forward.</li> <li>- Inadequate evidence exists to justify 20% levels on smaller sites; assumptions around land values and build costs are inaccurate.</li> </ul>	<p>based upon the Affordable Housing Viability Study evidence base. The policy now includes strategy for an annual target refined through matrices to base the approach on realistic viability.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011)</li> <li>- City of York Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010) and Annex 1 (2011)</li> <li>– Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007)</li> <li>- Affordable housing will be provided in line with current annual dynamic targets and thresholds; should reflect tenure split in terms of social rented and intermediate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred approach is likely to maximise the delivery of affordable housing through creating more certainty in terms of York’s affordable housing requirements and ensuring that delivery would be higher in response to better economic circumstances. This would be positive for the economy by ensuring the targets respond to the changing economy to ensure viability of sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should base affordable tenure mix on an objectively assessed need approach rather than a policy based requirement or market should be allowed to determine the amount of provision on a site.</li> <li>- Proper and full regard must be had to the overall viability of schemes in setting any requirements in the current economic circumstances.</li> <li>- The policy is not based on credible evidence.</li> <li>- The Affordable Housing Viability Study is out of date and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy approach remains broadly the same, however now reflects an updated evidence base.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>housing, and fully integrate affordable with market housing on a pro-rata basis by pepper potting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where the above criteria can not be met, developers have the flexibility through open book appraisal to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development would not be viable based on the current affordable housing dynamic targets.</li> </ul>		<p>does not take into account of all policy requirements, obligations and the viability implications of these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Main focus of affordable housing growth in the lifetime of the plan should come from direct building from the Council and Housing Associations.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PBA work on development viability</li> <li>- Master planning work on Strategic Sites which has provided greater certainty about what can be delivered on these sites.</li> <li>- Review of evidence base of 2011 SHMA in respect of the need for affordable homes.</li> <li>- Proposals for two or more dwellings supported that reflect the relative viability of development land types by providing affordable housing in line with percentage levels for site thresholds</li> <li>- On sites of 11 homes and above, on site provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would help improve affordability across the housing market in York. Assessed as having a significant positive effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing).</li> <li>- Expected to have a significant positive effect on SA Objective 5 (Equality and Accessibility).</li> </ul> <p>The delivery of affordable housing providing the community with access to good quality housing is considered likely to have a significant effect on health and appraised as having a significant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect updated evidence base.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>expected with a financial contribution sought for fraction of units; unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of equivalent value can be robustly justified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On sites of 2 – 10 homes an off site financial contribution is required</li> <li>- Provision should reflect tenure split as set out in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- Affordable housing should be fully integrated by pepper potting throughout the development with no more than two affordable dwellings placed next to each other.</li> <li>- Where a developer believes the policy criteria cannot be fully met, they have the opportunity through open book appraisal to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development would not be viable.</li> </ul>	<p>positive effect against SA Objective 2 (Health).</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (2017) produced by PBA.</li> <li>-Affordable housing target percentages changed and</li> </ul>	<p>The scale and broad location of mixed use development, housing and employment proposed in the policies mean that a</p>	<p>Various Parish Councils and consultants support the policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several respondents state that the policy is not sufficient to meet the acute need for social</li> </ul>	<p>Table 5.4: Affordable Housing Site Thresholds has been revised to</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
2017		<p>site thresholds amended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-SHMA and Addendum (2016) recommends an 80% social and affordable rented and 20% intermediate split.</li> <li>-Master planning work on Strategic Sites which has provided greater certainty about what can be delivered on these sites.</li> <li>-Affordable housing should be fully integrated by pepper potting throughout the development with no more than two affordable dwellings placed next to each other.</li> <li>-consideration of Vacant Building Credit.</li> </ul>	<p>range of dwellings and community facilities can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet specific needs.</p> <p>Ten of the proposed strategic sites were also assessed as having significant positive effects on equality and accessibility and health largely due to the provision of affordable housing and provision of services/facilities nearby</p>	<p>rented housing or ensure enough affordable housing is built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Several respondents state that affordable housing (including social housing) is much needed.</li> </ul>	<p>reflect the viability evidence contained in the latest Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment. The supporting text has been amended to match the revised policy.</p>

## 15. Policy Topic: Community Facilities

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Spatial Strategy (2004)</li> <li>- Sport and Active Leisure Strategy for York (2003);</li> <li>- Without Walls Community Strategy</li> <li>- Close to Home Care Strategy (2005)</li> <li>- York's Older People</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should take into account the need for new facilities of these types in making allocations and choosing a policy approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General concern that needs of older people had not been addressed and there was minimal reference to the provision for younger people.</li> <li>- Modern Libraries should also be recognised as a community facility.</li> <li>- Respondents were critical of</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Housing Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community facilities taken to cover a broad range of facilities including leisure, education, health care and emergency services. Important that the LDF Core Strategy helps to deliver accessible, and sustainable community facilities in York, which meets the needs of the residents of the City.</li> <li>- Range of options put forward for policy approach including raising quality and protecting existing facilities.</li> </ul>		<p>the current swimming provision in the City, and the closure of the Barbican Centre;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of any new social, educational, health and emergency facilities needs careful consideration in terms of flood risk</li> <li>- A green corridor strategy should be carried out.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sports and Active Leisure Strategy</li> <li>- York City Vision and Community Strategy (2004-2024)</li> <li>- Close to Home Care Strategy (2005)</li> <li>- Further options provided on some community facilities</li> <li>- To assist in addressing built sporting deficiencies a range of options set out to influence the approach. Option 1 : Seek to deliver provision relating to the deficiencies, Option 2: Prioritise particular</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wherever built sport facilities are located they should be accessible to all and be on key public transport routes / interchanges and be easily accessed by walking or cycling. This should be a consideration for public and private health and sports clubs.</li> <li>- Must be accommodating to the health needs of the residents and it is hoped that the strategic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Priorities suggested by respondents were to build a permanent ice rink, the need for a new state of the art sports stadium, the provision of an athletics track, a public sports centre and more flexible indoor space provision across the City which could include climbing walls and similar facilities for young people.</li> <li>- Respondents emphasised that provision should be based on the needs of the community.</li> <li>- Respondents also</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further options provided in responses to consultation at Issues and Options 1 stage.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>deficiencies or Option 3: Prioritise other built sport facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three policy approaches to healthcare facilities:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Large scale facilities provided centrally, in locations with good access by public transport, Option 2: Smaller scale local facilities, dispersed across York, within easy walking distance from large residential areas; and /or Option 3: Smaller scale local facilities, dispersed across York, accessible from large residential areas by public transport.</p>	<p>approach will promote more accessible facilities throughout York. New facilities should be easily accessed by high quality public transport links that provide a real alternative to car use. Facilities aimed at local needs should also be accessible by foot wherever possible by being integrated into residential neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>highlighted the need for more specialist sporting activities. York Central would be an ideal location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents were supportive of the need to provide facilities in accessible locations, especially for the elderly.</li> <li>- Many respondents emphasised the need for all facilities to be accessible by public transport.</li> <li>- The requirements linked to major developments such as York Northwest should be considered.</li> <li>- Raising the profile of preventative healthcare, through the promotion of healthier lifestyles should be important.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In order to deliver the vision of sustainable neighbourhoods the LDF will seek to provide accessible local services for all communities. In most circumstances these services will be best provided at a neighbourhood level. However some services will cover a wider catchment or even operate at a city wide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing community and neighbourhood services will help to ensure access to local shops, schools, community and health facilities which is important for local provision as well as helping to provide conditions for business success.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach should be strengthened by including more specific measures and targets and should be supported by a SPD;</li> <li>- Areas should have good local amenities to cope with any new development;</li> <li>- The section should be split into a number of different policies;</li> <li>- Need for places where</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>level such as hospitals or a new stadium. - - New development should have access to a range of local services including healthcare, schools, local shops, other community facilities and public transport. Existing communities will be supported by seeking to ensure that current local services are not lost. All services should be accessible to the communities that they serve by walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing more built sports facilities will promote healthier lifestyles and well-being.</li> <li>- The support shown for the emergency services framework within York is also positive for the well-being, safety and security of residents.</li> <li>- It is recommended that through new development in Local Service Centres and Villages emphasis is given to increasing accessibility.</li> <li>-- To avoid pressure on existing services it will be important for the Council to ensure that new facilities do not 'lag behind' new development.</li> </ul>	<p>people of all ages can meet formally and informally;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community involvement in facilities is a key element of a sustainable community;</li> <li>- LDF should ensure access to affordable leisure facilities;</li> <li>- The approach should include a 'showground' site in York;</li> <li>- The proposed stadium is a suitable location for new swimming facilities;</li> <li>- People should be able to walk to key services;</li> <li>- The approach should be split into 3 tiers – identifying city wide facilities, district facilities, and local facilities;</li> <li>- The strategy should protect existing facilities. Before loss is permitted, developers should have to show that a facility has no community value and that there are other accessible facilities available in the area.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<p>- Will create sustainable, low carbon neighbourhoods which are accessible to a range of new and existing quality community facilities and healthcare and</p>	<p>- The revised policy for community facilities is not location specific as per the recommendation and needs to be enforced before any effect can</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be a presumption in favour of community facilities sited within a walking distance of local neighbourhoods;</li> <li>- Support for the explanation of what a community facilities</li> </ul>	<p>- Whilst more prominence is given to the different types of community facilities by a change in</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>emergency services to meet the needs of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing services must be protected as much as possible however it is also important to get the most out of existing facilities in making sure they are 'fit for purpose'.</li> <li>- Service provision must keeps pace with new development so that communities have satisfactory access to community facilities. Appropriate developer contributions will be important in delivering this</li> <li>- Any new community facilities must be accessible to the communities they serve by walking, cycling and public transport .</li> </ul>	<p>be measured. The implementation of this part of the policy however, should ensure that any new development has appropriate service level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implications of the revised policy are positive in terms of sustainability.</li> <li>- Provision of new facilities must not lag behind any major development to make sure they facilities are set up ready for the community to use.</li> </ul>	<p>can include however one respondent suggested that the definition of community facilities should be expended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was considered that the policy should set out the site size or dwelling thresholds for which contributions for off site infrastructure, such as community facilities, will be required.</li> <li>- Access to cycle routes and outdoor play spaces for children and young people should be included.</li> </ul>	<p>presentation and addition of three policies in relation to community facilities, there is no change in the approach.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Childcare Act (2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consultation Draft Built Sports Facilities Strategy (2013)</li> <li>- York Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (2012 Refresh)</li> <li>- Health and Well Being in York: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2012)</li> <li>- Promotion of community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of health and equality and accessibility. This principally reflects the potential for this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of responses were received in relation to the approach to community facilities. Overall the majority of responses supported the approach, however there were several objections and a number of general comments.</li> <li>- Provision should be based on need and only be necessary where there is a</li> </ul>	<p>Also able to have criteria based policies to guide planning application decisions under new local plan development plan in accordance with the NPPF however general</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>cohesion and the development of strong, supportive and durable communities through the creation of sustainable, low carbon neighbourhoods where every community has access to quality community facilities to meet day to day needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extension and expansion of existing high quality sustainable built sports facilities. New facilities will be supported that meet an identified gap in provision, are accessible to all and suitable infrastructure exists or can be created to manage and maintain the facility.</li> <li>- New, high quality, childcare facilities will be supported where there is an identified need for the additional provision.</li> <li>- To contribute to residents living long, healthy and independent lives in sustainable neighbourhoods the Local Plan will support new primary healthcare services in accessible locations.</li> </ul>	<p>approach to maximise the provision of new services and facilities by requiring contributions from all development to meet newly arising need which, allied with local criteria to guide the location of community facilities, would help enhance accessibility for both existing and prospective residents.</p> <p>– It is considered that local level policy would enable a robust policy stance to protecting existing community facilities, maintaining accessibility.</p>	<p>deficiency. The requirement has not been tested against any cumulative viability assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sport England considered that the policy on built sports facilities needs to be more clearly expressed</li> <li>- The approach to childcare provision was supported by a number of the city’s nurseries.</li> <li>- The St Leonard’s Hospice site should be allocated to meet the future needs for health care facilities in York.</li> </ul>	<p>approach remains unchanged.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Childcare Act (2006)</li> </ul>	<p>– See above</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appraised as having significant positive effects against SA Objectives 1 (Housing), 2 (Health) and 5 (Equality and Access).</li> <li>- The provision of services in reasonable proximity to people’s homes will help to ensure that day-to-day requirements and demands can be catered for, particularly for those reliant upon local provision. The requirements of CF1 in delivering accessible services should help to reduce the need to travel. Any reduction in vehicle movements is considered to have benefits in terms of reduced greenhouse gas and vehicle emissions. As a result, the Community Facilities Policies have been appraised as having a minor positive effect on SA Objectives 6 (Travel), 7 (Greenhouse Gases)</li> </ul>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- No change in approach.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Childcare Act (2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York’s Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2017-22)</li> </ul>	<p>and 12 (Air Quality). Policies HW1-HW7 ensure the provision of suitable facilities and services to support the communities of York. They focus on protecting existing communities (HW1) and providing new facilities (HW2); supporting the provision of sport facilities (HW3); ensuring appropriate childcare provision (HW4); promoting the appropriate development of healthcare services (HW5) and emergency services (HW6), and supporting healthy places through new development (HW7). The policies have been assessed as cumulatively having a significant positive effect on SA Objective 5 (Access to Services).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several developers state that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required.</li> <li>- North Yorkshire County Council suggests that proposed developments should plan for the installation of equipment to enable the latest technology to be deployed, and not leave it to be installed by third parties once the development is complete.</li> <li>- Historic England support as long as there are no adverse impacts on views, setting, landscape character, heritage assets or Green Belt objectives.</li> <li>- York Green Party support but would like a presumption against advertising material in conservation areas.</li> <li>- York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce and state that the policy should require refurbishment and new development schemes should be future proof.</li> <li>- One member of the public said the policy needs to be updated to enable further</li> </ul>	<p>No major change to policy approach. Some clarifications made in relation to consultation responses.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				support for residents and businesses in rural areas.	

## 16. Policy Topic: Education

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPS1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li>   <li>- Links between education and skills and employment made.</li> <li>- Covered under community facilities. Policy approach could be developed based on the following:</li> <li>- Helping to facilitate the reduction of surplus capacity and help to ensure additional places are made available if there are areas of deficit, and take account of any demographic change over the lifetime of the LDF.</li> <li>- Seek new users and new uses for school buildings through implementation of the Extended Schools Initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May be desirable in terms of sustainability to retain some community or open space use on redundant school sites.</li> <li>- Extending the use of school buildings for community uses at times when schools are not in use should ensure the more efficient use of land by combining the use of sites.</li> <li>- Supporting higher and further education facilities in the City, should help to achieve sustainability objectives relating to skills, as well as those relating to the economy. However, any such proposals for new development will need to take into account sustainability objectives relating to the protection of the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A variety of issues were raised in connection with education and training and employment growth.</li> <li>- There should be investment in education and training so that local people can fill the new jobs.</li> <li>- Developers should be encouraged to use local labour skills in the construction of new buildings and that the education sector, particularly the universities need to recognise the links to economic growth and find ways of supporting that growth, particularly with regard to Science City York.</li> <li>- Dual use of school facilities welcomed and considered that this should be secured through community use agreements.</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>(including community use of school facilities, dual use of playing facilities etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that, where new education facilities are proposed, they are sited appropriately, well designed and well related to neighbourhood services and amenities (including further and higher education).</li> <li>- Ensure that new developments contribute appropriately to meeting education needs they generate.</li> <li>- Help to facilitate the continued success of the University of York and other Further and Higher Education establishments in the City.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- Building Schools for the Future (2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li>   <li>- Two options for provision of schools: provide sites for new schools where need has been identified or consolidate facilities on existing sites, providing for expansion of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many of the decisions relating to educational and training needs will be controlled by matters largely beyond the role of the LDF and be up to individual funding and expansion schemes by these institutions and the Local Education Authority</li> <li>- Sustainability implications of the provision of schools include ensuring good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>existing buildings where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several options put forward for further and higher education including combining new development with current or identified further and higher educational, providing student housing in line with the expansion of student numbers, the need to ensure a sustainable transport system and promote public access to sporting, cultural and social facilities connected to the education institution.</li> </ul>	<p>accessibility to new facilities, and ensuring the efficient use of land and other resources by avoiding building new facilities where upgraded facilities or more efficient use of available land would be more suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the approach to further and higher education should ensure the most efficient use of land, without overdeveloping sites</li> <li>- Should ensure students have an affordable place to live in locations that allow good access</li> <li>- Should ensure that where suitable, facilities are open for public use to ensure proper integration into communities</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (2008)</li> <li>- RSS Sustainable Settlement Study (2004)</li> <li>- Covered under ‘access to services’ in Policy CS8</li> <li>- Preferred approach is to provide accessible local services, including schools.</li> <li>- As required, new or improved education facilities will be provided to support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach supports sustainability objective EC2 ‘Good education and training opportunities for all which build the skills capacity of the population’ through providing and supporting an education, skills and training framework within the city.</li> <li>- Recommended that the Council re-word policy CS8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ambitions of all educational institutions in city need to be recognised and supported, including ongoing development of York College.</li> <li>- The approach should acknowledge the significance of Askham Bryan College as it provides specialist land-based education and training of national and regional importance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar but now comes under the community facilities and access to services theme rather than separately under education.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>new development. The Council will require new development to contribute towards ensuring there are sufficient facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will seek to secure community access to new sports and cultural facilities which are developed on education sites in order to increase the resources available to local communities</li> <li>- Will facilitate the continued success of higher and further education establishments in the city, in particular through supporting the development of the additional university campus 'Heslington East' and the potential expansion of further education establishments.</li> </ul>	<p>to emphasise that new development in Local Service Centres and Villages should be premised on increasing accessibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To avoid pressure on existing services it will be important for the Council to ensure that new facilities do not 'lag behind' new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach should be strengthened to support increased levels of training and development for the current, and future, workforce.</li> <li>- Planning agreements should be used to secure training facilities for disadvantaged groups and to improve access to buildings and IT.</li> <li>- Developments and construction sites should have a real benefit to those in learning through apprenticeships, work experience for 14 -19 year olds, and undergraduate and graduate internships.</li> <li>- Access to services should be split into a number of different policies.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>Schools White Paper (November 2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS(2008)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Local Area Statement of Need for the Provision of Learning for Young People aged 16–19 (October 2010)</li> <li>- Adult Learning and Skills Strategy (2007) and the 14-19 Plan (2009)</li> <li>- 14-19 Plan (2009)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The inclusion of this policy has bridged a gap from the Preferred Options document to recognise the need and importance of education, skills and training within York.</li> <li>- Evidence suggests that the high skills base and links to educational establishments within the city has supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too permissive and unconstrained which is not sustainable.</li> <li>- Should support the creation of sufficient jobs across the skill base to provide York's school and college leavers and graduates with local employment.</li> <li>- Policy approach to targeted recruitment and training should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education now covered in its own section in response to consultation representations.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the promotion of the City as both a nationally and internationally recognised centre of excellence for education and learning, with a commitment to lifelong learning and a culture of enterprise, innovation and creativity.</li> <li>- Will ensure the whole community in York have the education and skills that will enable them to play an active part in society and contribute to the life of the City and will utilise the planning process to target recruitment and training in construction and other related industries.</li> </ul>	<p>the economy through the recession and made the area a key economic competitor within the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy aims to continue and improve this role and has been appraised as positive in terms of economic and social objectives.</li> <li>- Will support the learning of skills for all in York, provide a competent and educated workforce to support the wider economy and to support the role of higher educational establishments including the universities.</li> <li>- Increasing community access to educational sites will also aid community participation in sports and recreational activities across the city. In the wider sense, this will also enable improved health and well-being for the population.</li> <li>- Requirement for future expansions to include for accommodation for the corresponding amount of students anticipated should support the students in the educational system with</li> </ul>	<p>be deleted, it does not comply with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and it is not a matter for the LDF or planning policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference should be added to apprenticeship opportunities.</li> <li>- Suggested that there should be framework for green infrastructure/ecosystem services training to link new skills training using University, Colleges and Schools to learn about the countryside.</li> <li>- The informal system for the development of skills for personal development and fulfilment in life should be referenced.</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>suitable accommodation throughout their studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targeted recruitment and training whilst aimed at the construction industry could be more valuable if the scope of its application be broadened to all roles within this type of industry. For example, it is not only construction which is associated to development, there is also practical applications for archaeology and landscaping which may be able to contribute to skills building and training on site.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF Schools White Paper</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dream Again: York’s Strategic Plan for Children, Young People and Their Families 2013-2016 (2012)</li> <li>– York Local Area Statement of Need September 2012: For the Provision of learning for young people aged 14-19 or aged up to 25 subject to a learning difficulty assessment (2012)</li> <li>– School Playing Fields Assessment Technical Paper (2010)</li> <li>- Approach is to facilitate the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of health (SA Objective 2), education (SA Objective 3), economy (SA Objective 4) and equality and accessibility (SA Objective 5).</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The preferred approach is considered to out-perform,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the policy.</li> <li>- Envisage a policy for Askham Bryan College similar to that for the University which would guide the type, form and location of new development within the settlement limit.</li> <li>- The Council should rely on the NPPF to guide development of Education facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach, however, higher education now covered in a separate section in response to consultation outcomes.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>provision of sufficient modern education facilities for the delivery of preschool, primary and secondary school education to meet an identified need and address deficiencies in existing facilities. This includes new provision, where required, to support strategic housing allocations and any future developments of Academies and Free Schools which reflect the aspirations of local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local criteria set out to guide education provision and accessibility</li> <li>- The continued success of all further and higher education institutions is supported, including any further expansion of their teaching and research operations, other facilities and student accommodation at their existing sites and campuses</li> <li>- Developments with a construction cost of £1million or more are required to provide skills and training opportunities, on or off site.</li> </ul>	<p>in sustainability terms, the reasonable alternatives and none of the alternatives were assessed as performing better than the preferred approach against any of the SA objectives.</p>		
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>School Playing Fields Assessment Technical Paper (2010)</p>	<p>- The policies have been assessed as having a significant positive effect</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the</p>	<p>- No change to general policy approach</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Draft - September 2014</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above.</li> <li>- Skills and training now removed.</li> </ul>	<p>upon SA Objectives 1 (Housing), 2 (Health), 3 (Education), 4 (Jobs) and 6 (Travel).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of appropriate and sufficient education and training opportunities is an important part of the development of an effective workforce.</li> <li>- The opportunity for community access to sports facilities under Policies ED6 and ED8 have been appraised positively against the health objective. The provision of locally accessible education, recreation and training will provide opportunities to influence patterns of movement which may make an important contribution to minimising travel and travel by car in particular.</li> </ul>	<p>Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>however, whilst preferred option policy EST4 had a positive SA assessment the policy has been deleted as it is not possible to build it into the viability testing. Local employment and training initiatives will however be added as a potential developer contribution.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>School Playing Fields Assessment Technical Paper (2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Largely as above.</li> <li>- Skills and training now removed.</li> </ul>	<p>Policies ED1-ED5 focus on supporting appropriate development at the University of York (ED1) and specifically Campus West (ED2) and Campus East (ED3); York St. John University Lord Mayor’s Walk Campus (ED4) and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Historic England felt more recognition / protection should be given to the University of York’s campus architecture. Supported the requirement that any future development should be sensitive to their surroundings.</li> <li>- Several developers asked for</li> </ul>	<p>No major change to policy approach.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>York St. John University Further Expansion (ED5). ED6 relates to the provision of sufficient modern preschool, primary and secondary school education. Policy ED7 supports the expansion of further education facilities and Policy ED8 promotes community use of new/extended education facilities. The policies have been assessed as having a significant positive effect upon SA Objectives 1 (Housing), 2 (Health), 3 (Education), 4 (Jobs) and 6 (Travel). Policies will help to ensure that there is equality of access to education facilities across the City, therefore they have the potential to have a minor positive effect on SA Objectives 5 (Equality) and 9 (Land Use). No significant or minor negative effects were recorded against any of the SA Objectives.</p>	<p>further detail on the extent of developer contributions required for sport / cultural facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce objected to the disconnect in the plan, noting the Universities' importance to the city and then failing to allocate adequate land for expansion.</li> <li>-York Green Party said additional purpose built student-accommodation should be built on campus.</li> <li>- York Central Partnership (YCP) were concerned about the lack of up to date evidence for school planning which should be demonstrated in an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan, also sought further clarity as to the intent and purpose of policy ED6 and whether it is intended to deliver educational facilities as part of its strategic sites.</li> <li>- Parish Councils objected to university expansion but if going ahead should do so in a manner that protects surrounding villages from being used as a thoroughfare, education policies should be condensed into one to simplify their concerns about</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<p>housing on campus and in the private rented sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many respondents provided general support for educational provision for all in the city.</li> <li>- Askham Bryan College designation on the Proposals Map is out of date.</li> </ul>	

## 17. Policy Topic: Universities

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Access to university one of four criteria in selection employment of sites. Evidence base indicates that development of business clusters in the region will also depend on good links with higher education facilities</li> <li>- Important that the Core Strategy recognises the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting higher education facilities in the City should help to achieve sustainability objectives relating to skills, as well as those relating to the economy. However, any such proposals for new development will need to take into account sustainability objectives relating to the protection of the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A variety of issues were raised in connection with education and training and employment growth.</li> <li>- There should be investment in education and training so that local people can fill the new jobs.</li> <li>- Developers should be encouraged to use local labour skills in the construction of new buildings and that the education sector, particularly the universities need to recognise the links to economic growth and find ways of supporting that growth, particularly with regard to Science City York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Council's continuing support for the growth of Further and Higher Education in the City, especially the University of York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Covered under community facilities. Policy approach could be developed based on helping to facilitate the continued success of the University of York and other Higher Education establishments in the City.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggested that York University needs to be better integrated into the City</li> <li>- The Core Strategy should refer to York St John University.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Future York Group Report</li> <li>- Approaches to the University of York include providing for Science City York and Research and Development uses; and/or maintain or enhance the parkland setting, views and ecology of the campuses.</li> <li>- Heslington East identified as a major development opportunity.</li> <li>- Proximity to university and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the approach to further and higher education should ensure the most efficient use of land, without overdeveloping sites</li> <li>- Should ensure students have an affordable place to live in locations that allow good access</li> <li>- Should ensure that where suitable, facilities are open for public use to ensure proper integration into communities</li> <li>- For York University, maintaining the parkland setting and ecological value of the area will be the most positive in terms of environmental protection and enhancement.</li> <li>- Enhancing Science City York role at this site will have advantages for the communities of York</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>other institutions one of six criteria in selection employment of sites</p>	<p>- Clear economic advantages to York of developing R&amp;D industries as part of Science City York.</p>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (2008)</li> <li>- RSS Sustainable Settlement Study (2004)</li> <li>- Employment Land Review 1 and 2</li> <li>- Covered under ‘access to services’ and the employment section</li> <li>-- Will seek to secure community access to new sports and cultural facilities which are developed on education sites in order to increase the resources available to local communities</li> <li>- Will facilitate the continued success of higher and further education establishments in the city, in particular through supporting the development of the additional university campus ‘Heslington East’ and the potential expansion of further education establishments.</li> <li>- Heslington East, the University of York’s new</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach supports sustainability objective EC2 ‘Good education and training opportunities for all which build the skills capacity of the population’ through providing and supporting an education, skills and training framework within the city.</li> <li>- The research and development (use class B1(b)) role offered in association with the new University of York Campus will strengthen links between the existing science park and the University potentially offering further training and educational opportunities for students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too much emphasis is placed on the expansion of the University of York at the expense of other establishments, such as York St John University, which make a significant contribution to the educational needs of the City.</li> <li>- Concern over the ‘studentification’ of parts of the City, which can damage communities. The strategy should address concerns about the impacts of additional students and the University expansion.</li> <li>- Need to introduce a policy to ensure students are retained in the city.</li> <li>- Developments and construction sites should have a real benefit to those in learning through apprenticeships, work experience for 14 -19 year olds, and undergraduate and graduate internships.</li> <li>- Access to services should be split into a number of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar but now comes under the community facilities and access to services theme rather than separately under education.</li> <li>- Recognition of economic role of University of York maintained.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>campus extension can accommodate all of the City's anticipated demand for free standing B1 (b) Research and Development uses.</p>		<p>different policies.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Land Review 1 and 2</li> <li>- RSS(2008)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Support for the promotion of the City as both a nationally and internationally recognised centre of excellence for education and learning, with a commitment to lifelong learning and a culture of enterprise, innovation and creativity.</li> <li>- Will ensure the whole community in York have the education and skills that will enable them to play an active part in society and contribute to the life of the City and will utilise the planning process to target recruitment and training in construction and other related industries.</li> <li>- Will ensure that Higher Education Institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The inclusion of this policy has bridged a gap from the Preferred Options document to recognise the need and importance of education, skills and training within York.</li> <li>- Evidence suggests that the high skills base and links to educational establishments within the city has supported the economy through the recession and made the area a key economic competitor within the region.</li> <li>- The policy aims to continue and improve this role and has been appraised as positive in terms of economic and social objectives.</li> <li>- Will support the learning of skills for all in York, provide a competent and educated workforce to support the wider economy and to support the role of higher educational establishments including the universities.</li> <li>- Increasing community access to educational sites will also aid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too permissive and unconstrained which is not sustainable.</li> <li>- Consideration should be given to the allocation of suitable sites for purpose built student housing.</li> <li>- The provision of student housing should not be required to be on campus.</li> <li>- Should support the expansion of the Heslington West campus in addition to Heslington East.</li> <li>- Should support the creation of sufficient jobs across the skill base to provide York's school and college leavers and graduates with local employment.</li> <li>- Policy approach to targeted recruitment and training should be deleted, it does not comply with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and it is not a matter for the LDF or planning policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education now covered in its own section in response to consultation representations.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>address the need for any additional student accommodation which arises because of their future expansion. Provision will be expected to be made on campus where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Premises for Research &amp; Development (B1(b)) will be provided through maximising the economic benefits of the city's education establishments, this includes up to 25ha of land at the University of York Heslington East Campus.</li> </ul>	<p>community participation in sports and recreational activities across the city. In the wider sense, this will also enable improved health and well-being for the population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirement for future expansions to include for accommodation for the corresponding amount of students anticipated should support the students in the educational system with suitable accommodation throughout their studies.</li> <li>- Targeted recruitment and training whilst aimed at the construction industry could be more valuable if the scope of its application be broadened to all roles within this type of industry. For example, it is not only construction which is associated to development, there is also practical applications for archaeology and landscaping which may be able to contribute to skills building and training on site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference should be added to apprenticeship opportunities.</li> <li>- Suggested that there should be framework for green infrastructure/ecosystem services training to link new skills training using University, Colleges and Schools to learn about the countryside.</li> <li>- The informal system for the development of skills for personal development and fulfilment in life should be referenced.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York St. John University Strategy for Sport 2012-2015 (2012)</li> <li>- York St. John University:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the provision of detailed local criteria to guide form and location of university development.</li> <li>- Policy will help to retain the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach, however, higher education now covered in a</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Our Strategy 2012-2015 (2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2008/00005/OUT: Heslington East Outline Planning Consent, as implemented</li> <li>- Development Brief: Heslington East University of York Campus (2004)</li> <li>- University of York Heslington Campus Development Brief for Future Expansion (1999)</li> <li>- Detailed local criteria provided to guide form and location of university development</li> </ul>	<p>education (SA Objective 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of local criteria is also expected to generate wider benefits in respect of the environmental SA objectives (although not to a level considered to be significant) for example, by ensuring that new development is accessible and does not adversely affect the City's special character.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- Overall, the preferred approach is considered to out-perform, in sustainability terms, the reasonable alternatives and none of the Alternatives were assessed as performing better than the preferred approach against any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>distinctive character of the campus and its landscape setting.</p>	<p>separate section in response to consultation outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> <li>- New university expansion site added to Policy ED3. 28ha of land is allocated to allow the university to continue to facilitate growth, within the context of its landscaped setting which gives it a special character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The policies have been assessed as having a significant positive effect upon SA Objectives 1 (Housing), 2 (Health), 3 (Education), 4 (Jobs) and 6 (Travel).</li> <li>-The provision of appropriate and sufficient education and training opportunities is an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect up to date sites work.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>and quality, to guarantee its future contribution to the need for education and research and to the local, regional and national economies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New student housing site added to Policy ED4 to support the university in meeting its students' accommodation needs.</li> </ul>	<p>important part of the development of an effective workforce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support for the City's Universities under Policies ED1-5 is considered to be of particular importance in helping to develop and retain a highly qualified workforce. The provision of education and training is considered fundamental to health and well-being, providing an opportunity for the population of York to realise their potential.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> <li>- The university development brief will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document by the Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of housing for students and staff (ED1, ED4 and ED5) will meet these particular needs and can have beneficial indirect impacts on the local housing market.</li> <li>- Support for the City's Universities under Policies ED1-5 is considered to be of particular importance in helping to develop and retain a highly qualified workforce. This is considered fundamental to health and wellbeing, providing an opportunity for the population of York to realise their potential.</li> <li>- The opportunity for community access to sports facilities under Policies ED6 and ED8 has also</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Historic England felt more recognition / protection should be given to the University of York's campus architecture. Supported the requirement that any future development should be sensitive to their surroundings.</li> <li>- Several developers asked for further detail on the extent of developer contributions required for sport / cultural facilities.</li> <li>-York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce objected to the disconnect in the plan, noting the Universities' importance to</li> </ul>	<p>No major changes to policy approach.</p> <p>ED3 changed to reflect proposed allocation amendments to include revised extension to south (ST27) following consideration of consultation comments and technical evidence.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>been appraised positively against the health objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education policies will help to ensure that there is equality of access to education facilities across the City, therefore assessed as a minor positive effects on SA Objectives 5 (Equality) and 9 (Land Use)</li> <li>-Minor positive effects are also anticipated in relation to SA Objectives 12 on the basis that accessible education facilities will help to minimise a reliance upon travel by car.</li> </ul>	<p>the city and then failing to allocate adequate land for expansion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-York Green Party said additional purpose built student-accommodation should be built on campus.</li> </ul>	

## 18. Policy Topic: Design and the Historic Environment

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG15</li> <li>- PPG16</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Evidence base provides basis for understanding City’s special characteristics, and informing strategic policy context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plan’s approach seeks to retain historic character in order to protect city’s attractiveness, economic prosperity and ensure high quality new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should restate duty to preserve and enhance historic character</li> <li>- Suggested we seek a higher standard of design quality through the LDF;</li> <li>- support for CABE based design principles bolstered by local evidence (including VDSs, CAAs and further SPDs);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discusses key issues relevant to design and the historic environment, with the aim of delivering a single strategic policy</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for producing Local List</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>PPS1 PPG15 PPG16</p> <p>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</p> <p>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</p> <p>Overall these advise putting in place policies to preserve and enhance the historic environment, including policies for protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Draft RSS (Dec 2005)</li> <li>- Restates design principles, but offers more debate around York’s specific characteristics, and the potential for further local character appraisal work to be carried out, in response to consultation comments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserving the quality of York’s historic environment is key to its economic success, and liveability</li> <li>- The Plan should promote specific design approaches for site allocations.</li> <li>- Should give particular care to protect unlisted as well as listed buildings and structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should restate duty to preserve and enhance historic character.</li> <li>- The plan should seek a ‘visionary approach’ to design quality;</li> <li>- Support for CABE based design principles bolstered by local evidence (including VDSs, CACAs and further SPDs)</li> <li>- Support producing Local List</li> <li>- Should assess impact of level of growth proposed on historic environment</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	interest.				
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG15</li> <li>- PPG16</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> </ul>	<p>RSS (May 2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gives substantial weight to the need to appraise local character alongside establishing a series of guiding design principles.</li> <li>- It is specific in its targets to prepare a CACA for the City's central historic core, and characterisation studies for strategic sites.</li> <li>- Detailed policies are included for the city centre and York Northwest strategic site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of general design approach, which aims to preserve the quality of York's historic environment. This is key to its economic success, and liveability.</li> <li>- Plan should give particular care to protect unlisted as well as listed buildings and structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for commitment to further appraising and understanding the city's special character, in particular VDS and the Local List.</li> <li>- Some support for further design guidelines for strategic sites</li> </ul>	No change in general approach from Local Plan (2005)
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS5</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Heritage Topic Paper (CYC, 2011):</li> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper, to defines those assets of strategic importance to the special character and setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcomes scope of policy, and clear requirements set out for development industry.</li> <li>- Establishes common baseline for heritage appraisal.</li> <li>- Supportive of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- English Heritage supportive of approach to include 6 principal 'special characteristics';</li> <li>- Need for more weight to be given to existing SPDs, including VDSs.</li> </ul>	- Responds to SA and consultation comments evidence base undertaken to understand better York's characteristics. This is the basis for the revised approach which focuses on protecting and enhancing these

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>Areas Act 1979 - Draft NPPF.</p>	<p>of York which are included within the policy. - Widens the scope of the approach to allow for impact on non-designated assets to be appraised. - Targets also allow for the completion of site specific heritage statements and design briefs for major sites.</p>	<p>general design approach, which aims to preserve the quality of York’s historic environment. This is key to its economic success, and liveability.</p>		<p>characteristics.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>- NPPF - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)</p>	<p>- Heritage Topic Paper (CYC, update 2013)  - Approach recognises the outstanding quality of the historic environment, its inherent value to the city and the central role it plays in York’s economic success. - York’s special qualities are key considerations in determining the</p>	<p>- Proposed policy approach would restrict development which would affect designated and non-designated assets. This is likely to have positive outcomes in sustainability terms.</p>	<p>- Lack of general design/amenity policy. - Include references to existing evidence, including VDS, and commitment to Local List. - Refer to all assets, not just those ‘designated’. - Clearer guidance on level of detail to be submitted in support of planning applications;</p>	<p>- No change in approach but more detailed policies provided.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		design implications of development			
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper (CYC, update 2013)</li> <li>- York's special characteristics are key benchmarks when considering the quality of future development.</li> <li>- Development proposals should be of high design standards at all scales.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No significant or minor negative effects were identified in the assessment of Policies D1-D13 against the SA Objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised structure and new policies added to allow for greater clarity in terms of policy requirements relating to the setting and design of new buildings and places and the design of extensions and alterations to existing buildings.</li> <li>- Respond to consultation responses from colleagues in Development Management and to provide more detail.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF &amp; NPPG</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Heritage Impact Assessment (2017)</li> <li>- York's special characteristics are key benchmarks when considering the quality of future development.</li> <li>- Development proposals should be of high design standards at all scales.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No significant or minor negative effects were identified in the assessment of Policies D1-D13 against the SA Objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad support for policy approach.</li> <li>- Some wanted a clear definition of York's special character / setting.</li> <li>- Comments from both Historic England and some developers that policies are not consistent with NPPF / do not reflect NPPF advice or wording.</li> <li>- Unable to locate the York Landscape Character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some additions made for clarity and changes made to better reflect national planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				Appraisal. - Questions as to when the local list of heritage assets is to be completed.	

## 19. Policy Topic: Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Recreation

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPS1 - PPS9	- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)  - Protect and enhance the region's biodiversity and landscape - Increase regional tree cover	- Policy should seek to conserve and enhance existing resource rather than identify new sites and landscapes;	- General support for policy approach to protect and enhance species, landscape and rivers and increase woodland/tree cover. - Need for biodiversity action plan asap, and EIA to appraise impacts of development on natural resources.	- Green Infrastructure not covered in I+O 1 as term was in its infancy. I+O 2 doc introduced the overarching concept; - Policy should reflect progress on Biodiversity Action Plan and SINC assessment - Open space to be covered separately, dealing with quantity, quality and accessibility.
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS1 - PPS9	- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004) - Draft RSS (Dec 2005)  - Protect and enhance the region's biodiversity and	- Generally positive impact on biodiversity. - Consider identifying key routes and green wedges as green infrastructure network - Take care not to prioritise protection of	- General support for policy approach to protect and enhance species, landscape and rivers and increase woodland/tree cover. - Need for biodiversity action plan asap, and EIA to appraise impacts of	- See above.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		landscape - Increase regional tree cover - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study advocates an increased emphasis on the value and contribution of existing sites rather than the identification of new sites. - Emerging Biodiversity Action Plan and SINC assessment	landscape character over biodiversity;	development on natural resources.	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS9</li> <li>- PPG17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (May 2008)</li> <li>- protect and enhance the region’s biodiversity and landscape</li> <li>- increase regional tree cover</li> <li>- Emerging Biodiversity Audit and Action Plan and SINC assessment</li> <li>- Sets out policy approach to Open Space i.e. improving quality of existing open space and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive impacts from improved access to existing open space, and approach to address deficiencies where they exist.</li> <li>- Generally positive impacts through managing biodiversity and green space</li> <li>- Potential conflict through recreation/biodiversity management as access and therefore use improves. Policy should explicitly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for policy approach</li> <li>- Broad range of comments covering biodiversity, recreational open space, green space, trees and woodland.</li> <li>- Make more reference to overarching benefits of green in economic/environmental terms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Move to Preferred Options necessitates full wording of policy objectives and criteria;</li> <li>- Separate consideration given to ‘Open Space’, outside of green infrastructure;</li> <li>- To allow for outcomes of emerging work mapping green corridors</li> <li>- Commitment to producing Green Infrastructure SPD</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		improving access. - PPG17 assessment and adoption of ANGSt standards to inform Core Strategy and other emerging DPDs	mention intention to manage recreational space.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS1 - PPS9 - PPG17	- Biodiversity Audit and Action Plan, 2011 - Leeds City Region GI Strategy, 2010 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, 2008 - Green Corridor Technical Paper, 2011	- Overall impact is likely to be positive - Approach includes commitment to produce Green Inf. Strategy - Gives greater clarity to developers on what will be expected in support of/to inform a planning application - Policy is more comprehensive in its approach to maintain, enhance and protect areas of biodiversity across its many functions.	- General support, including from Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency; - Include additional targets linked to Biodiversity Action Plan; - Commit to Playing Pitch Strategy; - Need for further masterplanning in relation to identified Areas of Search for development, to ensure appropriate green space provision/management	- Strategic Green Infrastructure objective reworded to recognise GI benefits across the themes of sustainability. - To improve clarity, policy makes distinction between ongoing GI strategy, which includes studies to appraise extent and quality of existing GI, and Dev management style ‘criteria based policy’ approach. - Removal of ANGSt as an indicator – reference instead to targets in Open Space Study
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	- Biodiversity Audit, 2011 and Action Plan, 2013 - Leeds City Region GI Strategy, 2010 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation	- Generally positive impact on SA objectives. - The preferred approach is expected to help protect and enhance	- Need for Green infrastructure Strategy - Need for Tree Strategy - Need to reassess green spaces for biodiversity value - Biodiversity policy should	-- Move to Local Plan necessitated full range of strategic policies contained within a single document.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Study, 2008 (note emerging 2014 update)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consultation Draft Playing Pitch Strategy, 2013</li> <li>- Green Infrastructure section includes policies on Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity, Trees, Open Space/Playing Pitches, New Open Space, Green Corridors and Access to Nature.</li> </ul>	<p>the City's existing green infrastructure assets including all biodiversity resources, areas of landscape value and open space. By prioritising the protection of functional green infrastructure, the approach would also help to conserve and enhance York's special character and landscape and may encourage the best use of land. Green infrastructure in York has an important flood water storage role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the preferred approach would also require major development to provide open space provision on/off site thereby helping to ensure that newly arising need for open space is met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- be more detailed to inform development decision making</li> <li>- CIL requirement is overly onerous, particularly on smaller sites</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Plan Evidence Base: Open Space and Green Infrastructure (2014)</li>   <li>- No change in approach however policies have been merged or deleted to add clarity.</li> <li>- New policy to cover Open Spaces and Playing Pitches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant positive effect against Objectives 5 (Equality), 6 (Travel) and 7 (Greenhouse Gases) and 12 (Air Quality). The safeguarding of the City's Green Infrastructure, which is an explicit requirement within Policies GI1-5 has been identified as having a significant positive effect upon SA Objective 9 (Land Use).</li> <li>- Appraised as having significant positive effects against SA Objectives 2 (Health) due to the opportunity for people to engage actively within these open spaces, but also due to the part these policies will play in helping to improve the City's air quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect the most up to date evidence base</li> <li>- For clarity,</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Consultation September 2017</b></p>	<p>-NPPF</p>	<p>-Local Plan Evidence Base: Open Space and Green Infrastructure Update (September 2017)                      - new evidence base reassesses the 2014 open space quantum based upon the new ward boundaries implemented in 2015 but retains the 2014 overall methodology and agreed typology standards for the different types of open space.                      -new policy to cover Burial and Memorial Grounds.</p>	<p>- Significant positive effect against Objectives 5 (Equality), 6 (Travel) and 7 (Greenhouse Gases) and 12 (Air Quality). The safeguarding of the City's Green Infrastructure, which is an explicit requirement within Policies GI1-5 has been identified as having a significant positive effect upon SA Objective 9 (Land Use).                      - Appraised as having significant positive effects against SA Objectives 2 (Health) due to the opportunity for recreational activities and the contribution these policies will make in helping to improve the City's air quality.                      - Green Infrastructure Policies are the centrepiece in realising the</p>	<p>-General support for the policy including from Historic England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, MOD, CPRE Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Fulford Parish Council. The provision of an SPD on GI and Biodiversity would be supported by Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.                      -removal of reference to Sites of Local Interest (SLI's) suggested                      -Statutory Consultee Sport England suggest some amendments to policies GI5 and GI6.</p>	<p>- No major change to policy approach.                      - Some changes made to reflect consultation comments and to be inline with the NPPF in relation to SINC's.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>aspiration of SA Objective 8 (Green Infrastructure) and as such the policies have been appraised as having a significant positive effect upon this objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policies have been identified as having a significant positive effect on Objectives 14 (Historic Environment) and 15 (Natural and Built Environment).</li> <li>- Cumulative minor positive effects have been identified against SA Objectives 1 (Housing), 3 (Education) and 4 (Employment).</li> <li>- No minor or significant negative effects were identified during the appraisal of the Green Infrastructure Policies.</li> </ul>		

## 20. Policy Topic: Approach to Development in the Green Belt

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Purpose of Green Belt should be to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. List of categories detailed which identify their contribution to preserving the historic character and setting of York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of green belt policy, as a strategic policy tool, and with the need under current policy for a boundary to be defined for the plan period and beyond need to be addressed as part of the selection of strategic spatial alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt is vital and as such not adequately addressed and should have its own separate section.</li> <li>- The role of the Green Belt in preserving the historic character and setting of York is a key factor in determining the location of future development.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Creating a permanent Green Belt for York that preserves its special character and setting, whilst ensuring sustainable development part of the spatial objectives of the plan.</li> <li>- Whole section now dedicated to York's Green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When considering which areas are most suitable for expansion and most suitable for exclusion from the Green Belt, may be necessary to apply different tests to different circumstances.</li> <li>- May not be suitable to pursue Option 1 as this is not in keeping with national policy set by the PPG. It may be that a single 'primary' purpose is not the most suitable way of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserving the historic character and setting of York is a key influence that should be considered when refining the approach to the location of development.</li> <li>- Supported option to run the Green Belt until 2029.</li> <li>- Primary purpose of Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of York.</li> <li>- More emphasis to be placed on the protection of the Green belt from development.</li> </ul>	- Approach still not determined but greater clarity and importance placed on the Green Belt with the inclusion of a dedicated chapter.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Belt to provide greater emphasis on improving and understanding its role for York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two options as to the lifespan of York's Green Belt: Option 1: To 2029, this is longer than the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy period which runs to 2021, or Option 2: Another date.</li> <li>- Two options as to the primary purpose of the green belt: Option 1: To preserve the setting and special character of York; or Option 2: One or more of the following; to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; -to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; -to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and/or to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban</li> </ul>	<p>designating Green Belt in York and the test needed may vary depending on the specifics of any particular location.</p>		

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>PPG2</p>	<p>land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- To create a permanent green belt for York that will endure until at least 2030.</li> <li>-- To maintain and preserve the historic setting of York;</li> <li>- To retain and protect special features such as the strays, green wedges and views of the Minster; and</li> <li>- To reflect the other purposes set out in PPG2.</li> <li>- Role of York Green Belt now articulated through policy rather than strategy.</li> <li>- Boundaries of Green Belt and Major Developed Sites to be defined in Allocations DPD. When setting Green Belt boundaries it must be ensured that the development needs of York can be met until at least 2030 outside the proposed Green Belt. They must be in line with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acknowledges importance of the Green Belt helping to protect the most important sites in terms of quality landscape, biodiversity and historic interest. Green belt is also needing to allow appropriate growth within the city and that in order to designate it, different tests should be applied where applicable.</li> <li>- Would be beneficial for the core strategy to encourage the use of land designated as Greenbelt in line with PPG2 to reinforce the designated land as an asset of the city. These uses could include rural diversification and the use of natural environment for recreational activity as well as supporting measures which address climate change in York and which would meet reducing York’s ecological footprint.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Numerous comments on the section as a whole. Generally felt that there needs to be further clarity on the role of the York’s historic character and setting and the green belt. Differing views on the life span of the green belt.</li> </ul>	<p>Introduction of policy to provide greater strength and emphasis to the role of the Green Belt.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>the Core Strategy Spatial Principles taking account of the levels of growth set out in the RSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft proposals map included in Allocations DPD with all options for sites included.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission</b> – <b>September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG2</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper (2011)</li> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- Refined policy, general policy approach retained from preferred options.</li> <li>- Confirmation that the Greenbelt boundary will endure until 2031 has been stated.</li> <li>- Land outside the Sub Regional City, Large Villages and Villages, will be included within the general extent of York's Green Belt, with designated Small Villages being washed over.</li> <li>- Only very restricted types of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised Greenbelt policy in York has been appraised as having mostly a positive impact on the economic, social and environmental objectives within the SA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern in relation to the permanence of the Green Belt and proposed Areas of Search.</li> <li>- Support for Policy CS1 and the intention to establish a permanent Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach but revised policy has been made more concise and tighter in specification for greater clarity. This is in line with national policy.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>appropriate to the purposes of the Green Belt will be permitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundaries to be defined in Allocations DPD.</li> <li>-Draft proposals map included in Allocations DPD with all options for sites included.</li> <li>- Will also address, within the York context, the other purposes of Green Belts set out in PPG2.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper (2011)</li> <li>- Saved policies of otherwise revoked RSS</li> <li>- Role of York’s Green Belt defined as policy in the Spatial Strategy.</li> <li>- Whole section now dedicated to development in the green belt and villages washed over by the Green Belt.</li> <li>- Policies included on what is appropriate development in the green belt, what is permitted in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preferred policy approach is considered to have a positive effect across all the relevant economic, social and environmental SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixture of objections to the wording of the policy</li> <li>- Support to the general direction of the policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach but greater clarity in terms of the role of the Green Belt and what types of development are appropriate. This is in line with national guidance.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>areas washed over by the greenbelt, reuse of buildings in the green belt, exception sites for affordable housing and major developed sites in the green belt.</p>			
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>- Largely as above.                      - Minor revisions to the exceptions policy are considered necessary                      - Major developed sites in the Green Belt Policy deleted.</p>	<p>- Policies GB1 and GB2 have been appraised as having significant positive effects upon SA Objectives 14 (Historic Environment) and 15 (Natural and Built Landscape). Policy GB3 which identifies the criteria for the reuse of buildings outside of settlement limits within the Green Belt has been appraised as having a minor positive effect against this objective.                      - Help to protect the Green Belt as a resource with benefits for health and also biodiversity and land use (SA Objectives 2, 8 and 9)                      - Restrictions on built development will constrain locations for housing</p>	<p>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</p>	<p>- Minor changes to exceptions policy are to ensure alignment with the NPPF and to tighten the test of development viability                      - Major developed sites in the Green Belt Policy deleted as it is not in accordance with the NPPF</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>development and may constrain commercial development formation or expansion has a minor negative effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing) and a minor negative/uncertain effect on Objective 4 (Employment).</p> <p>- However by focusing development within the urban area, there is the potential for minor positive effects associated with reducing the need to travel by concentrating homes and services together and as a result reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As a result minor positive effects have been recorded against Objectives 6 and 7.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<p>-NPPF</p>	<p>-As above</p>	<p>-Policies GB1 and GB2 have been appraised as having significant positive effects upon SA Objectives 14 (Historic Environment) and 15 (Natural and Built Landscape). GB3 has been appraised as having a minor positive effect against this objective.</p> <p>- Policy GB1 which places restrictions upon built</p>	<p>- Broad support for policy GB1 from Historic England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and York Green Party.</p> <p>- York Racecourse) considers the Green Belt designation to be unduly restrictive, request that the area of the racecourse previously identified as a major developed site, should be removed from the green belt as it does not serve green belt</p>	<p>GB1 amended to recognise the redevelopment of existing developed sites should be acceptable where it would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>development within the Green Belt can help to protect this resource with benefits for health and also biodiversity and land use (SA Objectives 2, 8 and 9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restrictions on built development will constrain locations for housing development (although Policy GB4 does identify that the development of affordable housing on exception sites may be permissible) and may constrain commercial development formation or expansion. Accordingly, Policy GB1 has been appraised as having minor negative effect on SA Objective 1 (Housing) and a minor negative/uncertain effect on Objective 4 (Employment).</li> <li>- Constraining development to the urban area through Policy GB1 creates potential for minor positive effects associated with reducing the need to travel, as a result minor positive effects have been recorded against Objectives 6</li> </ul>	<p>purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No justification is provided for washing over certain settlements, such settlements should be inset based on their merits and all villages currently washed over should be reassessed to ensure compliance with NPPF para 86.</li> <li>- Fulford Parish Council objects to policy GB1 as it should follow more closely the format of paragraph 89 of the NPPF.</li> </ul>	<p>openness.</p> <p>Policy GB3 amended to improve clarity and allow for proposals that could create an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			(Travel) and 7 (Greenhouse Gases).		

## 21. Policy Topic: Renewable Energy and Sustainable Design and Construction

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> <li>- Securing the Future: delivering the UK Sustainable Development Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sub-regional Renewable Energy Assessments and Targets Study 2004</li> <li>- Delivering Renewable Energy in North Yorkshire (2005)</li> <li>- Above studies led to a target-based approach for the city to achieve using renewable energy schemes.</li> <li>- It is recommended that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach to Renewable Energy put forward is compatible with the aim of achieving a greater level of sustainable development in the City of York.</li> <li>- It may also be suitable for the LDF and the Core Strategy to consider how buildings can be designed to take into account the effects of climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The main priority suggested by respondents was to reduce consumption.</li> <li>- It was suggested that information within this chapter is misleading and ambitious.</li> <li>- Should focus on what York can do best.</li> <li>- Some talked about encouraging community based energy schemes which should be</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>the energy hierarchy should be adopted as the overarching framework for energy policy within the Core Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options include Onshore wind, Biomass (wood and other), Hydro electricity, Ground source heat pumps, photo-voltaics.</li> </ul>		<p>encouraged by working with other local bodies.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Four options given on how to deliver 10% energy needs through on site renewable energy generation on:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1: All sites.</li> <li>Option 2: Sites of 500sqm commercial or 5 or more residential units.</li> <li>Option 3: Sites of 1000sqm commercial or 10 or more residential units.</li> <li>Option 4: One of the three options outlined above but incorporating an alternative approach for buildings in conservation areas and listed buildings, in recognition of their special character.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The Core Strategy needs to consider how the Council will assess the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further consideration of a more ambitious target than the 10%, setting a variable target, as to whether targets should be expressed in terms of renewable energy generation or carbon dioxide reduction, consideration of whether energy reduction will be in terms of regulated emissions or unregulated also.</li> <li>- It will be important to consider the long-term need and benefits of renewable energy generation against other more localised or small scale effects.</li> <li>- Securing renewable energy technology that serves the National Grid could make an important contribution to York's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None of the options received majority support.</li> <li>- Most respondents (81%) thought we should set a more ambitious target for renewable energy.</li> <li>- Whilst most types of renewable energy generators were supported some questioned the suitability of different types and commented on appropriate scales. Some respondents suggested that York should not have any wind turbines.</li> <li>- Suggestions included that the most appropriate renewable energy requirement was for 10% to be produced on-site up to 2012 rising to 15% by 2015 and 20% by 2020.</li> <li>- Respondents suggested</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>impact of stand-alone renewable energy generators.</p>	<p>economy. Depending on the scheme it could help in diversification of the rural economy.</p>	<p>that the development of stand alone renewable energy generators should not compromise the openness of green belt, nor the integrity of international and nationally designated areas and features or their settings, flood risk nor where they would increase risk elsewhere.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- The Climate Change Act (2008)</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper ‘Meeting the Energy Challenge’ (May 2007)</li> <li>- Energy Act (2008)</li> </ul>	<p>- The City of York Council will seek to help reduce York’s eco and carbon footprint through the promotion of sustainable design and construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy, thereby reducing overall energy use and help in the fight against Climate Change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate change is a key issue facing the city. The main source of carbon dioxide is from combustion of fossil fuels is through electricity generation or vehicle emissions. Encouraging the use of renewable energy and sustainable design and construction techniques will be key.</li> <li>- The SA supported an approach which would make the highest carbon dioxide reductions and therefore, more stringent targets as the technology improves. There is also a possible adverse impact on incorporating energy schemes in buildings in conservation areas or listed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 64% agree with promoting renewable energy on site.</li> <li>- Respondents were least likely to agree that promoting renewable energy off site will be most effective for York (33%).</li> <li>- ‘Other’ suggestions included to encourage additional methods of renewable energy.</li> </ul>	<p>- Approach is much more detailed as to how renewable energy will be collected and included targets as set by national policy.</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			buildings but the SA suggests not totally excluding these from the policy.		
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper: Meeting the Energy Challenge (2007)</li> <li>- Energy Act (2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate Change Framework and Action Plan (2010)</li> <li>- The LDF will play a key role in helping to deliver the Climate Change Framework and Action Plan through contributing to a reduction of York’s carbon and eco-footprint and helping the City to adapt to, and mitigate against climate change. This will be achieved through the application of the Energy Hierarchy by ensuring York’s renewable energy/low carbon potential is realised and high standards of sustainable design and construction are adopted,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The emerging Renewable Energy Study should also set out technologies and suitable areas for implementing renewable energy in York This should form part of the baseline evidence and be taken into consideration when it is available.</li> <li>- The SA also welcomes the ambition to exceed the targets referring to renewable energy generation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were a mixture of views over the targets in this chapter not being ambitious enough whereas others felt targets were unrealistically high.</li> <li>- Respondents felt that the policy went beyond what was required by regulations and guidance at a national level. Some of the respondents simply felt that policy duplicated matters covered by other statutory codes and building regulations</li> <li>- Some respondents felt that all planning applications for new build or refurbishments should incorporate on-site renewable / low carbon energy generation equipment to reduce predicted carbon emissions by at least 10%.</li> <li>- Several respondents felt strongly that the use of wind turbines is not justified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The emphasis of the policy hasn’t changed in terms of its remit for renewable energy but the wording has been significantly amended to include specific targets which need to be achieved. The policy now also includes more substantial information on sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<p>within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a need to provide more spatial guidance across York which identifies suitable locations for on shore wind developments.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Climate Change Act (2008)</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper: Meeting the Energy Challenge (2007)</li> </ul> <p><i>Energy Act (2008)</i></p>	<p>- The Local Plan will support and encourage the generation of renewable and low carbon energy through development proposals that meet the following requirements: Respond positively to the opportunities identified in The Renewable Energy Strategic Viability Study for York (2010) and as shown as potential areas of search for renewable electricity generation on the proposals map; Are in accordance with the Spatial Strategy. Demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse impacts on landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets and Green Belt objectives. Demonstrate benefits for local communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No significant positive effects were identified however, the options were assessed as having positive effects across the majority of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- In general, the reasonable alternatives assessed were considered to perform similar to, or worse than, the preferred approach. The exception is in relation to renewable and low carbon energy development where Option 2 (Rely on NPPF to guide renewable and low carbon energy development) was assessed as having a positive effect on</li> <li>- In order to avoid any potentially adverse effects from renewable and low carbon energy development, it is therefore recommended that generic local criteria includes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the areas of search are close to the boundaries of neighbouring authorities – would welcome joint working in the future.</li> <li>- Some areas are inappropriate for turbine installation due to the potential impact on wildlife, for example internationally important bird populations. Many objections regarding the damage to views into and out of York.</li> <li>- Substantial objection to the size and scale of the areas of search.</li> <li>- Objections stating that any benefit for the environment would be outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the setting and special character of the City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes reflect national policy direction.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>- Only focuses on stand alone renewable technologies and does not include district heating and combined heat and power networks. These are seen as being an integral part of creating sustainable new developments and this is dealt with in the approach to Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>	<p>appropriate safeguards for the environment.</p>		
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- National Planning Policy Guidance</li> <li>- Building Regulations Part L</li> <li>- Proposed Housing Standards Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Renewable Energy Study Update 2014</li> <li>- Broadly covers the principles of the preferred options approach above in terms of supporting renewable energy,</li> <li>- Now takes a criteria-based approach moving away from the areas of search approach in preferred approach. Includes allocations as these have a willing landowner and have been assessed through evidence base.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive effects on most SA Objectives with those being significant in respect of greenhouse gases and job creation.</li> <li>- Appraised as having a minor positive effect on housing, health, equality, travel, water, waste and air quality.</li> <li>- No significant or minor negative effects were identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect up to date evidence base and consultation responses.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- National Planning Policy Guidance</li> <li>- Building Regulations Part L</li> <li>- Proposed Housing Standards Review</li> </ul>	<p>- The City of York Council Renewable Energy Study (2014) assessed the city’s potential for generating renewable energy and concluded that there is potential to generate renewable energy from a variety of available sources including wind, solar and hydro</p> <p>-The Council will encourage applicants to use Managing Landscape Change: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments – A Sensitivity Framework of North Yorkshire and York (2012) in preparing their planning applications for renewable electricity and heat production installations.</p> <p>-A commitment has been outlined to achieve carbon reduction targets of 40% by 2020 and 80% by 2050, within the Climate Change Framework for York (2010).</p>	<p>Policy CC1 identifies that the generation of renewable and low carbon energy will be supported within the context of sustainable development and responding to the threat of climate change. Appraised as having positive effects on most SA Objectives with those being significant in respect of Objectives 7 (minimising greenhouse gases) and 4 (job creation).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Developers object to 28% reduction in carbon emissions, policy CC3 (district heating and CHP) and the requirement for strategic sites &lt;5ha to produce energy masterplans.</li> <li>- Rachel Maskell MP said that sites should be put aside for renewables.</li> <li>-Parish councils object to wind turbines and ground mounted solar, prefer solar to be integrated in the roofs of industrial premises and new housing.</li> <li>- In their argument for high standards York Green Party stress than integrating renewables (especially heat pumps) and good insulation during the initial design process is much cheaper than adding after a building is completed.</li> </ul>	<p>To reflect consultation responses policies amended.</p>

## 22. Policy Topic: Sustainable Design and Construction

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure sustainable, high quality design and construction there are a number of options for the LDF.</li> <li>- The approach taken could be based on the following factors</li> <li>The production of local and village design statements for areas across the City.</li> <li>The establishment of city-wide design principles</li> <li>The promotion of measures to reduce energy consumption in buildings through total refurbishment aiming for zero emissions</li> <li>A requirement that a certain percentage of energy to be used in new developments will be provided through renewable energy sources.</li> <li>The promotion of measures to implement energy efficiency measures in new development and construction practices.</li> <li>Ensuring sustainable waste management of materials in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach is appropriate in helping to set policy to achieve a high standard of design and sustainable construction.</li> <li>- It may be suitable for the LDF to consider including policy that requires that new development meet defined sustainable construction standards, such as those defined by Eco-Homes and BREEAM tools. It may also be suitable for the LDF and the Core Strategy to consider how buildings can be designed to take into account the effects of climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall respondents felt that the Local Development Framework (LDF) should be seeking a higher standard of design across the City.</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered that this section should be strengthened in terms of requiring developers to incorporate certain sustainable design measures and to introduce targets and minimum standards.</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered the LDF should require developers to incorporate certain sustainable design measures and to introduce targets and minimum standards specific to York.</li> <li>- The introduction of a blanket requirement would be unreasonable and fails to take account of individual site circumstances and constraints outside the developer’s control.</li> <li>- Requirements should be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		construction practices.		flexible because sustainable design is a rapidly evolving area and some suggested that developers should be encouraged to 'do more' than just the minimum requirement.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two options put forward that could underpin the design policies for the LDF Option 1: Establish a set of city-wide principles based on those set out in CABE's 'By Design'; Option 2: Use the CABE principles but supplement these with other standards, for example by including principles which are specific to York</li> <li>- Three options put forward for the scale of new development that should require a Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM assessment Option 1: A York-specific threshold.. Option 2: As per the government guidance definition of a 'major' development Option 3: All development sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The desire to see more efficient buildings is supported by the SA.</li> <li>- Other options that could be considered are whether it is suitable to widen the requirements for buildings beyond those required by the Code and BREEAM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of respondents to this issue suggested that all development sites should be covered by environmental assessment methods such as BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes, and there should be clear sanctions if levels are not achieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>- PPS1.</li> </ul>	<p>- All new developments and conversions to be built to the highest quality design using innovative construction and energy and water efficient methods based on targets set out in the forthcoming Sustainable Design and Construction SPD;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF could consider whether it is suitable to widen the requirements for building beyond those required by Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM such as water efficiency measures or sustainably sourced materials.</li> <li>- Consider requiring certain types of development to achieve better than ‘very good’ rating or increasing stringency of the standards over time, for e.g. after 2015 all developments should achieve ‘excellent’ rating or five stars on the Code ranking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two-thirds (67%) of the sample agree with promoting sustainable design and construction techniques.</li> <li>- The approach should not duplicate codes and guidance enforced through building regulations.</li> <li>- ‘Innovative construction techniques’ should only be applicable where appropriate and viable to do so.</li> <li>- Reference to ‘high standards’ should be expanded and defined in the Core Strategy, as well as in an SPD to provide clarity.</li> <li>- The policy should comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards.</li> </ul>	<p>- 2005 Local Plan just contained a General policy on Renewable Energy which just set out the Council’s intention to encourage renewable energy facilities provided there are no significant adverse effects. This approach sets out specific requirements for all new developments to incorporate a range of sustainable design and construction methods.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>- Building a Green Future</li> </ul>	<p>- All new developments will need to demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design and construction. For development proposals of 10 dwellings or more or non-residential schemes over 1000m2 the minimum Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards will apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA welcomes the inclusion of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM as well as a stipulation for carbon neutral development from 2016 and 2019.</li> <li>- Recognises that there are costs implication for businesses, developers and residents who choose to build and need to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents felt that the policy went beyond what was required by regulations and guidance at a national level.</li> <li>- Prescribing how developers comply with government targets to achieve zero carbon homes from 2016 onwards was contrary to building regulations and national policy.</li> </ul>	<p>- The approach now includes more substantial information on sustainable design and construction.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>Policy Statement (2007) - PPS1</p>		<p>implement the measures set out in this policy. However, the environmental benefits are clear and it should also have a long-term positive impact in costs saving for energy which offset the cost of its implementation.</p>	<p>- felt by others that requiring developers to meet specified Code for Sustainable Homes targets must be justified with a local evidence base. - Some felt that requiring Sustainable Energy Statements should be deleted as it is contrary to national guidance whereas others felt it should be it should be extended to all developments.</p>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>- NPPF - BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology) - Code for Sustainable Homes</p>	<p>- All new development will be expected to make carbon savings through reducing energy demand, using energy and other resources efficiently and by generating low carbon / renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy. The key areas the Council will seek to address this through the Local Plan are Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development, Consequential Improvements to Existing dwellings and District Heating and Combined Heat and Power Networks</p>	<p>- The options were assessed as having positive effects across the majority of the SA objectives which principally reflects the expectation that the preferred approach would both encourage the provision of renewable energy and low carbon energy development and help deliver energy efficient/low carbon, sustainably constructed homes and business premises. This in-turn may help to reduce emissions to air, minimise resource use, create employment and training opportunities within the renewables sector and</p>	<p>- Some feel the policy should be more ambitious; others suggest that since the policy is already more onerous than national standards it is likely to cause significant viability and deliverability issues, without justification for its thresholds and requirements. - Several consultees felt that the policy is overly focused on energy demand, and that additional efficiency measures including green roofs, rain water harvesting and SUDS should be promoted both in relation to new build and the existing housing stock. - Need for greater clarity in</p>	<p>- Changes made to reflect the proposed changes to building regulations. - A Sustainable Design and Construction SPD will be developed to support and help achieve the requirements of this chapter covering renewable energy generation, sustainable design and construction, climate resilience good practice and also consequential improvements and</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			help to alleviate climate change impacts.	policy wording, particularly regarding 'technical feasibility' and 'allowable solutions'. - Development Management raise a question around the reasonableness and consistent application of the policy's requirements in relation to house extensions, particularly since PD rights allow for a significant level of development to take place without planning permission.	other relevant issues to ensure that the local plan meets the challenges of climate change.
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- As above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Renewable Energy Study Update 2014</li> <li>- Policy broadly covers the principles of the preferred options policy.</li> <li>- Aims to ensure that all new development in the City of York achieves high standards of sustainable design and construction, both in relation to carbon savings and also for wider sustainability goals of reuse of materials and prudent use of natural resources.</li> <li>- A Sustainability Statement (including a Low Carbon Energy Strategy) required for all new residential and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identified as having positive effects on most SA Objectives with those being significant in respect of greenhouse gases and job creation.</li> <li>- No significant or minor negative effects were identified</li> </ul>	- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect the updated evidence base which provides more detailed guidance on what would be expected of large development sites/strategic sites.</li> <li>- The proposed changes to building regulations part L and the housing standard review are imminent and therefore the policy must be future proof.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>non-residential applications to demonstrate that the development will be of a high standard of sustainable design and construction using techniques.</p> <p>- Where technically viable, appropriate for the development, and in areas with sufficient existing or potential heat density, developments of 1,000 or more square metres or 10 dwellings or more (including conversions where feasible) should propose heating systems.</p>			
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes</li> </ul>	<p>-As above.</p>	<p>CC2 requires all new development to consider sustainable design and construction and to make carbon savings through reducing energy demand, using energy and other resources efficiently by generating low carbon/renewable energy. CC2 has been appraised as having a minor positive effect on Objectives 1 (housing), 2 (health), 5 (equality), 6 (travel), 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Environment Agency recommend a policy is inserted that ensures the requirements of the Water Framework Directive are adhered to, where appropriate.</li> <li>-Developers oppose policy CC2 saying standards should not be above government building regulations.</li> <li>-Developers object to requirement that new non-residential buildings over 100m2 to achieve BREEAM</li> </ul>	<p>CC2 amended to recognise water efficiency and the need for flexibility when converting buildings of heritage or conservation value.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			(water), 11 (waste) and 12 (air quality).	"Excellent" rating.	

## 23. Policy Topic: Environmental Quality

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC;</li> <li>- PPS23;</li> <li>- Framework Directive 96/62/EC;</li> <li>- Environment Act 1995;</li> <li>- Air Quality Regulations 2000;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Without Walls Community Strategy;</li> <li>- CYC Air Quality Management Order No. 1</li> <li>- Air Quality Action Plan (July 2004)</li> <li>- Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2)</li> <li>- The overall approach is to protect and improve the quality of the environment in York, especially in terms of noise and air pollution, by implementing a zoning system on a city wide basis to control levels of noise pollution, targeting specific areas with existing pollution problems, identifying areas that may not yet pose pollution problems but potentially</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach may prove useful in ensuring new polluting development is kept away from sensitive receptors such as hospital or schools, but also important that areas outside zones not adversely affected by polluting development. Preventing pollution in these areas would be better than reducing effects of pollution once occurred.</li> <li>- AQMA and sustainable transport policies should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pollution problems should be identified and future developments should be limited, to reduce impacts;</li> <li>- Emphasis should be placed on reducing air pollution, especially from traffic;</li> <li>- City wide Air Quality zoning, with accessible data to help inform travel choices;</li> <li>- Supporting development near Park &amp; Ride sites to reduce pollution;</li> <li>- Zoning could reduce tourism;</li> <li>- Need for overall traffic plan;</li> <li>- No mention of PPS23, or to use brownfield sites for development.</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		could, and control development to minimise impact.	reduce impacts in such areas.		
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC;</li> <li>- PPS23;</li> <li>- Framework Directive 96/62/EC;</li> <li>- Environment Act 1995;</li> <li>- Air Quality Regulations 2000;</li> </ul>	- No specific section on Environmental Quality, but issues of air quality considered as an efficient low emission public transport network will assist in reducing pollution.	- Option 4 in the Transport and Accessibility Section considers that although Park and Ride sites can reduce air quality issues locally, they still rely on car use for part of the journey.	- See above	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC;</li> <li>- PPS23;</li> <li>- Framework</li> </ul>	- Spatial Principle 2 (Areas of Constraint) considers the identification of sites in sustainable locations which don't lead to unacceptable levels of pollution or air quality.	- Policies CS13 and CS14 will both help to achieve the improvement of air quality. Policy CS2 also refers to air quality as a key objective, whilst CS3 aims to make York Central an exemplar sustainable development which	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that planning for excessive growth will have a negative impact due to increased levels of traffic and air pollution;</li> <li>- Air quality is not adequately addressed at a strategic level;</li> <li>- Development on the scale discussed in the LDF should consider the overall impact on pollution and air quality.</li> </ul>	- Only strategic approach can be taken in the Core Strategy which is different to the detailed approach taken in the Local Plan 2005. Still aiming to protect

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Directive 96/62/EC; - Environment Act 1995; - Air Quality Regulations 2000;		should incorporate many measures to improve air quality. - Many other policies will help in improving air quality by directing development to areas to reduce dependence on the car, through increasing public transport and improved cycle / pedestrian access.		environmental quality however.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS1; - PPG24; - Circular 10/73; - European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC; - PPS23; - Framework Directive 96/62/EC; - Environment Act 1995; - Air Quality Regulations 2000 - Draft NPPF	- Spatial Principle 2: Refers to the identification of sites in sustainable locations that would not lead to unacceptable levels of pollution or air quality. - The approach is to deliver improvements to air quality and the implementation of a Low Emissions Strategy by supporting measures to help reduce the emissions of nitrogen oxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ), particulate (PM <sub>10</sub> ) and carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )	- Areas of poor air quality are generally associated with high levels of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions as both types of emission arise from combustion sources. In most cases, air quality improvement measures will also reduce carbon emissions. However, some air quality improvement measures and carbon reduction policies can have conflicting outcomes so must be carefully managed.	- Objective to reduce emissions to air and improve air quality will not be achievable given employment and housing growth proposed. - Approach to air quality will perpetuate illegal levels of air pollution and that the strategic objectives and targets should be strengthened. - Objectives and targets should refer to early compliance with European Directives on air quality. - Air quality will worsen if the approach is not strengthened. - Radical measures need to be implemented to tackle air quality; - Policy should only apply to specific developments which fall within Air Quality Management Areas.	- Section on Air Quality included to reflect its importance as a key challenge for the city.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>- Monitoring of air quality around the city will continue for the foreseeable future and other AQMAs may be designated should other areas of air quality exceedance be identified.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>- NPPF</p>	<p>- 2012 Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment for City of York Council: In Fulfilment of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management (2012)                      - Low Emission Strategy (2012)                      - Contaminated Land Strategy (2001, revised 2010)                      - 2011 Air Quality Progress Report for City of York Council: In Fulfilment of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management (2011)                      - Air Quality Action Plan 2 (2006)  <u>Air Quality</u>                      - Development will only be</p>	<p>- Significant positive effects on health, land use, as well as positive effects in relation to climate change, water, air quality and cultural heritage. It provides a flexible approach to managing environmental quality issues, is considered to offer the most positive long-term approach.                      - The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</p>	<p>- Proposes no firm or objective criteria for determining whether impacts on air quality in Air Quality Management Areas are acceptable or not;                      - Lack of emphasis on the importance of air quality in rural villages;                      - The green infrastructure and tree strategy should be in mitigation and adaptation to air quality, noise and vibration, pollution and other benefits. It has not been introduced into key evidence base and into policies;                      - Should only apply to specific development proposals which fall within an Air Quality Management Area;                      - Water quality is not specifically referred to;                      - Add sources of electromagnetic radiation from electricity distribution networks;                      - Add section on local food here;                      - Support for limits to light pollution;                      - Support for the Policy and consideration of Land Contamination.</p>	<p>- Topic area known as 'Environmental Quality' to reflect wider key issues such as land contamination. Also able to have criteria based policies to guide planning application decisions under new local plan development plan in accordance with the NPPF.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and reduce further exposure to poor air quality.</p> <p><u>Managing Environmental Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will not be permitted where future occupiers would be subject to significant adverse environmental impacts due to noise, vibration, odour, fumes/emissions, dust and light pollution without effective mitigation measures.</li> </ul> <p><u>Land Contamination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will not be permitted where a contamination assessment does not fully assess the possible contamination risks, or where the proposed remedial measures will not deal effectively with the levels of contamination.</li> </ul>			

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	- See above	The policies have all been appraised as being broadly positive when assessed against the SA Objectives	- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.	- No change to policy approach
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	-NPPF	-City of York Council's Air Quality Action Plan 3 (2015) sets out how York intends to continue to deliver the ambitious and pioneering Low Emission Strategy (2012) and work towards becoming an internationally recognised ultra-low emission city. Headline measures for consideration include provision of low emission infrastructure and reducing emissions from new development.	ENV 1 – 5 have all been appraised as being broadly positive when assessed against the SA Objectives.	-Several developers object to the requirement for strategic sites to undertake detailed emissions strategy. - British Sugar PLC said standards implied by ENV2 should be in accordance with the NPPF.	No change to policy approach.

## 24. Policy Topic: Flood Risk, Groundwater and Surface Water Management

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG25	- Flooding is a key issue, shaper and driver of development focused in the Spatial Portrait and Spatial	- Many policy approaches that should help ensure that new development is compatible with the objectives of greater	- More detail needed on particular issues such as the opportunity for rivers, floodplains and strays to be utilised for recreation and	- N/A



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Strategy. Also covered in the sustainable vision for York and is a recurring theme through most sections of the plan.</p>	<p>sustainability. With regard to design and construction, it may be suitable to consider how buildings should be designed in areas that may be at risk of flooding, as climate change is likely to cause more storm events, and higher winter rainfall, that may contribute to this risk.</p>	<p>biodiversity; outlining of measures to protect from flooding.                      - Further emphasis should be placed on protecting and preventing areas from flooding, and that greater analysis of flood risk areas should be undertaken.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>PPG25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flood risk one of the spatial planning objectives within the vision.</li> <li>- Separate flood risk section in the plan detailing key issues centred around locating new development in areas at low risk of flooding and balancing flood risk and sustainability issues.</li> <li>- Key issues: when locating development in high flood risk areas how should the LDF seek to balance flood risk and sustainability issues?</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Prioritise</p>	<p>- The risk to property, people and the economy of York posed by flooding is quite severe. However, a large quantity of the previously developed land suitable for development in York is found within areas at risk of flood. This means in some instances developing in flood prone areas may be necessary subject to suitable controls. Weighing up the differing sustainability implications of the two proposed options is a difficult task as both could have significant yet different positive and adverse effects relating to sustainable development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responses evenly split between the two options.</li> <li>- Considered that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be used to inform the allocation of sites for new development, with the priority given to sites which are not within the flood plain; although also argued that it should not be the sole driver for directing development within the city.</li> <li>- Core Strategy should better reflect the approach set out in PPS25 and the RSS Policy ENV1 in relation to managing flood risk. It should refer to avoiding risk to people and managing flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		sustainable locations, and seek to mitigate potential flood risk through technical solutions; or Option 2: Given that flood risk is likely to intensify through Global Warming seek to identify sites in non high flood risk areas regardless of site sustainability.	objectives.		
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flood risk is identified as a key constraint in the overall spatial strategy and has been used to inform the location of future housing and employment growth</li> <li>- Both the sequential and Exception Tests set out in the SFRA will be applied to development proposals.</li> <li>- Will seek to ensure that new development is not subject to, nor contributes to, inappropriate levels of flood risk from the Rivers Ouse, Foss</li> </ul>	- SA suggests that the policy is strengthened to reflect and take full account of likely future impacts of climate change and other recommendations suggested to make policy stronger.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over four-fifths (85%) of respondents think that ensuring new development does not add to the flooding and drainage problems in York will be most effective for sustainable development.</li> <li>- As a result of climate change, the increased risks of flooding were highlighted, and it was emphasised that there is a need for urgent technical solutions as well as employing mitigation measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>	- No change, general direction of the policy remains the same in reducing flood risk through avoiding development on flood plains and mitigation measures.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		and Derwent and other sources, taking into account the full likely future impacts of climate change.			
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	PPG25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will ensure that new development is not subject to flooding, does not contribute to flooding and is designed in a way that takes account of both existing and future flood risk.</li> <li>- Will use the ‘Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification’ and ‘Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility Classification’ tables from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2011) and any subsequent updates</li> <li>- All new development will be required to include the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems unless it can be demonstrated that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised policy is clearer in its policy direction for implementing flood risk strategies to reduce risk and mitigate risk in the future and the SA considers it to be stronger in direction compared to the previous version.</li> <li>- Welcomes the added detail included within the revised policy to help set an understanding of what implementation measures are required in different circumstances as well as what will be used to assess the determination of if a site can be progressed through the planning system.</li> <li>- Wider strategic issues regarding flood management and implementation of defences in York is recognised to be under the remit of the EA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixture of views over the whether the flood risk policy was inline with national guidance.</li> <li>- The Environment Agency specifically stressed that the wording in the section failed to explain that the Sequential Test should be applied first and passed before the Exception Test is undertaken</li> <li>- York’s flooding history, high water table and climate change projections paragraph means that all watercourses should be referenced.</li> </ul>	<p>More detail has been given setting out the requirements for developers. However the approach to flood risk remains the same.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>it is not technically feasible or viable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design and construction of new development will take account of existing and future flood risk particularly given the implications of climate change.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<p>The Local Plan will ensure that new development is not subject to flood risk and is designed and constructed in such a way that it mitigates against current and future flood events, taking into account flood risk considerations in the NPPF and the Technical Guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will ensure that new development incorporates sustainable drainage measures and, where practicable, reduces surface water flows, irrespective of which flood zone it lays in.</li> <li>- New development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would have positive effects across several of the SA objectives with significant positive effects identified in respect of SA Objective 13 (Flood Risk).</li> <li>- It is assumed that the preferred approach would seek to restrict development in the floodplain which, alongside requiring all new development to adopt specific measures to mitigate flooding, would serve to minimise flood risk to both existing and new development in the City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of actions of relevance to planning in regard to catchment flood management plans have been omitted.</li> <li>- The sequential approach should be included in the policy rather than in the reasoned justification text. Policy should be reviewed with the aim of requiring more ‘Exception Testing’ in Flood Zones 1 and 2.</li> <li>- A requirement for project Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) to include assessments of the potential impacts of changes in flood risk and associated management measures on the Lower Derwent Valley’s statutory conservation designations should be identified along</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst more detail is provided and the evidence base has been updated the approach remains broadly the same.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		will not be permitted to allow outflow from ground water and/or land drainage to enter public sewers.		with appropriate mitigation measures where necessary. - Should be taking a more positive stance and seek betterment from developers to mitigate against future flood risk.	
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- NPPG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New development shall not be subject to flood risk and shall be designed and constructed in such a way that it mitigates against current and future flood events.</li> <li>- An assessment of flood risk for development proposals on sites over 1 hectare or in flood zone 2, 3a, 3a(i) and 3b is required and in other cases where flood risk is an issue.</li> <li>- Development required to restrict surface water run-off through attenuation as a means to prevent pollution and to avoid adverse impacts on water quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessed as having a significant positive effect on Objective 13 (Flood Risk) and to have a significant positive effect in relation to Objective 10 (Water Efficiency).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Major changes to the presentation of the policy approach following comments by colleagues in Development Management requesting that previous policies are streamlined.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- NPPG</li> </ul>	<p>-Same as above plus The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2015) has been produced and identifies the wider set of policies and strategic plans that need to be considered in the development of any proposals.</p> <p>-Emerging City of York Council Sustainable Drainage Guidance for Developers’</p>	<p>-ENV4 (requiring flood risk assessments depending on flood zone) and ENV5 (requiring development to restrict surface water run-off) have been assessed as having a significant positive effect on Objective 13 (Flood Risk). ENV5 is also considered to have a significant positive effect in relation to Objective 10 (Water Efficiency).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad support for approach to drainage and flood risk.</li> <li>- Environment Agency assume that the modelling used was the current York Detailed Model. Also acknowledge that an updated SFRA is underway and would like to work with the Council on this.</li> <li>- York Central Partnership state that it may be necessary to update the 2013 SFRA given the 2017 update on Flood Risk Maps for Planning.</li> <li>- Several developers ask that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required.</li> <li>- British Sugar PLC argue that the wording in ENV4 needs to make clear that only increases in flood risk arising as a direct result of the development in question will need to be mitigated for.</li> <li>- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust ask that language in ENV2 is strengthened to <i>‘The authority will support applications where SuDS are enhanced for</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ENV5 amended to clarify when applications involving SUDs will be supported in relation to biodiversity.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<i>biodiversity</i> . - YEF and Tremendous comment that there is no mention of mitigation measures in ENV4. Trees and leaky dams can slow the flow on river Ouse, Foss and strategically on Becks within York to reduce flood risk.	

## 25. Policy Topic: Communications Infrastructure

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG8	- Not covered.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPG8	- Not covered.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG8	Within Section 7 (York’s Special Historic and Built Environment), the Preferred Approach is considered to provide the context for policy and guidance on a range of planning matters	- Not referred to	- No comments	- Development Management policy included in the Local Plan (2005) however too detailed for a

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		concerned with design, landscape and the historic environment, including telecommunications equipment, by restating the authority's duty to protect, conserve or enhance all of York's heritage assets and enable the highest quality of design which responds to what is unique and distinct in York.			Core Strategy. Overarching approach set out in relation to design.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	PPG8 -	Within Section 13 (Sustainable Economic Growth) consideration is given to the future growth of the telecommunications industry through Science City York, and how the LDF could explore ways in which the Council could support the start up and growth of facilities for creative and IT / digital sectors.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- Reference to telecommunications removed from the approach to design and the historic environment.
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2013)</li> <li>- Policy approach supports the enhancement of communications infrastructure whilst at the same time seeking to ensure that the visual and environmental impacts are minimised.</li> <li>- Given the special character of York the siting, appearance and visual impact of any telecommunications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not assessed as having a significant positive effect on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- Would have a positive effect on socioeconomic SA objectives through supporting high quality communications infrastructure to improve York's connectivity to wider</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the proposed approach</li> <li>- Support for the approach which seeks to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city.</li> <li>- Removal of old communications infrastructure is supported.</li> <li>- York needs to have a world class communications network to support the Universities and business sector.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed, development management policy now added to reflect production of local plan in accordance with government guidance.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>infrastructure is key</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preference and encouragement to be given to mast and site sharing where this is technically possible. However the cumulative impact of additional infrastructure being added to an existing site will need to be taken into account</li> <li>- Will seek the removal of the visually intrusive masts in the City Centre, such as those masts on the BT Hungate and Cedar Court Hotel buildings as when the opportunity arises.</li> </ul>	<p>markets, widening the workforce catchment area through home-working and enabling access to services and facilities including education and training. Also expected that local policy would help to protect York's built and natural environmental assets from adverse impacts associated with communications infrastructure development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred option was not assessed as having a significant (or minor) negative effect on any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- Planning Practice Guidance 2014.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considered to have minor positive effects on SA Objectives relating to education, employment, equality and land use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach, only minor wording changes are considered necessary to strengthen the policy.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft September 2017</b>	- NPPF - Planning Practice Guidance 2014. Digital Economy Act 2017	- See above.	Policy C1 is considered to have minor positive effects on SA Objectives relating to education, employment, equality and land use.	- Generally supported. - Some suggestions for better connections across the city especially in rural areas. - Some asked for clarity regarding the developer contributions.	- No change in approach, only minor wording changes are considered necessary to strengthen the policy.

## 26. Policy Topic: Approach to Waste and Minerals

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPS10 - MPS1 - MPG6	- Waste Strategy (2001) - Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Autumn 2005)  <u>Waste</u> - Proposed approach to waste includes the following options: - Maximising the potential contribution to waste minimisation, re-use and recycling - Providing sufficient waste sites; - Identifying the location of new facilities and waste policies through locating facilities: 1. wherever possible on previously developed land;	Proposals should help to deliver the following sustainability objectives in relation to the prudent and efficient use of energy, water and other natural Resources and reducing pollution and waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling.  <u>Waste</u> - Construction waste should be kept to a minimum through construction planning, - Could also take an	<u>Waste</u> - Local recycling targets should be stronger and should exceed government targets - Reduction in waste generation supported - The approach to waste should include seeking the reuse of buildings to avoid demolition and consequently reducing the amount of construction waste. - The following should be factors in determining the location of new waste management facilities: flood risk; impact on the green belt; reduction of vehicle trips;	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>2. close to waste arisingsl; 3. in areas that are relatively unconstrained by sensitive environmental or cultural designations.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u> - Proposed approach to Minerals includes the following options: - Proposals for the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of minerals and aggregates will only be permitted where it can be shown that there is a demonstrable need and market demand for the resource - Proposals for the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of minerals and aggregates will only be permitted where it can be shown that there is a national requirement/shortfall for the resource.</p>	<p>approach that the refurbishment of buildings should be prioritised over demolition and redevelopment where practicable in order to save primary resources. - No indication in the document what the need for waste sites will be in the LDF area, and no real options can be drawn up for the location of these facilities. Without more detail on the need it is not possible to say, with any certainty, the effectiveness of policy.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u> - It is hoped that policies on the reuse of construction and demolition wastes should help reduce the demand for primary mineral resources.</p>	<p>whether the site is previously developed land and close to existing facilities; and consideration of the type of waste site proposed. - Should encourage the development of existing waste plants rather than creating new ones.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u> - The level of response to the minerals section was low and no strong message emerged from respondents. - Should actively reduce demand for non-renewable mineral resources by requiring all developments to maximise recycling of building waste and aggregates.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>- PPS10 - MPS1 - MPG6</p>	<p>- ‘Let’s Talk Less Rubbish’, A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (May 2006) - ‘City of York Council – Waste Management Strategy: 2002 – 2020’ (Nov 2002 / Amended Nov 2004)</p>	<p><u>Waste</u> - The options and questions presented under this Issue may not be suitable in determining this Core Strategy issue as choices will depend on the locations available, the needs of a particular waste</p>	<p><u>Waste</u> - Option 1 (avoiding environmentally sensitive areas e.g. SSSI’s), option 2 (where environmental impact would be unacceptable e.g. noise, dust, litter) and option 5 (which would be guided by the type of waste being dealt with</p>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>- Regional Sand and Gravel Study for Yorkshire and the Humber Region</p> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <p>- Options put forward for which factors should be used to direct the approach to identifying future waste sites. As follows:                      Option 1: Environmentally sensitive areas                      Option 2: Environmental impacts                      Option 3: Location in regard to Green Belt                      Option 4: Brownfield land                      Option 5: The waste stream (Option 6: Technology and design of waste facility                      Option 7: Co-location with existing facilities                      Option 8: The total distance from waste generator to new waste facility                      Option 9: Waste transportation modes                      Option 10: Access networks (</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Two options put forward for the approach to the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of sand and gravel as follows:                      Option 1: It can be shown that there is a regional requirement                      Option 2: It can be shown that</p>	<p>stream and partly be dependent on waste management decisions of the Council and others. Finding the Best Practicable Environmental Option will often be the way that suitable locations and technologies for waste management are found and care needs to be taken to be realistic in what this will be in each circumstance based on sound science and precautionary approaches.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Mining mineral resources could have an impact on protection of the natural environment and will impact on land take.                      - Development management policies of the LDF should ensure that reduction in need through re-use and recycling of primary mineral resources and building materials is a priority. Thereby reducing the overall mineral demand in York.                      - Consideration of cumulative impacts on local</p>	<p>e.g. industrial or household) were the most favoured options.                      - Some respondents supported all the options and suggested all should influence future locations.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Extraction based on local demand and need was the favoured option, with priority given to supplying the local market. Other respondents emphasised that which ever option was taken forward control over extraction was vital and extraction should only be permitted where there will be minimal impact on the surrounding area, natural environment and local communities.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>there is both a regional requirement and a demonstrable need and market demand for the resource arising in the York area based on proximity and other local factors (i.e. building rates).</p>	<p>communities should be considered, without inequitably disadvantaging any one community.                      - Overly constraining the supply of local minerals may adversely impact costs to the local building industry.</p>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS10</li> <li>- Waste Strategy for England (2007)</li> <li>- MSP1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (2008)</li> <li>- Let’s Talk Less Rubbish’, A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (May 2006)</li> <li>- ‘City of York Council – Waste Management Strategy: 2002 – 2020’ (Nov 2002 / Amended Nov 2004)</li> <li>- Waste Strategy Refresh for the period 2008-2014 (Executive September 2008).</li> <li>- Regional Sand and Gravel Study for Yorkshire and the Humber Region</li> </ul> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximise the extent to which waste is reduced, reused and recycled, and provide appropriate sites for waste management</li> <li>- To be achieved through:</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The continued screening and scoping of proposals is recommended to assess the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment. As is the continued protection of European Sites through the Appropriate Assessment procedures</li> <li>– Could be reworded to make specific reference to protecting York’s natural environment and open spaces and noise and air quality issues</li> <li>– Reference is made to protecting the historic character and setting of the City when considering proposals but does not set out specifically how this would be controlled or how</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should provide alternative means to landfill to dispose of waste including the promotion of more recycling and the need to make it easier</li> <li>- Should be made clear that waste sites are subject to Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>- Wherever possible waste transfer should avoid the use of the Strategic Road Network.</li> <li>- Approach is significantly lacking in terms of types of waste management facilities required and the requirements for different waste streams.</li> <li>- Pays insufficient attention to commercial and construction and demolition waste.</li> <li>- Should include waste strategies and policies unless they are being addressed in</li> </ul>	<p>- No change in approach</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>1 Supporting and encouraging waste minimisation                      2 Supporting and promoting reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting of waste                      3 Providing adequate household recycling facilities across the city.                      4 Allocating sufficient, appropriate and accessible land within York that is capable of accommodating a range of strategic waste management and treatment facilities, including facilities in relation to the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI).</p> <p><u>Minerals</u>                      - Will seek to safeguard mineral deposits and reduce the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources by encouraging re-use and recycling of construction and demolition waste, whilst contributing to meeting the RSS, Sand and Gravel and Brick Clay Study requirements.</p>	<p>the policy will be implemented to prove these matters have been thoroughly assessed (particularly by developers).                      – Could be re-worded to consider an assessment of the cumulative impact on local communities of these types of operation                      – More detail could be given on the strategic location of waste facilities so that these are delivered through the Allocations DPD in locations that will meet projected waste production and that reduce the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u>                      – Recommended that planning conditions are used to protect the environment and the amenity of communities                      - Should continue screening and scoping of proposals to assess the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment and continued protection of European Sites through the</p>	<p>other DPD's being prepared jointly with other local authorities or separately by the Unitary Authority. Otherwise there would be a need for a more comprehensive policy required by RSS and PPS10.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u>                      - Support for the principle of reducing the dependency on primary extraction.                      - Avoidance of environmental impacts should be the primary requirement.                      - Transfer of minerals should avoid the Strategic Road Network.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>Appropriate Assessment procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The use of the word ‘significant’ is not defined. Queried whether this offers enough protection to locally significant rural landscapes, public open spaces and important historic features.</li> <li>– Could specifically refer to noise pollution.</li> <li>– Could be re-worded to consider an assessment of the cumulative impact on local communities of these types of operation</li> <li>– Potential for new mineral extraction to result in adverse impacts on air quality. The policy should set out the need to take this into account in considering proposals.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS10</li> <li>- Waste Strategy for England (2007)</li> <li>- MSP1</li> <li>- National and Regional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Let’s Talk Less Rubbish: A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (2006)</li> <li>- Waste Management Strategy 2002 – 2020 (2002/amended 2004).</li> <li>- Waste Management Strategy –</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Including further factors for consideration when identifying new location for development enhances the environmental sustainability of this policy.</li> <li>- Reservations about the transportation of waste</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns in relation to construction and demolition waste</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy approach remains the same but more detail is provided, including on the location of any new</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England (June 2003)</p>	<p>refresh for the period 2008 – 2014 (2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Sand and Gravel Study Phase 1 (2001)</li> </ul> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximise the extent to which waste is prevented, reused, recycled and recovered, alongside providing appropriate sites for waste management in accordance with both the sub-regional and local waste management strategies.</li> <li>- Working jointly with North Yorkshire County Council to identify the Waste Private Finance Initiative facilities for residual municipal waste</li> <li>- Safeguarding existing facilities</li> <li>- Identifying through an appropriate Development Plan Document, suitable alternatives for municipal waste</li> <li>- Requiring the integration of facilities for waste prevention, re-use, recycling composting and recovery in association with the planning, construction and occupation of new development for housing, retail and other commercial site</li> <li>- promoting opportunities for on-site management of waste where</li> </ul>	<p>outside of the authority area in terms of environmental impacts suggests that this could be offset through using environmentally friendly vehicles.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The overall emphasis of the policy now follows a more sustainable approach</li> <li>- Welcomes the reference to the spatial principles if considering any mineral extraction.</li> <li>- Overall, the changes to the policy are positive in terms of sustainability.</li> <li>- Noted that there is a lack of evidence base with regards to specific Minerals in York aside from Coalbed Methane.</li> <li>- Currently no information regarding apportionments for the authority as this information is only dealt with at the Yorkshire and Humber level. In taking this policy forward more information will be needed as to the likely potential for extraction.</li> <li>- Issues regarding the</li> </ul>		<p>facilities and what factors will need to be considered for these. It also details the type of processes which will be employed to treat waste in the waste hierarchy. More detail is also provided on the factors to be considered for any new developments to include the natural environment and openspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- References to new waste locations being allocated in the Allocations DPD have been removed</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>it arises at retail, industrial and commercial locations, particularly in the main urban area.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources and safeguard mineral deposits.</li> <li>- minimising the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources in major developments by requiring developers to demonstrate good practice in the use, reuse, recycling and disposal of construction materials;</li> <li>- Safeguarding sand and gravel and coalbed methane mineral resources, through ensuring other forms of development do not prejudice future mineral extraction;</li> <li>- If a proven need exists, identifying sites of sufficient quality for mineral extraction, inline with agreed apportionments and guidelines, through an appropriate DPD.</li> </ul>	<p>cumulative impact of mineral extraction has not been covered. However, the policy aims to reduce the impact of extraction overall and it is acknowledged that the cumulative impact will be influenced by the scale and location of any proposed extraction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusion of air quality matters have not been included within the revised policy but this issue has been superseded by the inclusion of the Air Quality Policy.</li> </ul>		<p>but issues will be taken forward in a Waste DPD to be prepared.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>– National and regional guidelines for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A detailed range of evidence base documents informed the preferred approach.</li> <li>- Joint Waste and Minerals Plan being prepared that will provide a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect on the majority of the SA objectives although no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several responses objecting to the proposed waste treatment facility at Allerton Park. Incineration is unsustainable, and expensive, Localised management of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed considerations now to be covered in a Joint Waste and Minerals</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 (2009).</p>	<p>mechanism for formally addressing strategic crossboundary issues and will also contain detailed policies for waste and minerals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is not appropriate to duplicate these policies in the Local Plan but necessary to provide the strategic context for these policies.</li> <li>- Sustainable waste management will be promoted by encouraging waste prevention, reuse, recycling, composting and energy recovery in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy and effectively managing all of York's waste streams and their associated waste arisings.</li> <li>- Mineral resources will be safeguarded, the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources will be reduced by encouraging re-use and recycling of construction and demolition waste and any new provision of mineral resource will be carefully controlled.</li> </ul>	<p>effects were considered to be significant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred approach was considered to perform better than the reasonable alternatives identified and assessed</li> </ul>	<p>recycling and disposal is likely to create more jobs and still be cheaper than Allerton Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More detailed needed on approach.</li> <li>- Policy should deal with Shale Gas/Fracking. Should say no fracking in York.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role of York Local Plan to provide strategic context for this Joint Plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above</li> <li>- Waste Management Plan for England. December</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above with minor wording changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessed as broadly positive, particular in relation to reducing waste generation and encouraging recycling and minimising the volume of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reflect updated information and as points of clarification.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	2013 - Planning Practice Guidance for Onshore Oil and Gas. July 2013 - NPPG		waste arisings which are sent to landfill with resulting positive effects on health. - No significant or minor negative effects were identified.		
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	- NPPF - National Waste Planning Policy 2014. - Planning Practice Guidance for Onshore Oil and Gas. July 2013 - NPPG	- Up to date Local Aggregates Assessment. - Yorkshire and Humber Waste Position Paper 2016. - The Minerals and Waste Joint Plan being produced by CYC in partnership with North Yorkshire County Council and North York Moors is being examined in February-March 2018.	-Effects associated with both policies WM1 and WM2 have been assessed as broadly positive. Reducing waste generation, encouraging recycling and minimising the volume of waste which is sent to landfill results in positive effects on health. - Measures that define potential locations for waste or mineral sites will help to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the health of the local population, features of biodiversity interest/value or upon the setting of York’s built and natural environment. -No significant or minor negative effects were identified during the appraisal of the Waste and Minerals Policies.	-Broadly supported. - Rachael Maskell MP states that sites should be refused to any company planning to frack for shale gas. -Green Party consider WM1 should include requirement for new commercial developments / food premises to include separate recycling and food waste collection as well as waste storage facilities. Also believe WM2 should make reference to ensuring mineral exploitation takes full account of residential amenity and the unique heritage of York.	No major change to policy approach.  WM2 amended to clarify that opportunities for on-site recycling of waste at retail, industrial and commercial locations. A policy cross reference added.

## 27. Policy Topic: Transport

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- PPG23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2) identified congestion as a key concern.</li> <li>- A number of measures suggested to help reduce car usage which including demand management, public transport, walking and cycling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing a 'connected' LDF area in terms of public transport accessibility is one of the key ways in which it can have a positive impact on achieving more sustainable development.</li> <li>- With all new high trip generating development of this type it is vital that public transport accessibility, walking and cycling is taken into account from the outset</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A key issue in determining location is the need to locate housing in areas with good transport links and access to employment, services and facilities.</li> <li>- Employment locations should reduce the need to travel and reduce dependence on the car.</li> <li>- The Core Strategy should recognise that some visitors will always choose to arrive by car.</li> <li>- Many respondents suggested that we need a bus station close to the train Station and Park and ride schemes need strengthening.</li> <li>- The document should ultimately reflect the Regional Transport Strategy</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- PPG23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes more detail on the measures within City of York Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2)</li> <li>- Consideration of issues emerging since the publication of LTP2 e.g. Tram-Train scheme, Dualling the A1237 York outer ring road.</li> <li>- Lists eight options for reducing the impacts of traffic including using those measures in the Local Transport Plan that can be delivered through the LDF, include the Tram-Train proposal being investigated for the Leeds, Harrogate, Knaresborough, York line and identifying additional opportunities to improve rail facilities above the Haxby proposal set out in the Local Transport Plan 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Influence over achieving sustainable development through changing travel patterns, both through controlling the demand for travel and the distance travelled, by providing for peoples’ needs as locally as possible. The other factor of importance is reducing car use through encouraging people to use more sustainable modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to non-car transport modes suggested as a factor for considering the location of new development.</li> <li>- Access to public transport should feature more heavily in the Spatial Strategy.</li> <li>- General support for increasing use of public transport as an alternative to the car.</li> <li>- There was some support for investigating the Tram-Train proposal and generally improving rail facilities and better use of the rivers as a transport route were suggested.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar, but with more emphasis on regional influences rather than national policy. Contains more information on the interdependency between LDF and LTP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- Successive Government White Papers. All to encourage the most sustainable forms of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Themes for Transport Planning cover tackling congestion, Improving accessibility for all, safety, improving air quality, improving quality of life and supporting the local economy</li> <li>- the approach to transport will enable appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A gap in the LDFs objectives included the need to reduce travel through the location of development, in addition to ensuring public transport is a viable alternative to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport infrastructure should be one of the main drivers of the spatial strategy and not retro-fitted.</li> <li>- Good provision of public transport was a regular comment.</li> <li>- The public should be able to walk to key services and have</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy direction is broadly the same, with policies regarding minimising travel and traffic generation, promoting sustainable</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	transport and discourage the least sustainable.	development to take place that not only widens transport choice, particularly for the more sustainable forms of transport such as public transport including buses, walking and cycling, thereby reducing the use of the private car and improving access to services and facilities, but also, minimises the need to travel.	car use. - Plans for a shift in travel patterns to more sustainable methods of transport together with an integrated network which reduces the need for car transport.	access to frequent public transport routes. - The strategy should encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport as well as improving access to services. - The approach should support proposals to improve highway or transport infrastructure in association with development proposals which have not been anticipated within LTP2.	transport and reduce pollution and noise created by vehicles.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPG13 - Successive Government White Papers. All to encourage the most sustainable forms of transport and discourage the least sustainable.	- Approach is to address the City’s transport issues and deliver transport infrastructure and measures which ensure sustainable growth and development - The revised has been restructured into 5 separate streams. The first is location of development. The second structures the phasing of strategic infrastructure improvements, similarly to the previous policy, but groups each aspect under the timescale rather than in transport modes. The third section sets out the Council’s intention for behavioural change delivered through a range of interventions. The	- In terms of improving and mitigating traffic congestion an overarching theme for York needed to become more sustainable through the use of different transport modes. - Development across York for housing and employment purposes was seen to increase the need for alternative modes of transport to the car to reduce the amount of overall trips.	- In order to have a public transport system which adequately supports development, a fundamental re-envisaging of the city’s transport system should be undertaken which would ultimately result in the City’s core being car free. - The rivers should be used more as strategic transport links. - Many respondents stressed the importance of investment in transport infrastructure limited support was given to the general approach of this chapter. Several respondents expressed concern about the ability of the strategic road network, particularly the outer	- No change in general approach.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>fourth area concentrates on residential amenity and possible outcomes as well as referring to the role of the City Centre Area Action Plan. Section five relates to the Strategic Allocations and Future Areas of Search for Urban Extensions setting out the overall requirements for these sites should they come forward for development.</p>		<p>ring road, to facilitate economic well being.                      - Concern was expressed to the lack of consideration of the existing capacity and constraints of the Outer Ring Road on the feasibility of the growth rates assumed in the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed key evidence base informs the approach to deliver a fundamental shift in travel patterns through promoting sustainable connectivity through ensuring that new development is located with good access to high quality public transport and to the strategic cycling and walking network. The need to travel will be reduced by ensuring that new development is located with good access to services.</li> <li>- New stations will be provided at Haxby and potentially Strensall; and</li> <li>- Infrastructure will be provided to support sustainable travel; including the provision of safe new cycle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a significant positive effect on transport (SA Objective 6) and climate change (SA Objective 7). Positive effects were also identified across the majority of the SA objectives which seek a re-balancing of the modal split by encouraging public transport, cycling and walking, discouraging car-based travel and increase accessibility. It is recommended that transport policy includes mitigation to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of responses related to the A1237 outer ring road.</li> <li>- Whilst there was some support for the expansion and improvements of Park &amp; Ride facilities at Designer Outlet there was also some opposition to this, with extending its hours of operation suggested as an alternative.</li> <li>- Opposition and support to new rail stations at Haxby and Strensall.</li> <li>- Opposition to the joining of Manor Lane / Hurricane Way, as it would be detrimental to the quality of life for residents in the vicinity, being heavily used as a rat-run.</li> <li>- There is a need for a central</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The section now has extra policies to reflect the strategic nature of the plan and the importance of the rail network in York.</li> <li>- The general approach is broadly the same.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>and walking routes as part of a complete city wide network, high quality well located bus stops and secure cycle parking facilities, new rail and park and ride facilities.</p>	<p>address the uncertainties with regard to conserving the natural environment, using land resources efficiently and the potential for adverse impacts on the historic environment and the natural and built heritage.</p>	<p>bus (and coach) station at or near to York Railway station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should make considerably more off-road cycling provision between the outlying towns and the centre.</li> <li>- Objection to a reduction in the provision of long stay parking in the city centre because it will have a detrimental impact on trade and visitor numbers.</li> <li>- The thresholds for what is classed as a major development differ from those set out in the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessments.</li> <li>- There is no evidence to date to indicate that measure in place or proposed will reduce air pollution levels to within health based legal limits.</li> <li>- The proposal to extend the footstreets to include Fossgate makes no reference to consultation or working with the businesses and residents.</li> <li>- The whole of the city centre should be a 20mph limit and one-way systems returned to two way, where possible to naturally calm vehicles and make city centre streets less attractive as a vehicular short-</li> </ul>	



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				cut.	
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	- NPPF	- Largely as above albeit however amendments have been made to the projects listed to take account of the most up to date position.	- Positive direct and in-direct effects on health, employment, equality, greenhouse gas emissions and air quality. - Policies T1-T3 and T5 are considered to have significant positive effect upon SA Objective 6 (Travel).	- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.	No changes to overall approach.
<b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b>	- NPPF	- City of York Transport Topic Paper, September 2017. - City of York Council’s Strategic Cycle Route Network Evaluation and Prioritisation Methodology. - ‘Sustainable Transport for Development’ SPD that combines several separate but associated SPDs is referred to in the explanatory text. - For brevity, the explanatory text to some policies has been shortened and corresponding reference to the Sustainable Transport for Development SPD has been made.	-Policies T1-T3 and T5 promote sustainable access through considering the location and layout of new development and as such are considered to have significant positive effect upon SA Objective 6 (Travel). - T7 (Demand Management) and T8 (Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips) will	-Broad support for cycle path provision, especially for outlying villages where routes could be segregated from the road. - Broad support for public transport policies. - Many comments about outer ring road, most asking for it to be dualled before further development in York commences. - Highways England warns of the impact many strategic sites will have on the A64 and that local roads will require investment in highway	Minor changes in response to representations received, changes also made to allow flexibility depending on characteristics of sites.  Sub clauses and policy related to York Station expansion, University expansion and Transport Services amended to reflect

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amendments have been made to the projects listed to take account of the most up to date position.</li> <li>- More cross-referencing to the City of York Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2031.</li> <li>- Updated annual rail passenger flow data for York Station</li> <li>- 2016 Budget announcement regarding HS3 (or Northern Powerhouse Rail)</li> <li>- Order of sub-clauses in Policy T6 reversed.</li> <li>- Policy T7 and T8 reversed.</li> <li>- Alternative fuel fuelling stations added to Policy T9.</li> </ul>	<p>have positive direct and in-direct effects on health, employment, equality, greenhouse gas emissions and air quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-T9 (management of freight and delivery vehicles, support for alternative fuelling stations) is recorded as having positive effects on Objective 4 (employment), 6 (travel), and 7 (greenhouse gas emissions).</li> <li>- T4 (Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements) could result in an increase in vehicle use so this may have a negative impact on objective 6 (travel), air quality, land use and greenhouse gas emissions.</li> </ul>	<p>infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required and that the timings of junction upgrades in T4 need further explanation.</li> <li>- Broad support for rail station at Haxby but a few disagreements about exact location, many concerns about parking provision should it happen.</li> <li>- Several developers state that T1 as drafted lacks the flexibility suggested in para 14.10. It may be a bus enhancement scheme can become viable over a shorter period.</li> <li>- A few developers asking for clarification on CIL contributions and how long requirements to provide public transport last.</li> <li>- A few comments asking for electric vehicle charging points to be made mandatory in new developments.</li> <li>- Network Rail requested diagram in T3 be updated.</li> <li>- One respondent asked that the range of alternative fuel options in T9 be widened.</li> </ul>	<p>latest developments.</p> <p>Sub clause added to T2 to safeguard the long-term operation of the Designer Outlet Park &amp; Ride facility in the event that the lease is terminated prior to its expiry date (2026 with possible 3yr extension to 2029).</p> <p>Cross-references added.</p> <p>Figure 14.1 (in Explanation to Policy T3) amended to <del>remove new rail chord</del></p> <p>T9 amended to cover wider range of alternative fuels</p>

## 28. Policy Topic: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act	- Increasing tree cover as part of new development through section 106 contributions for tree planting, and protecting existing tree cover by increasing the number of Tree Preservation Orders in the City and surrounding area.	- N/A	- One respondent was concerned that financial contributions required from developers will inhibit the provision of student housing.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- N/A	- N/A	- N/A	- Suitable contributions will also be needed to ensure local services are not overstretched by new development.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS12 - Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act	- New development will be supported by appropriate physical, social and economic infrastructure provision. - The Council will work with infrastructure providers and other delivery agencies to determine the appropriate level of provision and will seek contributions from developers to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support development. - Prepare a Supplementary Planning Document which will set out the mechanism through	- It would be worth also including information on how the Council will work to address existing needs or gaps of infrastructure delivery across the authority within this policy.	- The Core Strategy should have an overarching policy on developer contributions and infrastructure provision, with the detail set out in an SPD. - This should be prepared in consultation with developers and test the various mechanisms for typical development scenarios to ensure that they meet circular 05/05. - CIL may result in developers not bringing land forward until the levy is	- No change in approach. The Local Plan 2005 also sought infrastructure and developer contributions through the development process.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>which developer contributions will be sought. This could include the use of planning obligations, tariffs, standard charges or a Levy.</p>		<p>removed or infrastructure has already been paid for by other developments.                      - CIL is not a suitable method to recover drainage and flood risk contributions.                      Infrastructure providers are unlikely to fund infrastructure for development if they may not recover full costs for 15-20 years                      - The approach should combine CIL with the continued use of planning Obligations. This would meet concerns about mitigating impacts in the immediate locality of the development and retain the flexibility to negotiate obligations regarding specific sites.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS12</li> <li>- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To deliver sustainable growth by ensuring that all development is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure provision.</li> <li>- The Council will prepare a further planning document which will set out the mechanism through which developer contributions will be sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The recommendation to address gaps in infrastructure should be progressed alongside any development. However, this issue is not fully addressed.</li> <li>- The SPD to be prepared to give more detail for this policy should include further</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many other respondents felt that approach is not founded on a sufficiently robust and credible evidence base as it is not considered to be based on a sound Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as the IDP does not demonstrate whether a viability assessment has been undertaken or if developers/funding sources can finance infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy is stronger and more comprehensive in prescribing what is expected of developers..</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>information with regards to redressing any gaps which exist in provision.</p>	<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is considered unreasonable by some respondents to expect developers to contribute to strategic infrastructure if likely costs are not established. It was also suggested that a site size or dwelling threshold for which contributions for off site infrastructure should be included, alongside a schedule of costs.</li> <li>- Several respondents suggested that specific types of infrastructure should be added to the list, such as sports facilities and the Strategic Road Network.</li> <li>- General comments include the need to include reference to emerging national biodiversity offsetting pilots as an alternative method to Section 106 and the need to plan for a transition to an economy that is not reliant on fossil fuels, including a city wide approach to renewable energy.</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act</li> <li>- Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008</li> <li>- Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is critical that new development is supported by appropriate infrastructure to ensure the creation of sustainable communities. A key element of delivery will be to ensure that the infrastructure needed to support development is provided and funded.</li> <li>- Infrastructure will be funded from a mix of sources including Council budgets, national Government funding, funding from other public bodies and agencies, as well as developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an expectation that the approach would generate significant levels of funding toward delivering the strategic infrastructure necessary to support growth and that this infrastructure would be in place prior to development. This would deliver benefits in respect of social, the economy and the environment</li> <li>- There are high costs implications to delivering transport infrastructure that is critical to enabling the development to be viable and deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should make specific reference to developers being required to provide contributions towards new flood alleviation schemes, the long term maintenance of existing defences and habitat creation through CIL.</li> <li>- Should ensure that a significant proportion of funds raised by S106 obligations and CIL are used to benefit community facilities in the local areas affected by development.</li> <li>- Policy IDC1 should be amended to refer to phasing.</li> <li>- Concern that Policy IDC1 makes no reference to viability considerations in setting out the requirement for infrastructure and developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The primary thrust of the policy and section remain the same however small changes have been made to take into account changes in CIL regulations.</li> </ul>
<b>Aborted Local Plan Publication Draft - September 2014</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above with minor wording changed to provide greater clarification of the type of infrastructure that the Council will seek contributions from developers for and when the contributions will be required, in order to support development in York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides the necessary policy context to secure infrastructure provision which will assist the Local Plan in securing sustainable development in accordance with the vision and outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A motion was submitted to Full Council in October 2014, which halted proceeding to the Publication Draft consultation whilst further work was undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In response to consultation responses received.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>which underpin the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considered to have a minor positive against most of the SA Objectives.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Local Plan Pre-publication Draft – September 2017</b></p>	<p>-As above (with revisions to Community Infrastructure Regulations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction to section amended to reflect new/revised/updated strategies and plans etc., that shape the Plan.</li> <li>- More detail included on the impacts of future development on traffic growth and travel delays to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.</li> <li>- Other minor changes</li> </ul>	<p>Policy DM1 provides the necessary policy context to secure infrastructure provision which will assist the Local Plan in securing sustainable development in accordance with the vision and outcomes which underpin the Local Plan and will assist in delivering growth across the City whilst meeting the needs of its existing and increasing population. Accordingly Policy DM1 is considered to have a minor positive effect against most of the SA Objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highways England states that DM1 needs to include an additional reference to the need for developers to contribute to mitigation schemes on the A64.</li> <li>- Rappleys LLP and Johnson Mowatt stress that the Council must ensure policy DM1 is in accordance with the NPPF.</li> <li>- CPRE North Yorkshire advocate that an additional paragraph should be included in DM1 setting out that any developer wishing to opt out of payment should be required to provide an open book audit as set out in Policy H10 dealing with affordable housing provision.</li> <li>- Johnson Mowatt notes that the Plan identifies approximately 30 policies where 'developer contributions' are referenced in the supporting 'delivery text'. Adding that it must be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting text has been amended to provide more detail on the strategic infrastructure considered to be essential.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				acknowledged they are all potentially making demands of development on matter that in the main would be covered by CIL.	



## Appendix K : Part 2 - Strategic Site Audit Trail

The Strategic Sites audit trail provides an understanding of the evolution of Strategic sites that have been identified as reasonable through the site selection process and considered for potential allocation in the Local Plan. This audit trail sets out an account at each stage of the plan making process, where applicable.

### Strategic Sites Audit Trail

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>ST1: British Sugar</b>	<p>Site ref: 295. (Amalgamated site comprising of site refs 126 and 196)</p> <p>Size Analysed: 36.65 ha</p> <p>Through the Site Selection Process the openspace on site was removed from the boundary taken forward for consideration.</p>	<p>Site ref: 295</p> <p>Allocated for Residential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35.65 hectares</li> <li>Suburban area, Acomb Ward</li> <li>998 dwellings phased across the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 in the trajectory).</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 295</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site boundary: 40.7ha</li> <li>existing openspace: 5.2ha</li> </ul> <p>The proposed allocation boundary was extended to include the whole of the former Manor School site (previously just the building footprint was included) as well as openspace associated with the former British Sugar Site (not included in developable area)</p>	<p>Site ref: 295</p> <p>The site amended at FSC has been taken forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40.7 hectares</li> <li>1140 dwellings</li> <li>735 dwellings in plan period</li> <li>Year 3 to year 14 in the trajectory</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for residential development within the plan period. Indicative strategic greenspace is shown around the SINC site 203, in accordance with policy GI6.</p>	<p>Site ref: 295</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40.7ha</li> <li>1140 dwellings</li> <li>805 in plan period based on a year 5 start date</li> </ul> <p>The boundary and total estimated site yield remain unchanged although there was some re-assessment of the yield within the plan period (2012- 2032) based on the likely time before construction will commence due to remediation works required. This meant that the estimated of 805 dwellings will be provided within the plan period to 2032 based on a year 5 start date.</p> <p>The site is confirmed to be available and with a willing landowner.</p>	<p>Site ref: 295</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>46.3 hectares</li> <li>1,200 dwellings</li> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 -16)</li> </ul> <p>Minor change is made to the overall quantum of the British Sugar portion of the site from 1140 at PSC to 1100 to reflect the latest planning application. The remaining 3.6ha on Manor School is being brought forward by CYC through the HCA Strategic Partnership and could deliver up to 100 dwellings. Potential redistribution of openspace so now incorporated into boundary.</p>	<p>Allocated Site ref: 295</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>46.3 hectares</li> <li>1,200 dwellings</li> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 -16)</li> </ul> <p>No change to Pre Publication draft Consultation (2017).</p>	No reasonable boundary alternatives
<b>ST2: Former Sports Ground at Millfield Lane</b>	<p>Site ref: 321</p> <p>Size Analysed: 11ha</p>	<p>Site ref: 321</p> <p>Allocated for Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 hectares</li> <li>Suburban area, Acomb Ward</li> <li>308 dwellings to be developed within the short to medium term</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 321</p> <p>Boundary change to include an additional parcel of land to the west of the boundary (site 733) and also exclude an area at the southern end of the site (West View Close) as this was</p>	<p>Site ref: 910</p> <p>The site taken forward has removed the site to the south with Planning permission. The boundary reference change reflects the removal of Westview Close but also excluded the proposed new parcel</p>	<p>Site ref: 910</p> <p>The boundary remains as included at the now aborted Local Plan Publication draft (2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.43 hectares</li> <li>292 dwellings</li> </ul> <p>Changes in dwellings numbers reflect updated</p>	<p>Site ref: 910</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.4 hectares</li> <li>266 dwellings</li> <li>Short to medium term (years 1 – 10)</li> </ul> <p>Minor change is made to the overall quantum of the site from 292 dwellings at PSC to</p>	<p>Site ref: 910</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.4 hectares</li> <li>266 dwellings</li> <li>Short to medium term (years 1 – 10)</li> </ul>	No reasonable alternatives

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
		(years 1-10 of the trajectory)	granted planning permission.	on the western edge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 hectares</li> <li>• 289 dwellings</li> <li>• Year 2 to year 6 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for residential development within the plan period. Indicative strategic greenspace is shown per latest masterplan discussions and in order to reflect the sites rural adjacency and former sports use.	density assumptions.	266 dwellings to reflect the latest planning application..	No change from Pre Publication draft Consultation (2017).	
<b>ST3: The Grainstores</b>	Site ref: 45  Size Analysed: 7.73 hectares	Site ref: 45  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.73 hectares</li> <li>• Suburban area. Skelton, Rawcliffe and Clifton Without Ward</li> <li>• 216 dwellings to be developed in the short term (years 1-5 in the trajectory).</li> </ul>	Site ref: 45  No change	Site ref: 45  The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.73 hectares</li> <li>• 197 number of dwellings</li> <li>• Years 2 to year 5 in the trajectory</li> </ul>	N/a  Site gained planning permission (11/00860/FULM).  Site now included permissions section of trajectory	n/a  Site gained planning permission (11/00860/FULM).  Site now included permissions section of trajectory	n/a  Site included within planning permissions in housing trajectory.  Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.	No reasonable boundary alternatives.
<b>ST4: Land adjacent Hull Road/ Grimston Bar</b>	Site ref: 35  Size Analysed: 7.54 hectares	Site ref: 35  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.54 hectares</li> <li>• Suburban area. Heslington Ward</li> <li>• 211 dwellings to be developed within the short to medium term (years 1-10 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 35  No change	Site ref: 35  The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.54 hectares</li> <li>• 230 number of dwellings</li> <li>• Years 1 to year 10 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It was proposed that land identified on the	Site ref: 35  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.54 hectares</li> <li>• 211 dwellings</li> </ul> The site boundary remains unchanged from the now aborted Local Plan Publication draft (2014). The site is confirmed available with a willing landowner and developer.	Site ref: 35  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.54 hectares</li> <li>• 211 dwellings</li> </ul> No change to PSC boundary (7.54ha) or quantum (211 dwellings).	Allocated Site ref: 35  Allocated for housing  No change to Pre Publication Consultation (2017).	No reasonable boundary alternatives

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
				proposals may be allocated for residential development within the plan period.				
<b>ST5: York Central</b>	Site ref: 293  Size Analysed: 37 hectares	Site ref: 293  Allocated for Mixed Use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60 hectares (gross) / 37 ha (net)</li> <li>• City Centre/City Centre Extension area. Holgate Ward</li> <li>• Mixed use site incorporating:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 438 dwellings (7.3 hectares) to be developed within the medium to long term (years 6-15 of the trajectory);</li> <li>○ 80,000 sq.m B1a Office floorspace;</li> <li>○ Culture, leisure, tourism and niche/ancillary retail facilities; and</li> <li>○ Openspace, high quality public realm and supporting social infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	No change	Site ref: 293  The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 37 hectares</li> <li>• 410 dwellings within the plan period</li> <li>• Year 6 to 15 in the trajectory</li> </ul> The site was included with the Publication Draft Local Plan as a key area of opportunity and allocated for 410 residential dwellings within the plan period (to 2031) with up to 80,000 sqm (gross) of office led commercial development based on the limited capacity of existing infrastructure. Therefore, development of only part of the site was possible within the plan period with the remainder to follow post plan period (2032 onwards).	Site ref: 293  Allocation is for both residential and office led commercial space (B1a). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 72 hectares (net developable area of 35 hectares)</li> <li>• 1,500 dwellings (1,250 within plan period)</li> <li>• 80,000 sqm B1a floorspace</li> </ul> The site quantum was adjusted following working with key partners including Network Rail. The Council made significant progress from 2014 to progress and de-risk the project, through identification of public funding routes to deliver key enabling infrastructure, increase site capacity and accelerate development. The figure of 1,500 dwellings has been assumed at this stage in the plan period to reflect complexity of delivery. The site will include a range of uses including offices, residential, cultural, leisure, tourism and niche/ancillary retail (subject to sequential and impact tests), open space, public realm, social infrastructure, rail use and car parking.	Site ref: 906  Mixed use allocation both housing and employment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 hectares</li> <li>• 1,500 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of the plan and post-plan period (Years 1-21)</li> <li>• 60,000 sqm B1a floorspace</li> </ul> Officers considered that the site could be included as a mixed use site with a residential element of 1500 dwellings within the post plan period as per PSC (2016) with 1250 dwellings within the plan period to 2032/33. Work is continuing to progress the masterplanning of the site to be reflected as the Local Plan progresses towards Publication stage and reflected in future iterations of the plan.	Allocated Site ref: 989  Site allocated for mixed use housing and employment (ST5): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 ha</li> <li>• 1700-2500 homes</li> <li>• 100,000 sqm of B1a floorspace</li> </ul> Further work undertaken by the York Central Partnership confirms that 1700 homes can be built within the plan period with up to 2,500 homes over the lifetime of the plan depending on land ownership, release of land from functional use and masterplanning. This was accepted by Members as a change at Executive in January 2018.  The revised site boundary reflects the entirety of the York Central area with aspirations for development, including land outside of the YBP	Reasonable alternative boundary:  987 – Developer alternative (reflects the York Central Partnership)

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
							control.	
<b>ST6: Land East of Grimston Bar</b>	Site ref: 181  Size Analysed: 34.16 hectares  Through the Site Selection Process this parcel was reduced to 23 hectares within criteria 1-4. Technical Officer Group further reduced this parcel to 5.5 hectares to avoid concerns relating to access, landscape and heritage issues.	Site ref: 181  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.5 hectares</li> <li>• Suburban area. Osbaldwick Ward</li> <li>• 154 dwellings to be developed within the short to medium term (years 1-10 of the trajectory)</li> </ul> Reduced site boundary reflected Technical Officer Group concerns regarding the historic environment and landscape and setting.	Site ref: 181  The FSC documented that the sites larger boundary was resubmitted for consideration through the Preferred Options Consultation. The recommendation was to have no change to the Preferred Options Boundary. This reflected concerns relating to the landscape impacts of a larger site boundary.	Site ref: 181  Two larger boundaries were re-submitted through the Further sites consultation of 19 ha and 25 ha for a combination of residential and employment uses. This was accompanied with evidence. Following technical officer consideration following the Further Sites Consultation it was proposed in the Publication Draft Local Plan (2014) that the land should be safeguarded for development beyond the plan period. The site was proposed as Safeguarded Land (SF13) due to concerns relating to the residential use of the site and its potential impact on the landscape setting.	Site ref: 847  Allocated for light industrial/storage and distribution (B1c/B2/B8). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.5 hectares</li> <li>• 20,000 sqm</li> </ul> Following further consideration by technical officers regarding proposed use of the site, it was consulted on for employment use subject to overcoming landscape and potential access constraints.  The revised boundary reference number reflects the identified allocation boundary consulted on at this stage.	Allocation removed.  Technical Officers identified that access to this site was a showstopper to development. The allocation was considered no longer suitable for development and discounted from being taken forward at this stage.	Not allocated	No reasonable alternative – access technical showstopper
<b>ST7: Land to East of Metcalfe Lane</b>	Site ref: 699  (amalgamated parcel comprising sites: 15,36, 90, 104, 117, 142, 143, 156, 209, 288, 309 323, 324, 325, 630, 693,721, 722)  Size Analysed: 114.44 hectares	Site ref: 699  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60 hectares</li> <li>• Extension to the Urban Area. Osbaldwick Ward</li> <li>• 1800 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 699  A revised boundary was presented showing additional land to the north and south of the Preferred Options draft allocation boundary and additional strategic green space. It was recommended to revise the boundary to reflect the need for appropriate greenspace to provide a setting to	Site ref: 699  The site taken forward is as per the Further Sites Consultation stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 113.28 hectares</li> <li>• 1800 number of dwellings (of which 1205 would be delivered in the plan period)</li> <li>• Year 4 to year 16 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It was proposed that land identified in the proposals map be allocated for	Site ref: 850  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34.5 hectares</li> <li>• 845 dwellings (805 within plan period)</li> </ul> Following further technical work relating to historic character and setting, greenbelt purposes and assessing concerns raised through the previous Local Plan consultations site 699 is no longer considered reasonable. The site area submitted was reduced to 34.5ha (site 850) with a total	Site ref: 850  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34.5 hectares</li> <li>• 845 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> No change to Preferred Sites Consultation position.  Following PSC (2016) Officers identified an alternative boundary to increase to the overall site size from 34.5ha (845 dwellings) to 44ha (975 dwellings) (site 911) could be	Allocated Site ref: 850  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34.5 hectares</li> <li>• 845 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> No Change to the Pre Publication draft Local Plan position.  Following Pre publication consultation and	Reasonable boundary alternative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>986 – reasonable alternative</li> <li>981 – developer reasonable alternative (for 1225 homes).</li> </ul>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	Through the site selection process this site was reduced to remove areas identified as flood zone 3a. Technical Officer Group further reduced the site to remove land to the south of the railway to preserve the setting of Osbaldwick Conservation Area and land adjoining Malton Road.		Osbaldwick village and create a green wedge as well as ensure appropriate options for highways access.	residential development within the plan period	estimated site capacity of 845 dwellings of which approximately 800 could be delivered within the plan period. The site has been pulled away from the existing urban edge of Heworth Without, Meadlands and Osbaldwick to create a separate new settlement or 'garden village'. The eastern edge of the site has also been pulled further away from the A64 in order to protect key views of the Minster.  A revised site boundary was also identified post Preferred Site Consultation for the site (site 911).	made on the basis of the technical evidence submitted. This reflected developers/landowners concerns raised regarding the viability/deliverability of the PSC site, the ability to deliver the proposed planning principles including provision of educational and community facilities and concerns over the provision of site access to the south of the site.	consideration of technical evidence, officers identified site 986 as an alternative boundary. Alternative boundaries were also submitted by the landowners/developer. (site 981). This site was not taken forward by Members at Executive in January 2018.	

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>ST8: Land North of Monks Cross</b>	Site ref: 329  (amalgamated site comprising of sites: 14, 118, 191, 195, 204, 277)  Size Analysed: 75.14 hectares  Through the Site Selection Process, the Sinc Site to the North was removed. Technical Officer Group further reduced this site to the north to mitigate landscape concerns and land to the south was considered separately for employment use (ST18). The remaining parcel was 52.3 ha.	Site ref: 329  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>52.3 hectares</li> <li>Extension to the Urban Area. Huntington Ward</li> <li>1569 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	Site 329  No Change to Preferred Options stage.	Site 329  The site taken forward was as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>52.58 hectares</li> <li>1,400 number of dwellings (of which 1,200 to be built in the plan period)</li> <li>Year 4 to year 16 in the trajectory</li> </ul> The site was identified on the proposals map to be allocated for residential purposes within the plan period, with an associated area of Strategic Greenspace to the east delivered over the same period to mitigate landscape and greenbelt impacts arising from development, and accommodate green and blue infrastructure associated with the site.  ST18 to the south of the site was also a proposed employment allocation for 8ha/ 64,000 sqm B1a (office) development.	Site ref: 849  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>39.5 hectares (13.8ha openspace)</li> <li>968 dwellings (875 in plan period)</li> </ul> Following further consideration by technical officers it was proposed that the housing and employment allocation (ST18) be merged into one site to be taken forward solely for residential use. The overall site area and housing number was reduced to 39.5ha and 968 respectively. An area of 13.8ha was also proposed for strategic greenspace between the western boundary of the site and the existing built edge of Huntington Village. Following consideration of greenbelt purposes, the boundary was amended to also not extend northwards of North Lane on the northern boundary.  Through consultation, developers/ landowners submitted larger boundaries for consideration (905, 913 and 914).	Site ref: 849  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>39.5 hectares</li> <li>968 dwellings</li> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> Developers submitted a larger site boundary for consideration during consultation. Officers considered that no change should be made to the site allocation boundary or the overall quantum of development (968 dwellings) and that it remains as per PSC (2016). However, additional open space and ecological mitigation was included on land to the east of the Link Road submitted as part of the Preferred Sites consultation response from landowners/ developers. This land was accepted and remained in the greenbelt providing that open space provision was still be provided to the required quantum within the allocation boundary and that Monks Cross Link Road would need to be reduced in speed through traffic calming measures and provision of pedestrian footways and safe crossing points.	Allocated Site ref: 849  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>39.5 hectares</li> <li>968 dwellings</li> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017).  Developers/landowners submitted a slightly larger boundary from officers consideration through the Preferred Sites Consultation to include land more land on the eastern edge of the site. Officers considered that no change should be made to the previously consulted on boundary.	Reasonable boundary alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>905 – Developer alternative boundary</li> <li>913 – developer alternative boundary</li> <li>914 – developer alternative boundary.</li> </ul>
<b>ST9: Land North of Haxby</b>	Site ref: 690  (Amalgamated site comprising of	Site ref: 690  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24.89 hectares</li> </ul>	Site ref: 690/846  A revised boundary was presented incorporating 7.33ha	Site ref: 823  The site taken forward is as per the Further Sites Consultation stage.	Site ref: 823  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35 hectares</li> <li>735 dwellings</li> </ul>	Site ref: 823  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35 hectares</li> <li>735 dwellings</li> </ul>	Allocated site ref: 823  Allocated for housing.	Reasonable boundary alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>980 –</li> </ul>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	sites: 145, 146, 164, 568)  Size Analysed: 24.89 hectares	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extension to Haxby Village. Haxby and Wigginton Ward</li> <li>747 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	of previously safeguarded land into the West and East of the previously proposed boundary. A further 1.1ha of new land at north of Cyprus Grove (at the southern end of the site) was also proposed to form part of the allocation. In addition a further 1.55ha of new land to north was proposed by site promoters to form part of the allocation and comprise of strategic greenspace. This area was included with other land to the north of the site as part of the safeguarded land. The recommendation was to include this revised boundary within the Local Plan to reflect the need to build at lower densities and drainage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>33.48 hectares</li> <li>747 number of dwellings</li> <li>Year 3 to year 12 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It was proposed that land identified within the proposals map be allocated for residential development purposes within the plan period.	Following further technical officer consideration the site remained as a strategic residential allocation. However, the boundary was amended to increase the total site area from 33.5 ha to 35ha. This now included strategic openspace to the south of the allocation totalling 11.5ha, important to help alleviate existing openspace deficits. The allocation was amended to incorporate additional land. Site reference 690/846 is superseded by 823. The density assumptions were: 60% net site area at 35 dph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> Officers suggested that no change was made to the PSC position. However, officers suggested that consideration should be given to the planning principles/site specific policy for the site including the location/ configuration of open space within the site boundary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35 hectares</li> <li>735 dwellings</li> <li>Lifetime of the plan (years 1 – 16)</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	reasonable alternative removing land for cemetery  814 – extension to ST9 (former SF4)
<b>ST10: Land at Moor Lane Woodthorpe</b>	Site ref: 148  Size Analysed: 88.49 hectares  Through the site selection process the site was reduced through criteria 1-3	Site ref: 148  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>17.02 hectares</li> <li>Extension as a suburban Area. Rural West Ward</li> <li>511 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 148  The FSC documented that the sites larger boundary was resubmitted for consideration through the Preferred Options consultation. The recommendation was to have no change to the Preferred Options Boundary (17 ha allocation). This	Site ref: 148  The site is not allocated as a Strategic Site. The Preferred Options site boundary is now included as an area of Safeguarded Land (SF12).  The land was identified as safeguarded land pending further investigations into	n/a  Safeguarded land allocations removed.  The Preferred Site Consultation document sought to identify sufficient land to accommodate York's development needs across the plan period, 2012-2032. In addition, the Plan provided further development land to 2037	N/a  Not allocated  No change from PSC.  Site promoter resubmitted larger sites for consideration. No change to previous outcomes. Officers discount site due to continuing significant concerns in relation to development in this location.	Not allocated	No reasonable alternative  Site 148- passes criteria 1-4

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	due to the majority of the site being in the Historic Character and Setting (2012). The site size carried forward to Technical Officer Assessment was 17 hectares. Site ref: 692:		<p>reflected concerns regarding impacts on the landscape and greenbelt as well as ecological impacts on the Askham Bogg SSSI.</p> <p>The site promoters supported a site through consultation that was for over 90 ha (site 880). This was discounted as suitable in the Site Selection paper Addendum which wrote up the results of the FSC. Main reasons were in relation to ecology, drainage and hydrology as well as landscape concerns.</p>	impacts on Askham Bogg SSSI.	<p>(including allowing for some flexibility in delivery) and establishes a green belt boundary enduring 20 years. In addition, safeguarded land is no longer designated, rather several of the Strategic Sites identified in the document have anticipated build out time beyond the fifteen year plan period. This ensured that York could meet long term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period and that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The larger boundary was re-submitted as part of the PS consultation. Officers reconsidered evidence based submitted through consultation for both the smaller and larger promoted site boundary. Officers assessment still raises significant concerns in relation to impacts at Askham Bogg SSSI as a result of hydrological change and landscape concerns. Officer considered that neither the small or larger site should not be allocated.</p>			
<b>ST11: Land at New Lane, Huntington</b>	Site ref: 692 (amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 3, 17, 51, 155, 169, 306, 320, 638) Size	Site ref: 692 Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13.7 hectares</li> <li>Extension to the Urban Area.</li> <li>411 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime</li> </ul>	Site ref: 692 New strategic greenspace was identified for inclusion on the site. This was identified to allow retention of and appropriate setting for heritage assets within the site, as well as	Site ref: 320 The site taken forward was as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13.76 hectares</li> <li>400 dwellings</li> <li>Year 2 to year 7 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It was proposed that land	Site ref: 320 Allocation removed. Following further technical officer consideration of the site it was considered that the site performs an important role in preserving the character and setting of Huntington keeping an	n/a No change from PSC - Not allocated Officers did not include the site in the PSC (2016) as it is considered that the site has an important role in preserving character and setting of Huntington and	Not allocated	Reasonable alternative: 320 – reasonable alternative (former allocation)



Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	<p>Analysed: 23.98 hectares.</p> <p>This site was reduced through the Site Selection Process to exclude an area of primary constraint within criteria 1-3. Technical Officer also reduced the southern boundary to mitigate landscape concerns. This reduced the boundary to 11.6 ha.</p>	of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)	providing a green corridor to the site boundary for ecological and landscape purposes.	identified on the proposals map be allocated for residential development over the plan period. Site boundary ref change reflects proposed allocation.	<p>important gap between the existing residential area of Huntington and the commercial area of Monks Cross. The area has a lack of greenspace and this site has local amenity value as well as providing a green wedge into the city. The site also contains a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Roman Camp) which needs to be preserved along with Huntington Grange and the cemetery which would need room for future expansion.</p> <p>Site re-submitted for consideration</p>	<p>provides an important gap between existing residential area of Huntington and the commercial area of Monks Cross. The site also contains SAM – Roman Camp which requires an adequate setting. Site discussed at Technical Officer workshop including the revised masterplan submitted for the land to the north of the cemetery (Barratt and David Wilson Homes). It is considered that the site does offer important relief in what is a dense area of Huntington and has important local amenity value. The revised masterplan does not respond adequately to setting of SAM or the creation of valuable openspace. Officers consider that the site to the south of cemetery should be retained as part of green wedge into Huntington. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Site was re-submitted through PPC consultation.</p>		
<b>ST12: Land at Manor Heath Road Copmanthorpe</b>	<p>Site ref: 723</p> <p>(Amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 208, 213)</p> <p>Size Analysed: 29.14</p> <p>This site was reduced at</p>	<p>Site ref: 723</p> <p>Allocated for Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14.75 hectares</li> <li>Village expansion. Rural West Ward</li> <li>354 dwellings to be developed in the short-medium term (years 1-10 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 723</p> <p>The FSC documented that the site's larger boundary was resubmitted for consideration through the Preferred Options consultation. The recommendation was to have no change to the Preferred Options Boundary. This reflected concerns</p>	<p>Site ref: 723</p> <p>The site taken forward reflects an increase on the Preferred Options boundary proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 hectares</li> <li>421 dwellings</li> <li>Year 3 to year 11 in the trajectory</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be</p>	<p>Site ref: 723</p> <p>Allocation removed.</p> <p>The site consists of two large fields split by a country lane (Hagg Lane) and is partially contained by the road/A64 embankment to the north and Manor Heath (road) and residential properties adjacent to the east. To the south of the southern field is a low level field boundary</p>	<p>n/a</p> <p>No change – not allocated</p> <p>Officers considered that alternatives site boundary submitted should not be allocated for development. The revised masterplans offered an increased belt of buffer planting along western and southern edges as well as landscaped openspaces incl. allotments to create a</p>	Not allocated	<p>Reasonable boundary alternatives</p> <p>723 – developer alternative</p> <p>872 – reasonable alternative (former allocation)</p>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	<p>Technical Officer Group to mitigate concerns realised in relation to landscape. The reduced parcels taken forward was 14.75 hectares.</p>		<p>regarding the scale and landscape impact of a larger site.</p>	<p>allocated for residential development within the plan period, with an associated area of Strategic Greenspace to the west delivered over the same period to mitigate landscape and greenbelt impacts arising from development.</p>	<p>with the western boundary of the southern field also having a low level field boundary. There is no defined boundary along the western boundary of the northern field other than a crop line so the site has a lack of containment and a sense of openness. The site would be a significant intrusion into open countryside and impact on the open and rural edge to Copmanthorpe. There is access to open countryside from the lane running through the site. It is therefore considered that the site serves green belt purposes and that Manor Heath Road should provide the boundary to the greenbelt to the west of Copmanthorpe.</p> <p>Developers submitted alternative boundary during PSC consultation</p>	<p>transition between urban edge and green belt. As part of the land is also owned by Askham Bryan College delivery of site would allow them to continue to invest in York with new technology and capital/estate improvements. Whilst there was some support for the reduced site boundary and extensive buffering offering an element of transition a defined green belt boundary would still have to be artificially created in this location and would not be as robust as the existing boundary currently offered by Manor Heath Road to the east of the proposed site. The roman road which runs through the site is still a gateway to the open countryside and building up on either side of this would be a significant intrusion into the open countryside. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Re-submitted through PPC consultation - proposals for a residential development of up to 250 new homes, substantial areas of public open space of 5.44ha in size, community space and associated infrastructure. Not accepted by Officers as per PSC and PPC.</p>		<p>944 – developer alternative.</p>
<b>ST13: Land at Moor</b>	Site ref: 131	Site ref: 131	Site ref: 131	Site ref: 131	Site ref: 131	n/a	Not allocated	No boundary alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>Lane Copmanthorpe</b>	Size Analysed: 5.5 hectares	Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.5 hectares</li> <li>• Village expansion. Rural West Ward</li> <li>• 115 dwellings to be developed in the short-medium term (years 1-10 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	No change	The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.61 hectares</li> <li>• 125 dwellings</li> <li>• Year 2 to year 5 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It is proposed that land identified within the proposals map be allocated for residential development purposes within the plan period	Allocation removed.  Further technical officer consideration states access via existing narrow roads (Moor Lane and Barnfield Way) through residential areas is a constraint and further work will be required to determine whether suitable highway improvements, such as highway / footway widening would be feasible. South end of Barnfield Way stops abruptly at fence line. There would be cumulative impacts with H29. Whilst the site is partially contained by residential properties the development of the site would extend the built edge of Copmanthorpe to the west into open countryside.  Site was re-submitted through consultation. Site promoters objected to removal of safeguarded land / allocation for residential.	Not allocated.  Technical officer workshop to consider further evidence concluded that access is only constraint, mitigation required but not considered a showstopper to development. The evidence submitted through the PSC from the landowner/developer confirms that from a technical perspective the site could be accessed with the required mitigation including widening Moor Lane and is not a showstopper to development. Officers consider however, that there would still be adverse impacts when looked at cumulatively with site H29. On balance it is considered that site H29 would be preferable to site ST13 given it is smaller in scale and would require less mitigation. In addition the development of Site ST13 would extend the built edge of Copmanthorpe to the west into open countryside.  Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.  Site re-submitted through consultation.		
<b>ST14: Land to the North of Clifton Moor</b>	Site ref: 698  (amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 89, 205, 216, 240, 241, 310, 576)	Site ref: 698  Allocated for Housing : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 134 hectares</li> <li>• Urban expansion. Skelton, Rawcliffe and Clifton Without Ward</li> </ul>	Site ref: 822  The FSC documented that a larger boundary was submitted for consideration through the Preferred Options consultation. The	Site ref: 822  The site taken forward is as per the Further Sites Consultation stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 157 hectares</li> <li>• 2800 number of dwellings</li> </ul>	Site ref: 848  Allocated for residential development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55 hectares</li> <li>• 1348 dwellings (845 within plan period)</li> </ul> The site was previously	Site ref: 848  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55 hectares</li> <li>• 1,348 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of the plan and post-plan period (years 1 – 21)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 848  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55 hectares</li> <li>• 1,348 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of</li> </ul>	Reasonable alternative site boundaries:  975 – Developer alternative (2200 homes)

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	<p>Size Analysed: 210 hectares.</p> <p>Through the Site Selection process the amalgamated site was reduced to exclude land within criteria 1-3.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4020 dwellings to be developed across the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> </ul>	<p>submitted boundary was reduced and agreed via the Technical Officer Group to include an extension to the western boundary of the site in comparison to the Preferred Options boundary. The recommendation was to include the revised boundary within the Local Plan to reflect the need for a strategic landscape buffer around the site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Year 4 to year 16 in the trajectory</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that land identified within the proposals map be allocated for residential development purposes within the plan period</p>	<p>included within the Publication Draft Local Plan as a strategic site (ST14) with a total site area of 157ha and a total site capacity of 2800 dwellings of which approximately 2591 would be delivered within the plan period. Following further technical work relating to historic character and setting, greenbelt purposes and assessing concerns raised through the previous Local Plan consultations the site area has been reduced to 55ha with a total estimated site capacity of 1348 dwellings of which approximately 850 could be delivered within the plan period. The site has been pulled further away from the A1237 to create a separate new settlement or 'garden village'. The western edge of the site has also been pulled further away from Skelton village in order to protect the setting of the village. The site is now approximately 1km from the western edge of Skelton village which replicates the existing distance from Skelton Village to the A1237 and the edge of the York main urban area allowing its setting to be protected.</p>	<p>No change from Preferred sites consultation.</p> <p>Post Pre Publication consultation Officer identified an alternative boundary (site 949) which would increase the quantum to 1672 dwellings/ 68 ha</p>	<p>the plan and post-plan period (years 1 – 21)</p> <p>No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)</p>	<p>974 – Developer alternative (1725 homes)</p> <p>915 – Developer alternative (1350 homes)</p> <p>949 – Post Pre Publication Officer Alternative</p>
<b>ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane</b>	<p>Site ref: 727</p> <p>(Amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 133, 242)</p>	<p>Site ref: 727</p> <p>ST15: Whinthorpe</p> <p>Allocated for Housing (predominantly):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>186 hectares</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 821</p> <p>ST15: Whinthorpe</p> <p>The FSC documented a boundary change to the site to incorporate</p>	<p>Site ref: 821</p> <p>ST15: Whinthorpe</p> <p>Allocated for residential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>392 hectares (gross)</li> <li>4680 dwellings (6000 dwellings in total with</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 851</p> <p>ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Allocated for housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>159 hectares</li> <li>3,339 dwellings (1,610</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 851</p> <p>ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Allocated for housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>159 hectares</li> <li>3,339 dwellings</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 851</p> <p>ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Allocated for housing:</p>	<p>Alternative boundaries:</p> <p>984 – Post Pre-Publication Officer boundary</p>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	<p>Size analysed: 548.56 hectares</p> <p>Through the Site Selection process the amalgamated site was reduced to exclude land within criteria 1-3. This included an area within criteria 1 (environmental assets – SSSI) and an area within Criteria 3 (greenfield and higher flood risk).</p>	<p>NB: The overall boundary shown on the proposals was 217 ha and included the area within flood zone 3a for additional landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Settlement. Heslington Ward</li> <li>• 5580 dwellings in total; 4680 to be developed across the lifetime of the plan (years 1-15 of the trajectory)</li> <li>• 900 to be delivered post 2030</li> </ul> <p>The remainder of the site submitted was allocated as Safeguarded Land.</p>	<p>part of the previously identified safeguarded land within the allocation boundary. This enlarged the boundary from 217ha (gross site area; 186 ha net site area) to 301 ha (gross). It also identified 132 ha of strategic greenspace within the allocation boundary to reflect up-to-date masterplanning. This was intended to address issues raised by statutory consultees and Officers in relation to ecology and landscaping and was based upon new/updated evidence base undertaken by the site promoters. The decision to amend the boundary was made via the Technical Officer Group using the evidence base available. The recommendation through the FSC was to include the revised boundary within the Local Plan to reflect the need for appropriate levels of strategic greenspace in proximity to Heslington Tillmire SSSI as well as create a workable site</p>	<p>1320 dwellings delivered post plan period)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 4 to year 16 in the trajectory (and beyond)</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for residential use, with ancillary community and commercial development, over the plan period.</p> <p>The allocated site extent differs from previous iterations in the Preferred Options plan and further sites consultation in order to facilitate the delivery of a sustainable new settlement whilst including additional central land potentially available through willing landowners and including land required for provision of site access routes.</p> <p>An additional area of some 50ha forming part of an 'Eastern Quarter' was proposed by site promoters in response to the Further Sites Consultation but this most easterly area of land is not reflected in the proposals map boundary due to concerns around landscape and ecology as set out in the relevant sections below.</p>	<p>within plan period to 2032)</p> <p>The site boundary has been amended substantially since the previous Publication Draft being pulled southwards from the A64 primarily to protect the historic character and setting of York retaining views over open countryside as viewed from the A64. This was following further discussions with Historic England. The site boundary also now excludes land within flood zone 3a which was previously within the allocation boundary but excluded from the developable area. In addition the site also includes an element of the Elvington Airfield brownfield site following further ecological assessment work including detailed analysis of the SINC sites.</p> <p>Post consultation Officers also identified an alternative boundary to increase to the overall site size from 159ha (3,339 dwellings) at PSC to 216ha (3901 dwellings) could be made (site 984). This alternative boundary was not taken forward by Members.</p> <p>Alternative boundaries also submitted by developers through consultation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lifetime of the plan and post-plan period (years 1 – 21)</li> </ul> <p>Officers identified an alternative boundary to increase to the overall site size from 159ha (3,339 dwellings) at PSC to 216ha (3901 dwellings) could be made (site 984). This alternative boundary was not taken forward by Members.</p> <p>Alternative boundaries also submitted by developers through consultation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 159 hectares</li> <li>• 3,339 dwellings</li> <li>• Lifetime of the plan and post-plan period (years 1 – 21)</li> </ul> <p>No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)</p>	<p>alternative</p> <p>979 – developer alternative</p> <p>877 /985 – developer alternative</p> <p>888 – alternative submission</p>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
			boundary.  Safeguarded land included at the Preferred Options stage was partly included within the revised site boundary. Land originally submitted adjacent to the site on the eastern boundary was designated as safeguarded land.	The site proposed incorporates an area of ecological enhancement to avoid and mitigate effects of development in this location.				
<b>ST16: Terrys Factory</b>	Site ref: 470  Size Analysed: 10.23  • This site had outline planning consent granted for mixed use development (ref: 09/01606/OUTM)	Site ref: 470  Allocated for Mixed Use: • Committed development for mixed use as per extant permission • Main urban Area. Micklegate Ward • 10.23 hectares  Outline planning permission, with means of access unreserved, for business (B1); assisted living accommodation and Residential Institution (C2); Residential (C3); Hotels with ancillary leisure (C1); Community Facilities including a Health Centre/Doctor's Surgery (D1); Children's Nursery (D1); exhibition space (D1); Leisure	Site ref: 470  No change	Site ref: 824  The site boundary taken forward has been enlarged to include Terry's car park (across Bishopthorpe Road) into the site. The employment element of this site (formerly 22,000 sq.m for B1a) has been reduced to 6,000 sq.m for B1a. The remaining land has been re-designated for housing following a review of its employment potential. • 11.11 hectares • 570 dwellings (395 dwellings granted through planning permission) • Years 1 to 11 in the trajectory	Site ref: 470 overall plus site 719 – Terry's car park and site 927 – extension to the south  Site ref: 719: Terry's Car Park  Allocated for residential • 0.87 hectares • 33 dwellings  The site was previously included with the Publication Draft Local Plan as part of wider Terry's development (ST16) and was identified for ancillary uses including health and community uses. The site is now proposed as a residential allocation.  Site 927: Terry's Extension Site 2 (Land to the rear of Terry's Factory)  This is within the overall boundary of Terry's but is additional to the consented development.  Allocated for residential • 1.18 hectares	ST16a site ref: 719 • Site totals 2.18 hectares • Phase 1 Terry's Clock Tower yields 22 dwellings • Phase 2 Terry's Car Park yields 33 dwellings  ST16b site ref: 927 • Phase 3 Terry's Land to the rear of Terry's Factory yields 56 dwellings  Officers consider that the sites should remain as in PSC and that the planning principles to restrict the height of any future development on the Car Park site Site 1) should be retained to protect the character of the surrounding landscape and prevent significant adverse impact on the openness and setting of the city. The estimated capacity on Site 2 (Rear of Terry's factory) is 56 dwellings based on a standard urban archetype of 95% of the site area (1.18ha) at density of 50dph. It is considered that a higher density and yield may be	ST16a site ref: 719 • Site totals 2.18 hectares • Phase 1 Terry's Clock Tower yields 22 dwellings • Phase 2 Terry's Car Park yields 33 dwellings  ST16b site ref: 927 • Phase 3 Terry's Land to the rear of Terry's Factory yields 56 dwellings  No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	No alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
		uses (D2); Retail (A1); Financial and Professional Services (A2); Restaurant/Cafe (A3); bar (A4); and live work units, with associated servicing, car parking, landscaping and highway works; additional deck to car park; demolition of existing buildings.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>56 dwellings</li> </ul> The site was not previously included with the Publication Draft Local Plan. The site is now proposed as a residential allocation.	appropriate on this site subject to detailed consideration against the planning principles but that this should be looked at through the planning application process.		
<b>ST17: Nestle South</b>	Site ref: 485  Site Analysed: 7.16 hectares  This site had outline planning consent granted for mixed use development (ref: 10/01955/OU TM)  Outline proposal for a mixed use development including residential, live/work, residential student accommodation, offices, retail, cafe, assisted living, community centre,	Site ref: 485  Allocated for Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.16 hectares</li> <li>Main urban Area. Clifton Ward</li> <li>This site has outline planning permission for a mixed use development to be brought forward within the plan period.</li> <li>130 dwellings in addition to planning permission. (Re-designation of commercial land in outline permission (excluding ancillary retail) to residential).</li> </ul>	Site ref: 485  No Change	Site ref: 485  The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.16 hectares</li> <li>445 dwellings</li> <li>Year 2 to year 7 in the trajectory</li> </ul>	Site ref: 485 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.8 hectares</li> <li>315 dwellings (Based on previously approved mixed use scheme (10/01960/FULM) which has recently expired.)</li> </ul> The site was previously included within the Publication Draft Local Plan as site ST17 Nestle South based on the committed site (10/01960/FULM). The site previously had planning consent for the conversion and alternation of the retained buildings within Nestle South for a mix of uses including residential, live/work units, residential student accommodation, office, ancillary retail, cafe and associated landscaping, roads and car parking. The planning permission has recently expired but the landowners/developers are currently working on a revised masterplan for the	17a Nestle South – Former Almond Factory with permission Site ref: 931  17b Nestle South – Remaining Land Site ref: 932  Phase 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.35 hectares</li> <li>263 dwellings</li> <li>Short to medium term (Years 1-10)</li> </ul> Phase 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.7 hectares</li> <li>600 dwellings</li> <li>Medium to long term (years 6-15)</li> </ul> A planning application has been submitted for part of the site (17/00284/FULM) for 258 dwellings on approx 2.35ha. Officers consider that this element of the site should be considered as phase 1 of the site with an earlier delivery timeframe. This application was approved at planning committee on the 15th June 2017 subject to confirmation of agreement to appropriate levels of education and open	17a Nestle South – Former Almond Factory with permission Site ref: 931  17b Nestle South – Remaining Land Site ref: 932  Phase 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.35 hectares</li> <li>263 dwellings</li> <li>Short to medium term (Years 1-10)</li> </ul> Phase 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.7 hectares</li> <li>600 dwellings</li> <li>Medium to long term (years 6-15)</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	gymnasium, creche, and associated car parking, landscaping, highway infrastructure and other ancillary works				site and are committed to bring the site forward for re-development.	space contributions and completion of a S106 agreement relating to affordable housing provision, open space, education and highways. Officers suggest that the remainder of the overall Nestle South site (4.74ha) could be included in the Local Plan for phase 2 of the site and that it could provide up to 600 additional dwellings based on suitable density levels for this type of site. This would increase the overall quantum for the whole site to circa 860 units.		
<b>ST18: Monks Cross</b>	Site ref: 724 (Amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 77, 190, 634, 633) Size Analysed: 20.56 hectares	Site ref: 724 Allocated for Employment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12.74 hectares</li> <li>• Suburban. Huntington Ward</li> <li>• 100,000 sq.m (40% plot ratio and 2 storeys)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 724 No change	Site ref: 724 The site taken forward is smaller than at the Preferred Options stage to reflect emerging masterplanning of the site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 hectares</li> <li>• 64,000 sq.m of floorspace for B1a (Office) use.</li> </ul>	Site ref: 724 The site was previously included as an employment allocation (ST18) within the Publication Draft Local Plan for up to 60,000 sqm office space (B1a). Following further consideration of employment land demand and market attractiveness/investment requirements as highlighted in the Employment Land Review, it is considered that the York Central Site will meet the forecast need for B1a over the Plan period and offers a unique opportunity for the creation of a new central business district to create Grade A offices space in a sustainable location. The ST18 site has therefore been re-assessed and is now included as part of the ST8 residential site North of Monks Cross.	n/a	Not allocated	No boundary alternatives. See ST8.
<b>ST19: Northminst</b>	Site ref: 689	Site ref: 689	Site ref: 689	Site ref: 91	Site ref: 857	Site ref: 857	Site ref: 857	Reasonable boundary



Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>er Business Park</b>	(Amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 24, 91, 582, 584, 586)  Size Analysed: 53.87 hectares	Allocated for Employment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 hectares</li> <li>Rural/adjacent to existing business park. Rural West Ward</li> <li>60,000 sq.m (40% plot ratio and 1 storeys) for R&amp;D, Light Industrial, storage and Distribution (B1b/B1c/B2/B8).</li> </ul> The land allocated reflects willing landowner parcels at this stage.	A revised site boundary was presented in the FSC that displayed a contiguous parcel of land to the south of Northminster Business Park as opposed to isolated parcels to the south and west as per the Preferred Options Local Plan. This enlarged the site to 25.53ha and reflected better land ownership (as per responses to the Preferred Options) and a more rational approach to the allocating and safeguarding of the land for employment land. The recommendation was to include the revised boundary to ST19 for employment use (B1b/B1c/B2/B8).	The submissions through the FSC confirmed deliverability for one of the original parcels of land to the south of the business park as opposed to the FSC boundary. The allocation for inclusion within the plan has therefore been reduced to 2.5ha /10,000 sqm. This is now a general employment allocation (E17).  The remaining land analysed as part of site 689 is safeguarded for development beyond the plan period.	Allocated for B1C, B2 and B8 employment use.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 hectares</li> <li>60,000 sqm indicative site capacity</li> </ul> The site was included within the Publication Draft Local Plan (2014) for employment allocation (E17) for 2.5ha/10,000 sq m of employment uses (B1C/B2/B8) with a wider area of land (51ha) included as safeguarded land (SF8). The reasons for safeguarding at that time related to concerns about deliverability due to separate land ownership. Following further technical officer consideration and analysis of employment demand through the Employment Land Review it is proposed that a 15ha site for up to 60,000 sq m of B1C/B2/B8 floorspace be allocated to the south of the existing Northminster Business Park. The site offers the opportunity for a phased approach to extending the existing Northminster Business Park	Allocated for B1C, B2 and B8 employment use. May be suitable for B1a.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 hectares</li> <li>49,500 sqm</li> </ul> Officers suggest that the 15ha allocation at PSC could be retained to provide approximately 49,500 sqm of floorspace across the B1, B2, B8 uses based on a split of approximately 40/60 B1a to B2/B8 which is the current ratio at the existing business park. Given the potential transport issues raised this would need to be subject to a more detailed assessment.  The ratio of land (ha) to floorspace (sqm) has been reduced from the PSC position (15ha/60,000 sqm) to reflect further evidence submitted on out of centre employment plot ratios across the city. These are approximately 3,300 sqm of floorspace per ha.  Alternative site identified by Officer to the north following consultation responses (site 952).	Allocated for B1C, B2 and B8 employment use. May be suitable for B1a.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 hectares</li> <li>49,500 sqm</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	alternatives:  907 – PSC consultation submission  952 – Post PSC Officer alternative.
<b>ST20: Castle Gateway</b>	Site ref: 725  (amalgamated parcel comprising of sites: 150, 151, 666, 448, 668)  Size	Site ref: 725  ST20: Castle Piccadilly  Allocated for Retail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.27 hectares</li> <li>City centre. Guildhall Ward</li> <li>25,000 sq.m for</li> </ul>	Site ref: 725  ST20: Castle Piccadilly  No change	Site ref: 725  ST20: Castle Piccadilly  The site boundary is taken forward as identified at Preferred Options (ST20). However, this is now also identified within the Local	n/a	Site 955  ST20: Castle Gateway  This part of the city is being allocated as an 'area of opportunity'. Mixed uses within different areas of the opportunity area.	Site 955  ST20: Castle Gateway  No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	No reasonable boundary alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	Analysed: 2.27 hectares	retail (A1)		Plan as an area of opportunity for mixed use development under policy SS10: Castle Piccadilly.				
<b>ST21: Naburn Designer Outlet</b>	Site ref: 799  (Amalgamated site: 286, 695)  Size Analysed: 18.48 hectares (existing Designer Outlet footprint including car parking).	Site ref: 799  Allocated for Leisure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural /extension to the existing Designer Outlet. Fulford Ward</li> <li>12,000 sq.m for Leisure (D1)</li> </ul>	Site ref: 799  No Change	Site ref: 799  The site taken forward is as per the Preferred Options stage. The allocated site details are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12,000 sq.m of D2 (Leisure) use, where it can be demonstrated that there would not be a detrimental impact on the city centre's vitality and viability.</li> </ul>	Site ref: 799  Allocation removed.  Site was previously identified for 12,000 sqm leisure development subject to detailed impact assessment to assess potential adverse impacts on York City Centre and other sequentially preferable sites. Whilst the role of the site in York's economy is recognised the site is in an out of centre location and therefore any future proposals should be assessed through the planning application process against relevant policies in the NPPF and the emerging Local Plan rather than through a specific allocation.  Given that D2 uses tend to be located in City Centres or other sustainable locations policies within the plan will seek to guide future D2 development but will not specifically allocate sites for this purpose. Development of the site could also require relocation/re-configuration of the Park and Ride site which would need further detailed technical assessment. <b>Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.</b>	Not allocated  No change to PSC stage.  Site continues to be supported by the site promoter.	Not allocated	No reasonable boundary alternatives.
<b>ST22: Germany</b>	Site ref: 458	Site ref: 458	Site ref: 458	Site ref: 458	n/a	n/a	n/a	No reasonable boundary

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>Beck</b>	<p>Size Analysed: 34.59 hectares</p> <p>This site had outline planning consent granted for residential development (ref: 01/01315/OUT and 12/01802/OUTM (time extension))</p>	<p>Allocated for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>34.59 hectares</li> <li>Extension to main urban Area. Fulford Ward</li> <li>Planning permission for 700 dwellings permitted.</li> <li>Ref: 01/01315/OUT and 12/01802/OUTM / 12/00384/REMM</li> </ul> <p>Outline planning approval 01/01315/OUT (granted by Secretary of State on 09/05/07) for residential development of approx 700 dwellings, the creation of public open space &amp; community facilities including local shops, with associated footpaths, cycleways, roads, engineering works &amp; landscaping</p>	No Change	<p>This site has planning permission and is in the process of being developed. The boundary for the site remains as per the permission at Preferred Options Stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>655 dwellings</li> <li>34.59 hectares</li> </ul> <p>This site has outline planning permission and is included under Policy H1. Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.</p>			<p>Site included within planning permissions in housing trajectory.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.</p>	alternatives.
<b>ST23: Derwenthorpe</b>	<p>Site ref: 457</p> <p>Size Analysed: 21.90 hectares</p> <p>This site had planning consent granted for</p>	<p>Site ref: 457</p> <p>Allocated for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21.90 hectares</li> <li>Extension to main urban Area. Osbaldwick Ward</li> <li>Outline Planning permission for 540 dwellings permitted, of</li> </ul>	<p>Site ref: 457</p> <p>No Change</p>	<p>Site ref: 457</p> <p>This site has planning permission and is in the process of being developed. The boundary for the site remains as per the permission at Preferred Options Stage.</p> <p>This site has outline</p>	n/a	n/a	<p>n/a</p> <p>Site included within planning permissions in housing trajectory.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the</p>	No reasonable boundary alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	residential development (ref: 03/02709/OUT/07/02789/REMM, 12/00242/REMM, 12/01286/REMM and 12/01878/REMM)	which 474 are left to complete. The site is under construction.		planning permission and is included under Policy H1. Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.			ongoing construction and completion of the permission.	
<b>ST24: York College</b>	Site ref: 461  Size Analysed: 10.32 hectares  This site had planning consent granted for residential development (ref: 04/00777/OUT and 07/00752/REMM)	Site ref: 461  Allocated for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.32 hectares</li> <li>Main urban Area. Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward</li> <li>Outline Planning permission for 360 dwellings permitted, of which 189 are left to complete. The site is under construction.</li> </ul>	Site ref: 461  No change	Site ref: 461  This site has planning permission and is in the process of being developed. The boundary for the site remains as per the permission at Preferred Options Stage.  This site has outline planning permission and is included under Policy H1. Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.	n/a	n/a	n/a  Site included within planning permissions in housing trajectory.  Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.	No reasonable boundary alternatives.
<b>ST25: Land South of Designer Outlet</b>	Site ref: 682  Size analysed: 28.9 ha (including land adj to the east of the Designer Outlet.)	Site ref: 682  This site was consulted on as safeguarded land during the Preferred Options Consultation. SF7 related to land to the south of the Designer Outlet.	Site ref: 682  Further evidence was received for this site through the Preferred Options consultation and as part of ongoing discussion in relation to ST21. This information was appraised through	Site ref: 800  This site was incorporated into the Publication draft Plan. It was proposed that land identified in the proposals map be allocated for employment and transport related development over the	Site ref: 800  Allocation removed.  Site was previously identified in the Publication Draft Local Plan as an employment allocation (B1b/B1C/B2/B8) for 9.8ha extension to the south of the existing York Designer Outlet site. Further	Not allocated  No change to PSC	Not allocated	Reasonable alternative:  800 – Former allocation ST25

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
		This was 16ha .	the Technical Officer Group and consequently, this site was included within the FSC as a proposed employment site. This recommended that the site was allocated as a potential employment site for uses B1b/B1c/B2/B8 for inclusion within the Local Plan.	plan period. It is now proposed however, that land formerly included in the proposed site boundary at Further Sites Consultation to the south of the proposed allocation (Acres Farm) be allocated as a Gypsy & Traveller site, and this land has therefore been removed from the potential employment and transport allocation. Part of the remaining site for employment uses is also to be designated for the re-location for the Park and Ride at Designer Outlet.  The allocated site details are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.8 hectares</li> <li>• 23,520sq.m</li> <li>• Light industrial, storage and distribution use (B1b/B1c/B2/B8)</li> </ul>	technical officer consideration of the site in relation to green belt purposes has confirmed that the existing boundary treatment to the south of the existing Designer Outlet site which consists of a belt of mature trees provides a strong defined green belt boundary and helps to screen from the surrounding open countryside. Therefore the development of the proposed site would be contrary to green belt purposes.  Officers support the removal of the site as an allocation.	site which consists of a belt of mature trees provides a strong defined green belt boundary and helps to screen the existing site from the surrounding open countryside.  Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.		
<b>ST26: South of Airfield Business Park</b>	Site ref: 97  Size Analysed: 15.89 hectares  0.8 ha of the site was removed through criteria 1 of the Site Selection Process. The	Site ref: 97  This site was included at the Local Plan Preferred Options as safeguarded land. Allocation SF6 was 15ha at this stage.	Site ref: 97/815  Reponses received through consultation confirmed that the land was available for employment purposes. The boundary was amended for consultation purposes to allow a more logical extension to the existing Business Park. The	Site ref: 97  It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for employment uses over the plan period, which represents half of the original parcel of land. The remaining land is identified as safeguarded land (SF6) for employment purposes beyond the plan period (8ha).	Site ref: 97  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.6 hectares</li> <li>• 30,400 sqm (B1b, B1c, B2/B8 employment floorspace for research and development, light industrial/storage and distribution)</li> </ul> Safeguarded land (SF6) to the west of the proposed site was removed following further assessment of employment demand over the	Site ref: 948  Allocated for B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 employment use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.6 hectares</li> <li>• 25,080 sqm</li> </ul> The ratio of land to floorspace has reduced from the PSC position to reflect further evidence submitted on out of centre employment plot ratios across the city. These are approximately 3,300 sqm of	Site ref: 948  Allocated for B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 employment use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.6 hectares</li> <li>• 25,080 sqm</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	Reasonable boundary alternative:  97 – Alternative boundary.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	parcel carried forward for further assessment was 15.09 ha.		recommendation in the FSC was to include this as a strategic site for employment use (B1b/B1c/B2/B8) within the Local Plan.  Representations received in response to the Further Sites Consultation proposed the allocation of all of the land identified as allocated and safeguarded in order to meet demand over the plan period	The allocated site details are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.6 ha</li> <li>• 30,400sq.m</li> <li>• Light industrial, storage and distribution use (B1b/B1c/B2/B8)</li> </ul>	Plan period and beyond.	floorspace per ha. Following Pre Publication consultation, Officers identified an alternative boundary increasing the allocation to 15 ha in total to provide approximately 10ha net of employment land equating to 33,000 sqm of floorspace over the plan period.		
<b>ST27: Heslington East University Campus and Extension</b>	Site ref: 794  Size Analysed: 66.63 ha	n/a  This site was received through the Preferred options consultation.	Site ref: 794  The site boundary submitted was reduced by Technical Officer Group to allow an expansion to the university campus to the south, whilst retaining a buffer to the ring-road. The site was recommended within the FSC as educational use for an expansion at the University of York for related Science City uses. The reduced site was reduced to 28 ha.	Site ref: 816  This site has been taken forward in the Submission Local Plan as per the Further Sites Consultation Boundary, although refinements have been made to the southern edge. However, based upon responses received to the FSC, the employment use is to be spread across the University Heslington East Campus as well as the new site boundary presented at FSC.  The allocated site details are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 hectares of employment use</li> <li>• 24,000sq.m of floorspace</li> <li>• Research and</li> </ul>	Site ref: 852  Allocated for B1b employment use - knowledge based activities and other higher education and related uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21.5 hectares</li> <li>• 20,000 sqm</li> </ul> The site has been reduced in size from the Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2014) from 25ha to 21.5ha. This has included the removal of land to the west of Green Lane to increase the distance between the site and Heslington Village and also to provide a defined green belt boundary which helps to maintain views into the southern aspect of York and the setting of Heslington village.	Site ref: 852  Allocated for B1b employment use - knowledge based activities and other higher education and related uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21.5 hectares</li> <li>• 20,000 sqm</li> </ul> Officers suggest that consideration is given to increasing the allocation to 26 ha in total to provide approximately 26,000 sqm of employment floorspace based on an approximate 10% employment use along with the provision of 3 x 650 bed student colleges and an academic research facility to meet the needs of the University over the plan period.	Site ref: 852  Allocated for B1b employment use - knowledge based activities and other higher education and related uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21.5 hectares (boundary size)</li> <li>• Campus East and ST27 to deliver 25 ha of B1a floorspace across both sites.</li> </ul> No boundary change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017) but change to how quantum of employment land expressed in policy.	Reasonable boundary alternative:  954 – reasonable alternative.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
				Development use (B1b/B1c) linked to the University.  It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for university expansion (incorporating education facilities, student accommodation and ancillary employment uses) over the plan period.			Publication consultation Officers identified an alternative boundary to increase the allocation to 26 ha (site 954).	
<b>ST28: Land adj. to &amp; R/O Windy Ridge &amp; Brecks Lane Huntington</b>	Site ref: 560  Site Analysed: 5.26 ha	Site ref: 560  This site was identified as a commitment at the Preferred Options Stage. This site has full planning permission for: Residential development of 87 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure. Ref: 12/02979/FULM	Site ref: 560  No Change	Site ref: 560  This site has been identified as a Strategic Site given its site size being over 5ha. The allocated site details are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 hectares</li> <li>• 87 number of dwellings</li> <li>• Year 1 to year 5 in the trajectory</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a	n/a  Site included within planning permissions in housing trajectory.  Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken for this site due to the ongoing construction and completion of the permission.	No reasonable boundary alternatives.
<b>ST29: Land at Boroughbridge Road</b>	Site ref: 779  Site Analysed: 5.76 hectares	Site ref: 779  Whilst the boundary for site 779 had not submitted for the Preferred Options stage, part of the site was included within site 327. This site was failed criteria 1 within the Preferred Options process given that the land was located within the Historic Character and	Site ref: 779  The site and additional evidence was submitted through the Preferred Options stage. This was taken to the Technical Officer Group wherein it passed with mitigation required for landscape and setting purposes. The recommendation within the FSC was to	Site ref: 779  The site taken forward is as per the Further Sites Consultation stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.75 hectares</li> <li>• 135 dwellings</li> <li>• Year 1 to year 10 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It is proposed that land identified in the proposals map is allocated for residential development during the plan period.	Site ref: 779  Allocation removed.  Following further technical officer consideration it is considered that the site provides an important role in the setting of York providing views over open countryside as you travel from York towards the A1237 along the A59. Although the site is partially contained with occasional tree planting and hedgerows along with	Not allocated  No change to PSC.  Site discussed at technical officer workshop – concerns remain over impact of site on setting of city and coalescence between York main urban area and Poppleton. Also perception of openness, views of open countryside as you travel out of York. Agree that existing Manor School and extended roundabout have already	Not allocated  Reasonable alternative:  779 – reasonable alternative (previous allocation)	

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
		Setting.  The boundary for site 779 was submitted through the Preferred options Consultation.	include it as a strategic site within the Local Plan for 161 dwellings.		existing residential properties to the east it has open fields to the southern boundary. The site provides a role in separating the urban edge of York from the village of Poppleton, preventing coalescence which has already been compromised on the opposite side of the road through the Manor School development. For these reasons it is considered to serve greenbelt purposes.  Site was re-submitted or consideration by site promoters.	compromised the area to a certain extent but that the development of this site would fill in the gap entirely.  Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.		
<b>ST30: Land to the North of Stockton Lane</b>	Site ref: 187  Site Analysed: 5.92 hectares	Site ref: 187  This site was considered through the Site Selection Process but was discounted at criteria 1 given that the site is predominantly within a area of historic character and setting.	Site ref: 187  Consultation responses received through the Preferred Options Consultation included further evidence for this site relating to landscape and ecology. The details were taken to the Technical Officer Group which identified that the site could be suitable subject to mitigation in relation to landscape and setting. The recommendation in the FSC was to include this as a Strategic site housing within the local Plan.	Site ref: 187  The site taken forward is as per the Further Sites Consultation stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.9 hectares</li> <li>• 165 dwellings</li> <li>• Year 3 to year 7 in the trajectory</li> </ul> It is proposed that land identified on the proposals map be allocated for residential development purposes within the plan period	Site ref: 187  Allocation removed.  Following further technical officer consideration of the site it is considered that the site performs an important role in maintaining a green wedge into York from Monk Stray which contributes to the setting of York. Maintaining green wedges is a key characteristic of York and an important role of York's Green Belt. The site is not contained to the north and eastern boundaries opening onto open agricultural fields to the northern boundary providing access to open countryside. Pasture Lane to the eastern boundary has intermittent residential properties along a track and does not provide containment to the site. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an	Not allocated n/a  No change to PSC.  Site removed from PSC due to green belt concerns. Site is considered to play an important role in maintaining green wedge into York from Monk Stray. The site is not contained to northern boundary and eastern boundary (Pasture Lane) is a rural track/lane with dispersed intermittent buildings and is not considered to provide containment to the site. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.	Not allocated	Reasonable alternative:  187 – reasonable alternative (previous allocation)



Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
					allocation in the emerging Local Plan.  Site re-submitted for consideration by site promoter.			
<b>ST31 Land to the South of Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe</b>	Submitted as site 185 through the Call for sites process.  8.1 hectares	Site ref: 185  Site failed criteria 1 in site selection methodology for being located in an area identified for historic character and setting. Not allocated.	Site ref: 185  Site resubmitted for consideration but continued to fail criteria 1.	n/a  Not allocated.	Site ref: 856  Allocated for housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.1 hectares</li> <li>• 170 dwellings</li> </ul> The site was not previously included with the Publication Draft Local Plan but is included within the emerging Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan as a potential housing site. The site is available with a willing landowner and developer. The site was not previously included as a draft housing allocation as it is located within an area designated in the 2003 York Green Belt Study (Updates 2011 and 2013). The site is part of an 'area preventing coalescence' parcel G3 which extends from Bishopthorpe to Copmanthorpe and northwards to the existing edge of the York main built up area. Further evidence base produced regarding this was accepted.	Site ref: 185  Allocated for housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.1 hectares</li> <li>• 158 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> Officers considered that there could be a minor change in the PSC boundary to remove the triangle of land adjacent to the railway line and to the south of Yorkfield Lane. Reduction in site size to 7.5ha / 158 dwellings (60% @ 35dph).	Site ref: 185  Allocated for housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.1 hectares</li> <li>• 158 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	No reasonable alternatives.
<b>ST32 Hungate (Formerly E1/MU1)</b>	Site 456  Site has existing	Site ref: 456  Hungate as a city centre site is	Site ref: 456  No change to Preferred Options	Site ref: 829  The entirety of Hungate was identified for Mixed	Site ref: 829  Reserved matters planning permissions built out against	Site ref: 829  Phases 5+ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.17 hectares</li> </ul>	Site ref: 829  Phases 5+ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.17 hectares</li> </ul>	No reasonable alternatives

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	<p>outline permission for mixed use development. Not built out.</p> <p>02/03741/OUT for: Outline application to redevelop 4.1 ha. of land for residential, (720 units) Class B1 business ( total floorspace 12,062 sq. m), Class A1 retail, A3/A4/A5 food/drink uses (total 6,392 sq. m), focal building, enhanced Nature Reserve/Riverside, public spaces, landscaping, car/cycle parking, access routes, bridge to Navigation Rd and sewer realignment</p>	<p>generally supported for town centre uses and residential use within existing planning permission.</p> <p>Allocation in the Local Plan for employment: E1: Hungate (12,000sq.m/1.51ha )</p>	<p>position.</p>	<p>use (allocation MU1) and smaller parcel within this for employment (E1))</p> <p>E1/MU1: Hungate (12,000 sq. m office (B1a) as part of a mixed use scheme);</p>	<p>the Outline permission.</p> <p>Additional dwellings through new outline permission: 15/01709/OUTM</p> <p>Addition to current housing allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.8 hectares</li> <li>• 305 dwellings</li> </ul> <p>Site has existing consent for 720 dwellings and masterplan approved at planning committee for Phase 5+ which will provide up to 305 additional dwellings over and above the original extant scheme giving total site capacity of up to 1025 residential units along with commercial space, community building, public open space and associated car parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 328 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> <p>Officers consider that the site should remain as a strategic site in the Local Plan. Of the original consent for 720 dwellings there are a remaining 550 dwellings (at 1st April 2017) which have planning permission and are included as an unimplemented consent. It is considered that a further 328 dwellings could be provided through the remaining phases of the site bringing to overall site capacity to 1041 dwellings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 328 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> <p>No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)</p>	

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
<b>ST33 Station Yard, Wheldrake</b>	Site ref: 13  Submitted through the call for sites. Site size: 4.5 ha.	Site ref: 13  Passed criteria 1-3 but failed criteria 4 of the site selection process.  Not allocated.	Site ref: 13  Re-submitted and assessed but site continued to fail Criteria 4.  Developer site submissions to FSC amended boundary (site ref 817).	Site ref: 817  Amended boundary passed criteria 4.  Site ref 817 allocated as a general housing site (H49) in the aborted Publication draft (2014).  Site allocated for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.89 ha</li> <li>• 102 dwellings.</li> </ul>	Site ref: 855  Allocated for housing.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 hectares</li> <li>• 147 dwellings</li> </ul> The site was previously included with the Publication Draft Local Plan but for a smaller site area of 3.89ha and an estimated yield of 108 dwellings. The site area has been extended to include an area of land to the south of the existing industrial estate which is part of the original site submission and offers the opportunity to provide a sustainable extension to Wheldrake Village. The site is available with a willing landowner and developer.	Site ref: 855  Allocated for housing.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 hectares</li> <li>• 147 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> Officers consider that the site should be retained as per the PSC boundary at 6ha and circa 147 dwellings. It should be noted that the final yield of the site may be reduced following the completion of a noise assessment.	Site ref: 855  Allocated for housing.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 hectares</li> <li>• 147 dwellings</li> <li>• Short to medium term (years 1-10)</li> </ul> No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)	No reasonable alternative boundaries.
<b>ST34</b>	N/a – withdrawn reference							
<b>ST35 Queen Elizabeth Barracks</b>	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	Sites 918,919,934 ,935,936 - MOD submission/Strensall village submitted boundaries which were logged as part of PSC consultation.  MOD official announcement of closure of barracks in November 2016 as part of the Defence Infrastructure review. MOD boundary determined at this point as Site 934 (28.8 ha) and 936 (1.3 ha).	Site ref: 934  Allocated for housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28.8 hectares</li> <li>• 578 dwellings</li> <li>• Medium to long term (years 6-15)</li> </ul> Site passed site selection criteria assessment.  Further technical work is progressing on the site including the HRA screening and Appropriate Assessment. The screening assessment will be produced to accompany the next stage of consultation with further work and consultation with the appropriate statutory and	Site ref: 934  Allocated for housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28.8 hectares</li> <li>• 500 dwellings</li> <li>• Medium to long term (years 6-15)</li> </ul> Since Pre Publication draft consultation (2017) the number of dwellings has been reduced. The net to gross development ratio changed to 50:50 to allow more openspace to be	Reasonable alternative boundary  978 – Developer alternative boundary.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
						<p>specific consultees.</p> <p>A bespoke planning policy for the site will need to be included within the draft Plan guiding the principle of its development and covering the issues highlighted by technical officers.</p>	<p>provided on site and identified of a new strategic openspace (OS12). This is to mitigate the impact on Strensall Common identified in the Habitat Regulation Assessment.</p>	
<b>ST36 Imphal Barracks</b>	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	<p>Site ref: 951</p> <p>MOD official announcement of closure of barracks in November 2016 as part of the Defence Infrastructure review. MOD boundary determined at this point as Site 937.</p>	<p>Site ref: 951</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18 hectares</li> <li>• 769 dwellings</li> <li>• Post-plan period (years 16-21)</li> </ul> <p>Officers suggest that the site could be included as a potential housing allocation within the Plan for up to 769 dwellings. Further technical work is progressing on the site including the required transport modelling and consultation with the appropriate statutory consultees. A bespoke planning policy for the site will need to be included within the draft Plan guiding the principle of its development and covering the issues highlighted by technical officers.</p>	<p>Site ref: 951</p> <p>Allocated for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18 hectares</li> <li>• 769 dwellings</li> <li>• Post-plan period (years 16-21)</li> </ul> <p>No change from Pre Publication draft consultation (2017)</p>	<p>Reasonable boundary alternative:</p> <p>937 – developer alternative boundary.</p>
<b>ST37 Whitehall Grange</b>	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	<p>Site ref: 246</p> <p>Outline planning permission granted for the demolition of existing buildings and the use of the land as a car storage facility for up to 2,000 cars. A two storey, 3,000sqm office building for approximately 200 staff is to be located at</p>	<p>Site ref: 246</p> <p>ST37 allocated for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10.1 ha</li> <li>• 33,330sqm for B8 storage use.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>No change from Pre Publication draft</p>	No reasonable alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
						the north west corner of the site.  ST37 allocated for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10.1 ha</li> <li>• 33,330sqm for B8 storage use.</li> </ul>	consultation (2017)	
Site 170: Pond Fields, Heslington	Site ref: 170  Size analysed: 5.7 hectares  This site passed the site selection criteria 1-4 and was taken to Technical Officer Group for further consideration .	Site ref: 170  This site was considered through the Site Selection Process but was discounted at the Technical Officer Group due to landscape and setting issues. The site is considered important to the setting of Heslington and for ensuring separation between the University and Badger Hill. In addition, it was considered that this was important for Green Infrastructure as a wildlife corridor. The site was therefore not allocated at the Preferred Options Stage.	Site ref: 170  Further evidence was submitted through the Preferred options Consultation to enable reconsideration of the site in terms of landscape and setting. This evidence base was taken to Technical Officer Group and discussed in more detail. Whilst the submitted landscape and visual impact assessment resulted in some mitigation measures, it was considered that these were not sufficient to prevent a change in the character and setting of Heslington or to prevent coalescence with Badger Hill or the disruption of an identified green infrastructure corridor. The site was therefore not identified to have potential for development and was recorded as failing Technical Officer Group. The site was	Site ref: 170  Not allocated	Site ref: 170  Site resubmitted through PSC consultation.	Site ref: 170  Not allocated.  Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.  Revised masterplan does not retain a meaningful separation – physically or visually, between Badger Hill and Heslington village. Whilst the revised site access – on Windmill Lane – results in a reduced impact on Field Lane, the imposing Proposed Residential parcels in effect fill this remaining critical gap. The proposed open space and buffer planting would not mitigate the loss of undeveloped land between Badger Hill and Heslington.	Not allocated	No reasonable boundary alternatives

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
			therefore rejected for further consideration.					
Site 297 : Sites off Riverside Gardens / Main Street Elvington	<p>Site ref: 297</p> <p>Size analysed: 8.21 hectares</p> <p>This is an amalgamated parcel comprising of sites 50 and 56.</p> <p>This site passed the site selection process (stage 2) and was taken to technical Officer Group for further comments.</p>	<p>Site ref: 297</p> <p>This site was considered at Technical Officer Group wherein concerns were raised in relation to suitable access and in relation to the scale of development in relation to the existing village. The site failed Technical Officer Group and was not allocated at the Preferred options Stage.</p>	<p>Site ref: 297</p> <p>The site was resubmitted through the Preferred Options stage for further consideration. An additional site (749)) was also suggested as an extension to 297.</p> <p>Technical Officers identified that access to the site was difficult given suitability over existing roads and ability for upgrading. The site was therefore not identified to have potential for development and was recorded as failing Technical Officer Group. The site was therefore rejected for further consideration.</p>	<p>Site ref: 802</p> <p>Further assessment of rejected sites against criteria 1-3 identified potential site for safeguarded land in this location as the sites pass criteria. Site 297 and 749 considered amalgamated .</p> <p>A safeguarded land parcel more appropriate in scale was identified and allocated in the Publication draft (2014). This was site 802 and the allocation ref was SF10: Land at Riverside Gardens, Elvington.</p>	<p>Site ref: 894</p> <p>Safeguarded land was removed at the Preferred Options following further consideration of strategic site delivery. SF10 was therefore removed.</p> <p>Through consultation, site promoters re-submitted site but with a slightly different boundary (site 894) and a larger parcel, site 895, for consideration for housing.</p>	<p>N/a</p> <p>No change to PSC - Not allocated</p> <p>Officers stated that the site (874) was previously included as safeguarded land in the halted Publication Draft Local Plan. At that point the site passed the site selection criteria but further information was requested in order to demonstrate suitable access. Landscape impacts on the 4ha site were not considered to be a showstopper as the site is well contained, surrounded on two sides by existing residential and on the other two by mature hedgerows. The site is close to the village centre and can be accessed via Riverside Gardens. It is considered that visual impact on the wider landscape and setting of the village would be relatively limited.</p> <p>Officers suggested that that the site could be included with a total site area of 4.15 ha and up to 102 dwellings (70% @ 35dph). The site was not taken forward as an allocation following Executive in July 2017.</p>	<p>Not allocated</p> <p>No change to PPC.</p> <p>Following consultation and further consideration of evidence, officers still considered site 874 to be a potential for housing. Chnage was not taken forward by Members in January 2018.</p>	<p>Alternatives boundaries considered:</p> <p>297 – original submission</p> <p>802/874 – former SF10</p> <p>875 – larger boundary alternative submitted by site promoter.</p>
Site 789 – Land to the West of Beckside,	n/a	<p>Not allocated at PO Stage.</p> <p>Site 789 was</p>	<p>Site 789</p> <p>Although site passed criteria 1-4, the site</p>	<p>Site 789</p> <p>Not allocated.</p>	<p>N/a</p> <p>Not identified as an allocation.</p>	<p>N/a</p> <p>No change to PSC</p>	<p>Not allocated</p>	<p>No alternative boundaries</p>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
Elvington		submitted through Preferred Options consultation for consideration as residential or safeguarded land.	was rejected as a suitable site for residential use. Officers concluded that the development of this site would materially affect the character of the eastern boundary of the village. A landscape appraisal of landscape character/ features and visual impact is required. There is a strong field pattern and hedges. The site represents a considerable extension of the village into the surrounding countryside and would visually impact on a significant number of residential receptors and PROW. This could have a potentially detrimental impact on the conservation area, esp. Church Lane. Development of the could impact on Derwent Ings and would need further investigation.  Site was re-submitted by the land agent to promote the site.	Following re-submission, Technical Officers reassessed the site. Officers concluded that given that no further evidence submitted including landscape appraisal or visual impact assessment, there should be no change to conclusions at FSC. It is considered that the site would have a visual impact on a number of receptors and public rights of way and would constitute a considerable extension to Elvington into the surrounding countryside.	Representation received from planning agent OBO Landowner. Objects to rejection of the site for residential allocation or safeguarded land. No additional evidence submitted through PSC. No landscape or visual impact assessment including assessment of key views submitted as set out as part of previous Site Selection Paper reports. It is maintained that the development of this site would constitute a considerable extension to Elvington Village in a sensitive location which would impact on a number of sensitive residential receptors and a number of public right of ways (PROW's). Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.  Site re-submitted through consultation	Consideration of evidence by officers still have concerns in relation landscape. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.  Site resubmitted by site promoter through consultation.		
Site726 – Wheatlands, Poppleton	Separated sites submitted during Call for sites and amalgamated	Site ref 726  Failed criteria 4 for residential use.  Passed criteria for	N/a	N/a	N/a  Site was not included in the Preferred Sites consultation.  Separate parcels within site	N/a  No change to PSC - Not allocated.	Not allocated.	No reasonable alternative boundaries.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
	into 724	<p>employment use but not shortlisted for employment.</p> <p>Site was not taken forward for allocation.</p>			<p>726 re-submitted individually including 585, 687 886, 887 and 969.</p> <p>Officers consider that this site 887 (with developable area of 726 due to other allocations) provides a buffer between development at North minster Business Park and the A1237. Allowing built development to stretch closer to the western boundary of the ring road would increase the feeling of urbanisation in this area. The development of this open area would significantly reduce the gap between the Ring Road and what in effect would become the southern edge of Poppleton village. Development of this area would consolidate development in this area</p> <p>Potential access to the site is proposed from two points on Northfield Lane. Further traffic assessments would need to be carried out as to the impact any potential site would have on the existing road network and in particular the junction with the A59 and the A59/A1237 roundabout. Any study would also need to take account the use of the road and the proposed expansion of Northminster Business Park.</p> <p>The site is some distance from Poppleton village and associated facilities including shops, GP surgery and primary school.</p> <p>Officers consider that the site</p>	<p>Consideration of response to PSC not accepted on the basis that part of the site is already allocated for employment use. However, parcel 726 passes revised criteria 1-4 assessment.</p> <p>Site 887 (overall parcel for whole triangular wedge) re-submitted for consideration.</p>		



Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
					<p>should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Site 887 resubmitted by site promoter.</p>			
Site 840 – South of Designer Outlet	N/a	N/a	<p>N/a</p> <p>Not allocated.</p> <p>Site submitted through FSC for consideration for strategic housing. Site partially fails within Criteria 1 Historic Character and Setting. Remaining land failed Technical Officer comments.</p>	N/a Not allocated.	N/a	<p>Site 840</p> <p>Not allocated</p>	Not allocated.	No reasonable alternatives.
Site 859 – North of Escrick	<p>Site 183</p> <p>Submitted through Call for sites. 9.7 ha.</p>	<p>Site 183</p> <p>Not allocated</p> <p>Site failed criteria 4.</p> <p>Site resubmitted for use. Asked to check access to services as outside of authority boundary.</p>	<p>Site 183</p> <p>Site re-run through criteria assessment. Passed criteria 4. The site is considered potentially suitable for development however there are issues regarding footpaths / public right of ways into Escrick, connectivity with the rest of the village, sustainable transport access, drainage and noise impacts from the A19. It is considered that the site area should be reduced to follow the field boundary in line with the existing extent of the buildings along the A19 so that</p>	<p>Site 859</p> <p>Site allocated or safeguarded land. (SF15 – 10ha).</p> <p>Land identified as SF15 on the proposals map be safeguarded to meet potential housing need beyond the plan period. Part of the land was identified as a potential housing allocation in the Further Sites Consultation (with the remaining site area safeguarded), though as a consequence of technical issues set out below, the decision has been made to safeguard the whole site area. The site is also located on the boundary of York</p>	<p>Site 859</p> <p>Safeguarded land was removed at the Preferred Options following further consideration of strategic site delivery. SF10 was therefore removed.</p> <p>Site re-submitted for consideration or safeguarded land by the site promoter</p>	<p>Site 859</p> <p>Not allocated</p> <p>The site was previously included in the halted Publication Draft Local Plan (2014) as safeguarded land to reflect the position of Selby District Council and their emerging allocations given its location on the boundary between City of York and the Selby district area. The site passes the site selection methodology and there are no showstoppers identified through the technical officer assessment.</p> <p>Officers suggest that the site could be included as an allocation for the post plan period (2033-2038) to reflect the current uncertainty</p>	<p>Site 859</p> <p>No allocated</p> <p>Following consideration of consultation responses, officers also pursued conversation with Selby District Council who have confirmed that they do not support the allocation</p>	No reasonable alternatives.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
			the development area is more proportional to the size of the existing village and also to reduce the impact on the gap preventing coalescence between Escrick and Deighton (site 859).	and Selby districts .The Council is conscious that given this location it is important that any decision should reflect Selby's planning policy context including the fit with their spatial approach and plan. Given the current position with Selby's plan it seems most appropriate to Safeguard the land at this point.		around the position of the emerging Plan Selby. Site was not taken forward for allocation by Members in July 2017.  Site re-submitted for consideration or safeguarded land by the site promoter		
Site 964 – Galtres Garden Village	N/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Site 891 /922  Not allocated  Sit e891 submitted through PSC was for 38.7ha and up to 953 dwellings. The site passes the first 3 site selection criteria but based on this boundary fails the sustainable access criteria (4a and 4b) not meeting the minimum scoring threshold for residential sites. The location of the site adjacent to the A1237 means it currently has very limited access to existing services and does not attain the minimum score required to be considered further as a potential residential site.  A revised submission (site 922) was submitted post consultation for consideration. This extends the site to 78.8ha (up to 1500 dwellings) and includes the provision of a pedestrian and cycle footbridge over the A1237 which would potentially improve its access	Site 891/922  Not allocated  Officers considered that both proposals for Galtres Village site is located directly adjacent to the A1237 and it is considered that the site boundary and layout reflects neither an urban extension or a separate settlement or 'garden village'. It is not considered that the site reflects the urban form of York which is a compact city surrounded by a 'clock face' of smaller independent villages. This also reflects previous consultation comments received from statutory consultees including Historic England. Whilst it is accepted that the revised masterplan includes a widened landscape buffer to the A1237 it is not considered it provides an adequate setting for the site. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.	Site 964  Not allocated  Following further consideration of responses for a revised boundary (site 964), officers considered that there remained concerns regarding landscape, access and ecology. However, given the new location of the site, it was considered to have reduced significant concerns and there was more potential for mitigation. Therefore officers included the site as a potential for allocation recognising the risks that this was a revised boundary. The site was not taken forward by Members at Executive January	No reasonable alternative boundaries.

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
					to existing facilities within the Huntington area.	A revised site submission (site 964) was submitted through the consultation superseding previous boundaries.	2018.	
Site 220 – West of Knapton	Site submitted for consideration in call for sites.	Site 220 Not allocated. Site fails criteria 4 assessment	Site 220 Site resubmitted for consideration at PO stage but no evidence. Site continues to fail criteria 4.	N/a Not allocated	Site 220 Not allocated at PSC. Revised scoring of criteria 1-4 means site now passes criteria 4 and included as a reasonable alternative. Site re-submitted for residential use through the consultation.	Site 220 Not allocated. Previously rejected site. Representation received from planning agent OBO landowner. Site resubmitted for residential and confirmation that site is considered to be suitable and deliverable. No additional technical evidence submitted as part of the representation. Site is isolated and does not have sustainable access to services or public transport. Development of the site would compromise the setting of York and of Knapton village consisting of a significant intrusion into open countryside. Not considered a suitable site for residential development.  Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.	Not allocated No change to PSC	No reasonable alternative boundaries.
Site 864 – Land to the north of Elvington Industrial estate.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Site 864. New site submitted through PSC for consideration as an additional employment site to the north of the existing Elvington Industrial Estate. Site is 5.4ha and is currently in agricultural use (Grade 3). The site can be accessed from the north of the existing	Site 864 Not allocated. The site passes the site selection methodology and technical officers consider that there are no showstoppers to the potential development of this site. The site could provide	Site 864 Not allocated. Following further consideration if evidence and responses at PPC consultation, officers identified that the site remains as a	Reasonable alternative boundaries. 864

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
					<p>industrial estate. The existing industrial estate benefits from a very high level of occupancy which demonstrates that this location is sound commercially and evidence from local estate agents suggests there is an unmet demand for additional employment floorspace in this area.</p>	<p>additional employment land to help to increase flexibility over the Local Plan period in an attractive location for employment uses. The site boundaries are clearly defined by mature hedgerows and the site is well screened. Officers suggest that consideration is given to this potential new allocation of 5.4ha to provide approximately 17,820 sqm of floorspace for B2, B8 uses. The ratio of land to floorspace reflects further evidence submitted on out of centre employment plot ratios across the city. These are approximately 3,300 sqm of floorspace per ha. Potential site taken forward by Members in July 2017.</p>	<p>potential employment site. No change was made to include the site by Members in January 2018.</p>	
629 – The Retreat	<p>Site 629 Historic site considered.</p>	<p>Site 629 Not allocated at Preferred Options as no willing landowner.</p>	<p>Site 629 N/a</p>	<p>n/a Not allocated</p>	<p>Site 861/862 Site submitted through Preferred Sites consultation. The site was submitted for residential development mixed with potential for relocation of the existing mental health facility. No technical evidence submitted as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Site 861/862 Not allocated Officer identified that the site is very sensitive in relation to heritage assets and landscape. All of the buildings on the site are within a conservation area for The Retreat and the site contains listed buildings. The conservation area is based on the openness of the area and the existing buildings and their setting. All of the site to the south of existing buildings is designated as part of Green Wedge C3 and the site is very important in contributing to the openness and feel of that green wedge as well as it playing an important role in</p>	<p>Site 861 Not allocated. No change to PSC position.</p>	<p>Reasonable alternatives 629 861</p>

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
						<p>terms of biodiversity. All of the site is sensitive in terms of its impact on heritage and landscape. The area closest to the road has views of the Wolds and is prominent in how it can be perceived. The sports ground and area to the north form plateaus. Even though the site is walled the higher areas offer views in and out of the area which contribute to a sense of openness which needs to be preserved. All of the cemetery, sports facilities and burial ground form part of the setting of Walmgate stray.</p> <p>It would be impossible to retain the landscape character of the area if new buildings were added. The area to the south is not just one big field but contains many different elements, it merges with the adjacent university land and creates good landscape flow into this and grazing land. There could be some support for retaining and converting existing buildings to the North but it would be difficult to define a green belt boundary around this. The entire site is currently within the greenbelt and needs to remain so. Due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City it is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes and not as an</p>		

Strategic Sites	Submitted boundary	Preferred Options stage (2013)	Further Sites Consultation (2014)	Local Plan Publication draft (aborted 2014)	Preferred Sites Consultation (2016)	Pre-Publication Draft (2017)	Publication draft (2018)	Boundary Alternatives
						allocation in the Local Plan. Officers consider that the site should not be included as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.		

## Appendix K: Part 3 – All Sites Audit Trail

All of the sites which passed criteria 1 to 4 in the site selection process were considered reasonable but some were not chosen as allocations. Between Pre-Publication consultation 2017 and Publication 2018 the list of reasonable sites has been subject to further technical officer analysis which included updates to availability and deliverability, analysis of further evidence in relation to show stoppers and technical officer comments. The following table summarises this information.

**Table K.3.1 General Housing Alternatives passing Criteria 1 to 4**

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
6	Land adjacent to Greystone Court, Haxby, York	3.486	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H37		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee in July 2017 or Jan 2018.
8	Land North of Church Lane	1.744	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 903 - Previous allocation H34		N/A
11	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	3.145	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
13	Buffet Depot/Wheldrake Station and SE6744 ID sheet OS6247	4.786	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H49 now reasonable alt to ST33	ST33	Rejected – The Site was rejected due to an alternative boundary being selected – See Appendix K Part 2
22	The Stables Elvington	1.58	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As SP1	SP1	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the Gypsy and Traveller use.
25	Sessions of York	0.466	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
30	Land at Intake Lane Dunnington	0.749	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected at technical officer comments as it is an isolated site separated from Dunningtons main urban area.
35	Land Adj Hull Road - Grimston Bar	7.54	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST4	ST4	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for. See Appendix k Part 2.
37	Ford Garage Jockey Lane	1.665	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for Retail only		N/A
45	Grain Stores	7.727	No	Unreasonable - Under Construction	ST3	See aneex K Part 2
49	Land at Brecks Lane, Strensall	3.94	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H27		Rejected - The site was rejected due to impacts on landscape.
55	Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington, York	4.055	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H26		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and cultural heritage impacts.
58	Askham Bar Park and Ride Site	1.574	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H8	H8	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and is a brownfield site in a sustainable location for housing development.
59	Heworth Lighthouse	0.29	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H22 - with Permission	H22	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing in a sustainable location.
64	Land at Layerthorpe and James St	0.228	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation E4 - Housing Allocation H55	H55	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a brownfield for housing site in a sustainable location.
69	62 Mill lane Wigginton	0.393	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - Site was rejected as under threshold
72	Water Tower Land Dunnington	4.585	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H33		Rejected – The Site was rejected due to impacts on the landscape and cultural heritage.
74	York Road, Dunnington	6	No	Unreasonable –Isolated from Village		N/A



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
76	Duncombe Farm, Strensall	34.35	No	Unreasonable - to protect the regional green corridor any development would be separated from the main urban area by over 250m		N/A
80	Land north of Woodland Chase, York	0.367	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
83	Land at Main Street, Knapton	0.329	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H53	H53	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for housing in Knapton.
95	North of Church lane Elvinton	0.917	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H39	H39	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing as a natural extension to the village and in a sustainable location close to local facilities.
98	Grove House EPH	0.246	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H23	H23	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site in a sustainable location.
99	Woolnough House EPH	0.293	Yes	Reasonable - Previously allocated As H21		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.
120	Beckfield Lane former HWS	0.487	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
121	Burnholme School	2.476	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 853 - Alternative boundary to H3		N/A
124	Oakhaven EPH	0.333	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H20	H20	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site in a sustainable location
125	Morrell House EPH	0.232	No	Reasonable - Previously allocated As H51		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
127	Lowfields former school site	3.64	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H5	H5	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing with Brownfield redevelopment opportunities in a sustainable location.
130	Land at Acomb Waterworks	1.076	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected due to unsuitable adjacent uses and flood risk concerns
131	Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	5.498	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST13		Rejected - The site was rejected due to adverse impacts of achieving suitable access to the site. See appendix K part 2
132	Land at Cherry Lane	0.902	No	Unreasonable - to protect nature conservation the issues the remaining developable area is covered by site 947 - Alt boundary to Previous allocation H2b		N/A
137	Land at Heworth Croft	1.69	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation SH1	SH1	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for specialist housing.
138	York St John University playing field	4.75	Yes	Unreasonable - Alternative boundary to H56		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
148	The Moor Lane 'Zero Carbon' Partnership	16.865	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST10 –		Rejected - land pending further investigations into impacts on Askham Bogg SSSI – See Appendix K Part 2
163	Hudson House	0.676	Yes	Reasonable - With Permission		Rejected – Preferred Used would have been employment – however site now has planning permission for office to residential conversion
166	Land at Moor Lane	2.648	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H29	H29	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for housing.
170	Pond Field	5.706	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected primarily due to the landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
171	Lime tree Farm	0.755	No	Unreasonable - to protect openspace the only remaining developable area contains existing structures		N/A
172	Bootham Cresnet Football Stadium	1.721	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H7	H7	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for redevelopment for housing.
179	Whiteland Field	1.386	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H54		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns around deliverability in light of electricity lines crossing the site buffer required to railway line.
180	Malton Road site, york	1.938	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H50		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts.
181	Land East of Grimston Bar	5.7	No	Unreasonable - remaining area same as 847 – Alternative boundary to ST6		See Appendix K Part 2
182	Old School Playing Field	2.74	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H46	H46	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a well contained site in the landscape in a sustainable location.
183	Land to the North of Escrick	9.66	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 859		See appendix K part 2
185	Land to the South of Tadcaster Road	7.578	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST31	ST31	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See appendix K part 2
187	Open Pasture Land North of Stockton Lane	5.91	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST30		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts See appendix K Part 2
189	Monks Cross North	18.821	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by		N/A
191	Land North of Avon Drive		No	Unreasonable – Superseded by site 968		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
192	Land RO Stockton lane off Greenfield Park Drive	0.767	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H12		Rejected – Site was rejected due to access concerns however site now has planning consent.
193	West Fields Copmanthorpe	0.82	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H40		Rejected – Site was rejected due to concerns regarding the impact on the greenbelt and ability to establish robust boundaries
194	Manor Farm Yard	0.254	No	Unreasonable - No Willing Landowner - Previous allocation H43		N/A
197	Bristows Garage	0.217	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for Retail only		N/A
200	Severus Hill	1.126	No	Unreasonable- Sinc in the middle of the site does not allow logical parcel for development.		N/A
202	St Joseph's Monastery	2.615	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
220	Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton	9.535	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to not having sustainable access to services or public transport and development would compromise setting of York and Knapton village – See appendix K part 2
226	Site A Land off Main Street Nether Poppleton	3.147	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are awould be over 350m away from the urban edge		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
227	Site B - land off Ouse Moor Lane Nether Poppleton	0.701	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historical character and setting of York the remaining land would be a thin 20m wide undevelopable strip separated from the urban edge by over 250m		N/A
229	Land west of Beckside, Elvington and land parcel SE6947 6854 & 70	4.439	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as failed technical officer comments, overlaps with site 789 and has the same landscape and visual impact concerns
247	Land at Wilberforce Home	2.052	Yes	Reasonable – Alternative boundary to H6		Rejected – Site was rejected as alternative boundary was selected to protect the amenity and views of residents of the existing care adjacent care facility
271	Land alongside A64	0.592	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 786		N/A
293	York Central	67.955	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 989 - Alternative Boundary to ST5		See Appendix K Part 2
295	Amalgomated Sites at British Sugar	40.697	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST1	ST1	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
297	Amalgomated Sites off main Street Elvington	8.21	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 874 and 875		See Appendix K part 2
298	Amalgomated Sites at Connaught Court Care Home	2.174	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H47 - With Permission		Rejected – Site rejected as now has planning consent

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
300	Amalgomated sites Eastfield Lane, Dunnington	2.512	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 930 - Alternative Boundary to H31		N/A
303	Amalgomated sites off Stockton Lane	2.384	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area would be over 250m away from the urban edge		N/A
305	Amalgomated sites South of Haxby	3.486	No	Unreasonable - Developable area covered by site 6?Alternative Boundary previous allocation H37		N/A
307	Amalgomated sites at James Street	0.225	Yes	Reasonable - Previously allocated E5 – Part with Permission	E5	Rejected - Site rejected as part of site now has consent for 102 student units and remainder is under threshold.
308	Amalgomated sites RO Wilberforce Home/York College	2.052	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is considered entirely by Ste 247 - Alternative Boundary to H6		N/A
317	Amalgomated Sites North of Moor Lane Woodthorpe	1.35	No	Unreasonable – remaining developable area covered by site 791 - Part previous allocation H9		N/A
318	Amalgomated Sites at Layerthorpe	0.638	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
320	Amalgomated Sites at New Lane Huntington	13.757	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST11		Rejected - The site was rejected due to impacts on landscape and cultural heritage - See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
321	Amalgomated sites at Millfield lane/A59	11	No	Unreasonable – part built out - Superseded by Site 910 – Alternative boundary to ST2		See Appendix K Part 2
322	Amalgomated sites South of Strensall	2.532	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H30		Rejected - The site was rejected due to access concerns.
327	Amalgomated sites between Knapton and Westfield	0.324	No	Unreasonable - remaining area same as site 779		N/A
329	Amalgomated sites North of Monks Cross	70.682	No	Unreasonable - Amalgomated Boudnary - no willing landowner for whole site - Alternative Boundary to ST8		See Appendix K Part 2
456	Hungate	2.43	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by site 829 – Alternative boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
470	Terrys Chocolate Factory	9.454	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 824 - Alternative Boundary to ST16		See Appendix K part 2
472	Former Gas Site 24 Heworth Green	3.536	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H1	H1	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site for housing with good access to services and facilities.
485	Nestle South	7.129	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 931 and 932 - Alternative Boundary to ST17		See Appendix K part 2
560	Brecks Lane, Huntington	5.25	No	Unreasonable – Development Completed. Previously Allocated as ST28		See Appendix K part 2
579	Land adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane	0.202	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H45		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
580	Land at Blairgowrie House, Main Street	1.499	No	Unreasonable - superseded by Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan		N/A
587	Land at York RI Rugby Ground	0.412	No	Unreasonable - remaining land is the club house servicing the adjacent openspace		N/A
596	Land adj. 26 & 38 Church lane	0.547	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H41		N/A
597	Builders Yard, Church Lane	0.335	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H42		N/A
598	South of Moor Lane	2.671	No	Unreasonable - remaining land consists of an operational garden nursey and a thin strip of land. Historic site - no longer a willing landowner		N/A
618	Land RO Surgery & 2a/2b Petercroft Lane	0.233	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H44		N/A
623	Land Adjacent to Grimston Bar and A1079	13.293	No	Unreasonable		N/A
624	MOD Land Fulford	0.221	No	Unreasonable - Not Currently available		N/A
626	Land at Breary Close	0.323	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner		N/A
627	Land at frederick House East of Fulford	0.777	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H11		Rejected - the site was rejected due to heritage and access concerns.



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
629	The Retreat, Heslington Road	6.098	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - the site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
631	Burnholme WMC, Burnholme Drive	0.432	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
642	Elm Tree Garage Car Park	0.316	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
645	Land west of Haxby Road	1.223	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
649	Car park, High Newbiggin Street	0.605	No	Unreasonable - historical Site - no willing landowner		N/A
651	Heworth Green North (Forum Site)	0.209	No	Unreasonable - Part with permission and access. Remaining land under threshold		N/A
654	Land at Mill Mount	0.363	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H19		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the access and design concerns.
656	Barbican Centre	0.963	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H10	H10	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use for housing. The site is Brownfield in a sustainable location.
657	Peel St/ Margret St	0.408	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
660	Land at Marygate	0.506	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
677	Land RO Rufforth Primary School	0.988	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H38	H38	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a well contained site in a sustainable location.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
685	End of Great North Way, York Business park	2.978	No	Unreasonable - Under Construction		N/A
688	Land to the West of Knapton	5.6	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by 780 and 796		N/A
690	Amalgamated North of Haxby	24.906	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 823 and 846 - Alternative Boundary to ST9		See Appendix K Part 2
692	Amalgamated sites at New Lane Huntington	18.991	No	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST11		See Appendix K Part 2
696	Amalgamated sites off Tadcaster Road	3.486	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 947 and 988 - Alternative Boundary to Previous Site H2		N/A
697	Amalgamated Sites off Common Lane Dunnington	2.588	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated Site no willing landowner for combined site – site split by primary constraints leaving isolated parcels of land.		N/A
698	Amalgomated Sites at Clifton Moor		No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by further evidence and later submissions. See Site 948. Alternative boundary to ST14		See Appendix K part 2
699	Amalgomated Development Sites East of metcalf Lane	96.858	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated site without willing landowner for whole areas - Alternative Boundary to ST7		See Appendix K part 2
700	Amalgamated Site Monks Cross Shopping Park	0.649	No	Unreasonable - willing landowner for retail only		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
719	Terrys Carpark	0.862	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST16	ST16a	Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for redevelopment in a sustainable location if sensitively designed. See Appendix K Part 2
723	Amalgamated Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe	29.137	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside – See appendix K Part 2
724	Amalgamated sites North Monks Cross Inc Cement Works	20.563	No	Unreasonable - superceeded by ST8 submissions – Previously allocated as ST18		See Appendix K part 2
725	Castle Piccadilly	0.491	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 955 - Alternative Boundary to ST20		See Appendix K part 2
726	Wheatlands	6.785	Yes	Reasonable		Reacted – The sites was rejected due to impact on landscape, cultural heritage and access constraints – See Appendix K Part 2
727	South of A64		No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by further evidence and later submissions. See site 851. Alternative boundary to ST15		See Appendix K part 2
737	Stockhill Field	1.857	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
738	Land on South side of Intake Lane, Dunnington	0.829	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
742	Upper Poppleton Garden Centre	2.759	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As E16 (Former H57)		Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for employment redevelopment in a sustainable location

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
744	Bull Balks	1.593	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to heritage/landscape and sustainable transport concerns
748	Adjacent Stamford Bridge Road Dunnington	0.926	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to heritage/landscape and sustainable transport concerns
749	North of Riverside Gardens	1.472	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 874		N/A
757	Haxby Hall EPH	0.423	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H48		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.
758	Broad Highway Wheldrake	0.668	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to potential impact on the greenbelt boundary
763	Land West of Upper Poppleton	10.631	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 200m away from the urban edge		N/A
764	Poppleton South	117.039	No	Unreasonable – mostly covered by land submitted for Northminster business park		N/A
773	Land North of Skelton Village	31.057	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 350m away from the urban edge		N/A
775	East of Station Road, Poppleton	0.232	No	Unreasonable - remaining area is the same as assessed through Site 923 - duplicate		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
779	South of Boroughbridge Road	5.75	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST29		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K Part 2
786	London Bridge Site 1B	6.796	No	Unreasonable - Inaccessible for housing		N/A
789	Land to the West of Becksid Elvington	5.754	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K Part 2
791	East and West of Askham lane Acomb	1.355	Yes	Reasonable - Part previous allocation H9		Rejected - Site was rejected due to defendable boundary and greenbelt concerns
792	Land off Askham Lane	1.29	No	Unreasonable – Remaining developable area completely covered by site 791 - Part previous allocation H9		N/A
799	Designer Outlet	18.32	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for retail only		N/A
800	Safeguarded Land SF7 Land South of Designer Outlet	14.501	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST25		Rejected – The site was rejected due to concerns regarding the potential impact on the greenbelt – See Appendix K Part 2
802	Land at Elvington Village	4.037	No	Unreasonable – Superceded by Site 874		See Appendix K part 2
804	Water Lane Caravan Park, Clifton, York	2.011	No	Unreasonable - Existing traveller site		N/A
806	Osbalwick Caravan Site, Outgang Lane, Osbalwick	0.641	No	Unreasonable - Existing traveller site		N/A
809	Wilberforce Home	0.521	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for openspace and landscaping only		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
810	East of Earswick	97.24	No	Unreasonable - No Longer a Willing Landowner site withdrawn		N/A
811	Dunnington Extention	5.141	No	Unreasonable – Officer defined boundary - No willing landowner		N/A
814	North of Haxby	30.28	No	Unreasonable – Officer defined boundary - No willing landowner		N/A
819	Acres Farm, Naburn	3.838	No	Unreasonable – Developable area covered entirely by site 800		N/A
820	Between Poppleton and A1237	0.258	No	Unreasonable - remaining area is the same as assessed through Site 923 - duplicate		N/A
821	Whinthorpe New Settlement	327.8	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by Further Evidence - Alternative boundary to ST15		N/A
822	North of Clifton Moor	135.378	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by Further Evidence - Alternative Boundary to ST14		N/A
823	North of Haxby	35.158	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST9	ST9	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – Appendix K Part 2
824	Terrys Chocolate Factory	9.443	Yes	Reasonable - Mostly developed out but part remaining relates to planning application - Allocated as ST16	ST16	Selected – The site passes CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated – This boundary has been chosen to depict the allocation on the proposals map but see also sites 719 and 927 for and b parcels. See appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
826	Companthorpe (safeguarded)	22.216	No	Unreasonable – without the development of site 131 (former ST13) this site would be isolated from the urban development of Copmanthorpe		N/A
827	Water Tower, Dunnington	1.658	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H33		Rejected - Due to impacts on the landscape and cultural heritage.
828	Land at Hull Road	3.985	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H56	H56	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable for housing in a sustainable location with Brownfield redevelopment opportunities.
829	Hungate	3.094	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 929 - Previously allocated as E1 and MU1 now Alternative Boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
832	RO the square Tadcaster Road	1.52	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H6	H6	Selected- The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for specialised housing.
835	Harewood Whin (for Solar)	99.957	No	Unreasonable - Unreasonable - built out for alternative purposes		N/A
840	South of the Designer Outlet, West of the A19	87.471	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as failed technical officer comments – See appendix K Part 2
842	Land North of Monks Cross	0.442	No	Unreasonable - Entirely considered within 849 - Alternative Boundary to ST8		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
845	Land to the South of Graystone Court	3.488	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is the same as for site 6 - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation H37		N/A
846	North of Haxby PO submitted boundary (amending 690)	26.094	No	Unreasonable - Developable area already covered by site 823 - Alternative Boundary to ST9		See Appendix K Part 2
847	Safeguarded Land North of Grimston Bar SF13 Officer agreed boundary (amending 181)	5.536	No	Unreasonable - Updated evidence shows access to site is a showstopper - Previous allocation ST6		See Appendix K Part 2
848	Land to the West of Wigginton Road	55.57	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST14	ST14	The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K part 2
849	Revised north of Monks Cross	39.307	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST8	ST8	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
850	Amalgamated east of Metcalfe lane	34.475	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST7	ST7	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K Part 2
851	Land to the west of Elvington lane	159.159	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST15	ST15	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K Part 2
853	Revised Burnholme School	4.021	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H3	H3	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing in a sustainable location.



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
854	Revised Lowfields School	2.232	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to H5		Rejected - The site was rejected in preference of the larger site boundary
855	Amalgamated sites at Wheldrake	5.813	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST33	ST33	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
856	Amalgamated sites south of Tadcaster Road	8.154	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated site – no response from landowner on area to the south – therefore superceded by site 185 - Alternative Boundary to ST31		See Appendix K part 2
859	FSC Proposed Housing Allocation North of Escrick	6.08	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - suggested as an allocation for the post plan period (2033-2038) to reflect the current uncertainty around the position of the emerging Plan Selby however was not taken forward for allocation by Members in July 2017.
861	The Retreat South	3.323	Yes	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining area is covered by site 629		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
862	The Retreat North	2.613	Yes	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining area is covered by site 629		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
867	The Derwent Arms Osbaldwick	0.994	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to cultural heritage impacts and ecological and landscape concerns.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
872	ST12 alternative boundary	14.693	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside
874	Riverside Gardens Elvington	4.23	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward as an allocation following Executive in July 2017 or Jan 2018 - See Appendix K part 2
875	Land beyond Riverside Gardens	11.471	No	Unreasonable – Separated from the urban area – reliant on 874 being developed before could be considered		N/A
877	ST15 alternative	186.297	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
878	Land at Victoria Farm Close Ruffoth	0.953	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward as an allocation following Executive in July 2017.
879	Land off Maythorpe Ruffoth	0.666	Yes	Reasonable		
880	ST10 Alternative Boundary	16.839	No	Unreasonable - remaining boundary same as Site 148 - duplicate		N/A
881	Land to the North of Escrick with additional Biodiversity Area	11.421	No	Unreasonable – remaining developable area entirely considered under site 859		N/A
885	Minster Equine Veterinary Clinic	0.385	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The rejected for housing and considered as employment reasonable alternative.
886	South of Wyevale garden Centre	4.422	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts and distance from services and facilities.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
887	Land East of Northfield Lane	12.113	No	Unreasonable – Remaining developable area is considered entirely within site 779		N/A
888	Land North of Langwith Lakes	118.355	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		
890	Luigis	0.207	No	Unreasonable – Considered under wider boundary of 953		N/A
891	Galtres Garden Village	31.485	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 922		See Appendix K part 2
899	York Road Dunnington Reduced Boundary	0.743	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
901	Land between The Village and the railway line Strensall	1.655	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previously allocated site H30		Rejected – Failed Technical Officer Comments
903	North Lane Skelton	1.655	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to Previous Allocation H34		Rejected – Due to heritage and access concerns
905	ST8 Alternative boundary	49.674	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
906	York Central PSC Boundary	72.464	Yes	Reasonable - Superseded by Site 989 - Alternative Boundary to ST5		Rejected – The site was rejected in preference for an alternative boundary - See Appendix K Part 2
908	Extended Land to the Rear of Rufforth Primary	2.412	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to H38		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
910	Civil Service Sports Ground	10.433	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST2	ST2	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
911	ST7 Alternative	49.649	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 986 – Alternative boundary to ST7		N/A
913	ST8 Alt with nature reserve to east and sports to west	59.471	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
914	ST8 Alt with Land to North and nature Reserve to east	71.888	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
915	ST14 Alt Option 1 1350 Homes	66.89	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
916	ST14 Alt Option 2 1725 Homes	74.935	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by 974 - Alternative Boundary to ST14		N/A
918	Graham Newcombe Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Area 2	0.291	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by later boundary submission from MOD		N/A
919	Graham Newcombe Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Area 3	0.338	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by later boundary submission from MOD		N/A
922	Extended Galtres Village	76.017	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 964		See Appendix K part 2
923	Phase 1 Land East of Station Road South of Railway Poppleton	0.515	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and cultural heritage concerns.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
924	ST15 Langwith and Elvington Airfield PSC Submission	133.282	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 979 - Alternative Boundary to ST15		N/A
926	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	2.675	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previously allocated site H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee in Jan 2018
927	Land to the South of Terrys	1.183	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST16	ST16b	Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for employment redevelopment in a sustainable location See Appendix K Part 2
929	Revised Hungate Boundary	2.58	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST32	ST32	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K Part 2
930	Revised Eastfield Lane Dunnington	2.365	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H31	H31	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for.
931	Former Almond and Cream blocks ST17a	2.352	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST17a	ST17a	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K part 2
932	Nestle SOuth ST17b	4.744	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST17b	ST17b	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K part 2
933	ST7 Alt boundary	93.912	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 986 - Alternative Boundary to ST7		N/A
934	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 1	29.911	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST35	ST35	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for allocation as a strategic housing site. The site offers partial Brownfield - See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
935	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 2	0.755	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Failed Technical Officer comments given site is dominated by existing church structure
936	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 3	0.206	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H59	H59	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for.
937	Main Imphal Barracks 1	19.887	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST36		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
938	Clifton Without Primary School	0.712	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H58	H58	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site for housing in a sustainable location.
939	Imphal Red Line Yellow fill 2	0.591	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
944	ST12 alternative boundary	17.612	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside
945	Willow House EPH PSC boundary	0.209	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 946 - Alternative Boundary to H52		N/A
946	Willow House EPH Post PSC	0.303	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H52	H52	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable partly Brownfield site for housing.
947	H2b Land at Cherry Lane	0.441	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H2b		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee July 2017 or Jan 2018
949	Land West of Wigginton Road Post PSC Officer Proposal	68.261	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
950	Land West of Elvington Lane Post PSC Officer Proposal	211.997	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by boundary 924 which excludes land needed by air museum		N/A
951	Main Imphal Barracks Officer Discussion	17.952	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST36	ST36	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
953	Poppleton Garden Centre Expanded	3.326	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to E16 (Previous H57)		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee July 2017 or Jan 2018
955	Castle Gateway	21.477	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST20	ST20	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents an area of opportunity for masterplanning a new gateway to the city - See Appendix K part 2
956	Milstone Avenue Rufforth	0.39	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected as was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
959	Land at Kettlestring Way	3.248	Yes	Reasonable		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
964	Galtres Garden Village	82.47	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward by Members at Executive January 2018 – See appendix K Part 2
965	Land South of Rufforth Airfield	1.585	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected as failed technical officer comments
967	Land to the North of North Lane Wheldrake	3.067	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
968	Land to the North of Avon Drive	2.763	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site rejected at technical officer comments - Landscape/setting concerns regarding the impact on openness and bringing development directly adjacent to the A1237.
969	Land East of Northfield Lane South of Wyevale	1.83	No	Unreasonable – Site considered as part of wider site 726		See appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
971	Land to the South of Southfields Road Strensall	0.309	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H30		Rejected – Site was rejected as fails technical officer comments
974	Alt PPC ST14 Option 1725 Homes	79.582	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
975	Alt PPC ST14 Option 2200 Homes	93.361	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
976	Site to the West of H39	1.693	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as fails technical officer comments
978	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall	28.926	No	Unreasonable - Site considered under ref 934 - Alternative boundary to ST35		N/A
979	ST15 Langwith PPC Submission	214.119	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
980	North of Haxby excluding Cemetery expansion land	29.656	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST9		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
981	ST7 PPC Alternative Boundary for 1225 Homes	55.658	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST7		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
984	ST15 Post PPD consultation alternative	193.025	Yes	Reasonable - Post Pub Draft Alt		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
985	ST15 Alternative PPC submission	163.402	No	Unreasonable - Area already covered by site 877 - no new developable area		N/A



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
986	ST7 Post PPC Officer Recommendation	47.637	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST7		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
987	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission	45.498	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST5		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
988	H2a potential allocation	2.289	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H2a		Site as was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
989	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission 2	82.833	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST5	ST5	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location – See Appendix K Part 2

**Table H.3 General Employment Reasonable Alternatives**

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
6	Land adjacent to Greystone Court, Haxby, York	3.486	No	Reasonable - Landowner is only willing for housing - Previous allocation H37		N/A
8	Land North of Church Lane	1.744	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 903 - Previous allocation H34		N/A
35	Land Adj Hull Road - Grimston Bar	7.540	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	ST4	N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
37	Ford Garage Jockey Lane	1.665	No	Unreasonable – land owner is only willing for retail – previously allocated as E3		N/A
45	Grain Stores	7.727	No	Unreasonable – Under Construction	ST3	N/A
58	Askham Bar Park and Ride Site	1.574	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	H8	N/A
59	Heworth Lighthouse	0.290	No	Unreasonable - Site has planning consent for Assisted living accommodation	H22	N/A
64	Land at Layerthorpe and James St	0.228	Yes	Reasonable	H55 Previous E4	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a brownfield site but is no longer needed for employment uses following further work on demand and supply and has a preferred use for housing – allocated as site H55
72	Water Tower Land Dunnington	4.585	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
74			NO			
76	Duncombe Farm, Strensall	34.350	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
80	Land north of Woodland Chase, York	0.367	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
91	Land south of Hackness Road	2.570	No	Unreasonable – Previously E17 - Now Considered Under ST19		See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
97	South of Airfield Business Park	15.100	Yes	Reasonable – See also Site 948 – Alternative boundary to ST26		Rejected - Site was rejected in favour of an alternative boundary - see appendix K Part 2
98	Grove House EPH	0.246	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	H23	N/A
99	Woolnough House EPH	0.293	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
101	Land at Earswick	3.076	No	Superceded by site 966		N/A
111	Back Lane Wetherby Road Knapton	Yes	No			N/A
120	Beckfield Lane former HWS	0.487	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
121	Burnholme School	2.476	No	Unreasonable - Site already has masterplan for housing and social functions		N/A
124	Oakhaven EPH	0.333	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	H20	N/A
127	Lowfields former school site	5.551	No		H5	N/A
130	Land at Acomb Waterworks	1.076	No			N/A
138	York St John University playing field	4.750	No	Unreasonable – Superceded by site 828 – Previously allocated as E16. Now allocated as H56		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
148	The Moor Lane 'Zero Carbon' Partnership	0.000	No	Unreasonable – Land Owner only willing for residential – Employment proposals only covered wider site submissions not within the developable area. Previously Allocated as ST10		N/A
160	Land at Grimston Bar	4.713	Yes	Reasonable –		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts as well as concerns over ability to access the site
161	Land at Murton Lane Industrial Estate	5.043	Yes	Reasonable –		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts as well as concerns over impact of access to the site and lack of sustainable transport modes
163	Hudson House	0.676	Yes	Unreasonable – The site has planning consent 14/02579/ORC 5/01256/FULM15/02965/ORC17 /00576/FULM		N/A
170	Pond Field	5.706	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
172	Bootham Crescent Football Stadium	1.721	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	H7	N/A
180	Malton Road site, York	1.938	No			N/A
185	Land to the South of Tadcaster Road	7.578	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	ST31	N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
192	Land RO Stockton lane off Greenfield Park Drive	0.767	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	H12	N/A
200	Severus Hill	1.126	No	Unreasonable- Sinc in the middle of the site does not allow logical parcel for development		N/A
202	St Joseph's Monastery	2.615	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
226	Site A Land off Main Street Nether Poppleton	3.147	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
227	Site B - land off Ouse Moor Lane Nether Poppleton	0.701	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing		N/A
244	Heslington West and East, University of York	57.393	No	Unreasonable – Most of site developed out - Landowner is only willing for Educations related purposes.		N/A
246	Whitehall Grange	10.246	Yes	Reasonable – with permission – Allocated as ST37	ST37	Selected – See appendix K Part 2
247	RO Wilberforce Home/York College	2.052	Yes	Unreasonable – Land Owner only willing for housing	H6	N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
289	Heslington West and East, University of York	38.560	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by 816/794/904/954		N/A
293	York Central	67.955	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by site 989 – Alternative boundary to ST5		N/A
295	Amalgomated Sites at British Sugar	40.697	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing	ST1	N/A
298	Amalgomated Sites at Connaught Court Care Home	2.174	No	Unreasonable - Land owner is only willing for housing – with permission		N/A
300	Amalgomated sites Eastfield Lane, Dunnington	2.512	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by site 910		N/A
302	Amalgomated site west of Chapelfields 1	0.000	No			N/A
305	Amalgomated sites South of Haxby	3.486	No	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is considered within site 6 – Previously allocated as H34		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
307	Amalgomated sites at James Street	0.077	Yes	Unreasonable – Part with permission for 102 student units and remainder under threshold – Previously E5		N/A
308	Amalgomated sites RO Wilberforce Home/York College	2.052	No			N/A
311	Amalgomated Sites South of Heslington	1.457	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 904/954		N/A
317	Amalgomated Sites North of Moor Lane Woodthorpe	1.350	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York any remaining developable area is completely covered by site 791 – Part previously allocated as H9		N/A
318	Amalgomated Sites at Layerthorpe	0.638	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
320	Amalgomated Sites at New Lane Huntington	13.757	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
322	Amalgomated sites South of Strensall	2.532	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing – Previously allocated as H30		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
329	Amalgomated sites North of Monks Cross	70.682	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
456	Hungate	2.43	No	Unreasonable – Superceded by site 829 – Alternative boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
457	(Remaining) Land West of Metcalfe Lane	34.59	No	Unreasonable – Site has existing planning consent. Previously allocated ST23		See Appendix K part 2
458	Germany Beck Site East of Fordlands Road	21.90	No	Unreasonable – Site has existing planning consent. Previously allocated ST22		See Appendix K part 2
461	York College Tadcaster road	10.32	No	Unreasonable – Development Completed. Previously allocated ST24		See Appendix K part 2
472	Former Gas Site 24 Heworth Green	3.536	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing – Allocated as H1	H1	N/A
485	Nestle South	7.129	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by 931 and 932 - Alternative Boundary to ST17		N/A
565	Land at the Mews, Strensall	0.996	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
577	South of Great North Way, York Business Park	0.571	No	Unreasonable - Already developed		N/A
579	Land adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane	0.202	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
580	Land at Blairgowrie House, Main St	1.499	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
588	Land West of Chapelfields	0.000	No			N/A
589	The Paddock Acomb Grange	0.000	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
596	Land adj. 26 & 38 Church lane	0.547	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A
598	South of Moor Lane	2.671	No			N/A
599	Wheldrake Industrial Estate	1.183	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner – Previously E7	ST33	N/A
600	Wheldrake Industrial Estate	0.449	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as E8	E8	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use.
601	Elvington Park	0.809	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A
602	Elvington Industrial Estate	0.997	No	Reasonable – Allocated As E9	E9	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use
603	Land at Airfield Business Park, Elvington	0.295	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A
604	Land to west of Elvington Airfield Business Park	1.377	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
605	Site E, Airfield Industrial Estate, Elvington	0.394	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A
618	Land RO Surgery & 2a/2b Petercroft Lane	0.233	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing Landowner – Previous Allocation -		N/A
624	MOD Land Fulford	0.221	No			N/A
626	Land at Breary Close	0.323	No	Unreasonable – historic Site – No willing Landowner		N/A
627	Land at frederick House East of Fulford	0.777	No			N/A
629	The Retreat, Heslington Road	6.098	No	Unreasonable – Landowner only willing for housing		N/A
631	Burnholme WMC, Burnholme Drive	0.432	No	Unreasonable – Site already developed		N/A
634	Cement Works, Monks Cross	1.044	No	Unreasonable – Already developed		N/A
635	Land north of Monks Cross Drive		No	Unreasonable – Development Complete – Previously E2		
638	New Lane Monks Cross	4.407	No	Unreasonable – Historic Site – No willing landowner		N/A
639	Annamine Nurseries	1.038	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as E11	E11	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
649	Car park, High Newbiggin Street	0.605	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
651	Heworth Green North (Forum Site)	0.209	No	Unreasonable - Part with permission and access. Remaining land under threshold		N/A
654	Land at Mill Mount	0.363	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
656	Barbican Centre	0.963	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing	H10	N/A
657	Peel St/ Margret St	0.408	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
660	Land at Marygate	0.506	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
661	Marygate Car Park, access from Hetherton's Street	0.000	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
669	Site at James Street	0.165	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site – Development Complete		N/A
682	Land Adjacent to the designer Outlet	28.9		Unreasonable – To protect the historic Character and Setting of York remaining developable area is covered by Site 800		See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
684	York Business Park		No	Unreasonable – Development Complete Previously E12		N/A
685	End of Great North Way, York Business park	2.978	No	Unreasonable – Under Construction – Previously E13	E13	N/A
686	Site to south in York Business park	0.205	Yes	Reasonable -		Rejected site passed the CYC site selection criteria but is the only opportunity to provide safeguarded land for a future rail station to support ST1 should it be required.
689	Amalgamated Land around Northminster Business park	55.276	No	Unreasonable – Amalgamated Site no willing landowner for while site – superseded by later submissions. Previously allocated as SF8/St19		See Appendix K part 2
692	Amalgamated sites at New Lane Huntington	18.991	No	Unreasonable – superseded by Site 320 and landowner only willing for housing		N/A
694	Amalgamated sites adj Designer Outlet	15.107	No	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is the same as site 800		N/A
695	Amalgamated extension sites to York Designer Outlet Centre	2.811	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by site 799		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
700	Amalgamated Site Monks Cross Shopping Park	0.649	No	Unreasonable - this is an amalgamation of smaller parcels all of which individually are under threshold		N/A
706	Chessingham Park remaining land	0.233	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as E10	E10	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use
723	Amalgamated Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe	29.137	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
724	Amalgamated sites North Monks Cross Inc Cement Works	20.563	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by further work on ST8 – Previously Allocated as ST18		See Appendix K part 2
725	Castle Piccadilly	0.491	No	Superseded by site 955 – Alternative boundary for ST20		N/A
726	Wheatlands	6.785	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The sites was rejected due to impact on landscape, cultural heritage and access constraints – See Appendix K Part 2
742	Upper Poppleton Garden Centre	2.759	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as E16	E16	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use
794	Revised University Expansion	66.63	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 852 - Alternative boundary to ST27		See Appendix K Part 2
795	Greenacres	1.353	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward by executive in July 2018 or Jan 2018

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
799	Designer Outlet	18.320	No	Unreasonable – site is existing retail use. Previously ST21		See Appendix K part 2
800	Safeguarded Land SF7 Land South of Designer Outlet	14.501	Yes	Reasonable	ST25	Rejected – The site was rejected subject Concerns about impact on the greenbelt – See Appendix K Part 2
810	East of Earswick	97.240	No			N/A
816	Heslington East University Campus and new extension	32.844	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 852 - Alternative boundary to ST27		See Appendix K Part 2
824	Terrys Chocolate Factory	9.443	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing	ST16	N/A
829	Hungate	3.09	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by Site 929 – employment portion already developed out Previously allocated as E1/MU2 – Alternative boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
840	South of the Designer Outlet, West of the A19	87.471	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected as it failed technical officer comments

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
847	Safeguarded Land North of Grimston Bar SF13 Officer agreed boundary (amending 181)	5.536	No	Unreasonable – Transport access now understood to be a showstopper – Previously allocated at St6		N/A
852	Revised University Expansion	21.277	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as ST27	ST27	Selected - Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents suitable site for the use allocated for.
857	Northminster Business Park (South)	15.163	Yes	Reasonable – allocated as ST19	ST19	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K part 2
864	Extention to Elvington Industrial Estate	5.467	Yes	Reasonable -		Rejected - Site was not taken forward by Members in July 2017 or Jan 2018 – See appendix K part 2
885	Minster Equine Veterinary Clinic	0.385	No	Unreasonable – Entire Developable area considered under Site 953 extended alternative to E16		N/A
890	Luigis	0.207	No	Unreasonable – Site considered under larger parcel of 953		
899	York Road Dunnington Reduced Boundary	0.743	No	Unreasonable -		
903	North Lane Skelton	1.655	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for housing		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
904	ST27 PSC boundary	30.61	Yes	Reasonable – Alternative Boundary to ST27		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
906	York Central PSC Boundary	72.464	Yes	Reasonable — Alternative Boundary to ST5		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
907	Land North of Northminster	19.678	Yes	Reasonable – Alternative Boundary to ST19		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
925	Towthorpe Lines Red Line	4.636	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated as E18	E18	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents suitable site for the use allocated for.
929	Hungate	2.54	No	Unreasonable – revised area submitted excludes developed employment – Land owner only willing for residential on remainder of site	ST32	See Appendix K Part 2
940	Remaining Land at Bull Commercial Centre	2.99	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward by in July 2017 or Jan 2018
948	ST26 Allocated Land at Elvington Airfield	7.588	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST26	ST26	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents suitable site for the use allocated for – Appendix K Part 2
952	Land North of Northminster Business Park	14.774	Yes	Reasonable Alternative Boundary to ST19		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
953	Poppleton garden Centre Expanded		Yes	Reasonable – Alternative boundary to E16		site was not taken forward by executive in July 2017 or Jan 2018



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
954	University Of York Post PSC Officer Proposal	24.906	Yes	Reasonable – Alternative Boundary to ST27		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
955	Castle Gateway	21.477	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST20	ST20	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents an area of opportunity for masterplanning a new gateway to the city.
959	Land at Kettlestring Way	3.248	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
956	Milstone Avenue Rufforth	0.390	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
964	Galtres Garden Village	82.470	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
966	East of Strensall Road	19.230	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
968	Land to the North of Avon Drive	2.763	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
969	Land East of Northfield Lane South of Wyevale	1.830	No	Unreasonable – Developable area completely considered under Site 726		N/A
975	Alt PPC ST14 Option 2200 Homes	93.361	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
976	Site to the West of H39	1.693	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
978	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall	28.926	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing	ST35	N/A
980	North of Haxby excluding Cemetery expansion land	29.656	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
981	ST7 PPC Alternative Boundary for 1225 Homes	55.658	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
986	ST7 Post PPC Officer Recommendation	47.637	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
987	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission	45.498	No	Unreasonable – Superceded by Site 989 – Alternative boundary to ST5		N/A
988	H2a potential allocation	2.289	No	Unreasonable – Landowner is only willing for Housing		N/A
989	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission 2	82.833	Yes New	Reasonable – Allocated as ST5	ST5	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents suitable site for the use allocated for.