



YORK

CITY OF YORK
LOCAL PLAN
Further Sites Consultation Statement
2018

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Consultation documents	1
3.0	Who was invited to make representations	2
4.0	How people were invited to make representations	2
5.0	Main Issues raised	4
6.0	Conclusion and next steps	39

Annexes

Annex A: Copy of comments form

Annex B: Copy of letter to consultees

Annex C: Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendices- main issues raised through consultation

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Through the preferred options consultation for the City of York Local Plan proposals for new sites and revised boundaries were received, as well as additional evidence to consider on sites that had previously considered but had not been identified as potential allocations. The further sites consultation provided an opportunity for views on the merits of the additional sites and information to be taken into account prior to the production of the publication draft Local Plan. Responses received as part of the further sites consultation provided information that has allowed a fair comparison to be made of all the possible sites that could be included in the final plan. This fair comparison was important to ensure help ensure that the decision on sites in the final plan are properly justified in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 1.2 The further sites consultation commenced on 4th June 2014 and a number of consultation techniques were used in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2007). Consultation ran for six weeks until 16th July 2014. The purpose of this report is to summarise this further sites consultation, it outlines the consultation documents that were produced, sets out who was consulted, outlines the methods and techniques used during the consultation and summarises the main issues raised in the responses received.
- 1.3 As the further sites consultation focused on sites this consultation statement should be read alongside the Site Selection Paper (2013) and the further sites consultation technical appendices 1 to 13 (2014) for detailed site analysis information. Copies of all responses received and tables providing a summary of comments on a site by site basis can be found on our website for information. A formal regulation 22(1)(c) statement will be prepared at such a time as the local plan is submitted to the secretary of state for examination. This statement relates only to responses received through the six week formal consultation period.

2.0 Consultation Documents

- 2.1 A number of documents were produced as part of the consultation to inform people about what the process involved, how they could respond and ways in which they could contact the forward planning team.
- 2.2 The following main consultation documents were produced:
- City of York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation (June 2014); and
 - City of York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendices 1 to 13 (June 2014).
- 2.3 A comments form was available (see Annex A) and a series of large scale maps illustrating the further sites on an area by area basis were also prepared to help people interpret how the further sites relate to their communities. All relevant existing supporting documents and evidence base documents associated with the local plan were already published and available on the council's website which people were directed to from the main further sites consultation webpage.

3.0 Who was invited to make representations

- 3.1 To support the production of York's Local Development Framework (now local plan), the Council have compiled a database to include statutory consultation bodies and key stakeholders, alongside individuals who have registered an interest in the York development plan process or have expressed an interest to be informed of the progress of planning documents in York. The local plan database comprises a number of categories; specific consultation bodies, general consultation bodies, other groups/organisations and individuals. An internal consultation was also undertaken with relevant officers and all Members were informed of the consultation and how to comment. Consultation with neighbouring authorities, as part of the duty to cooperate, utilised existing structures through Local Government North Yorkshire and York and the Leeds City Region.
- 3.2 In addition to writing to database consultees and undertaking internal consultation, the council sought to further publicise the further sites consultation and give details on how and when comments could be made. This is discussed in Section 4 below.

4.0 How people were invited to make representations

- 4.1 Over 9,000 consultees from the local plan database were sent an email or a letter informing them of the consultation and the opportunity to comment, alongside details of the web page and where to find more information¹. A copy of the letter sent to consultees can be found at Annex B.
- 4.2 There were several ways in which people and organisations could comment on the further sites. These were by:
- filling in the comments form and either posting or emailing to the forward planning team;
 - writing to the forward planning team;
 - emailing the forward planning team;
 - using the electronic comments form which could be found on the council's website; and
 - using the council's online consultation tool and completing an online response form which could be found on the council's website.
- 4.3 To ensure as many people knew about the consultation and to give details on how and when comments could be made this was achieved through the following:

¹ Due to an administrative error a minority of those people registered on the local plan database were not contacted by email during the further sites consultation. At the same time, the further sites document was publicised and debated through various media and in numerous ways during June and July. Officers therefore consider that the consultation was in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

- A press release was issued to publicise the start date of the consultation.
- All of the consultation documents were made available to view and download on the council's website, including a link to the online survey. The further sites consultation webpage was clearly publicised on the council's homepage, as well on the council's current consultations section of the website.
- Hard copies of the consultation documents were placed in all of City of York Council libraries and at the council's reception at West Offices. It was also possible for those who required hard copies to ring or email the forward planning team and request a copy of the documents.
- Key consultation documents were made available in accessible formats on request, including large print or another language.
- A poster advertising the consultation (alongside copies of consultation materials) were placed in each council library for the public to view. Area based maps were also available in each library showing the proposals in that location.
- The local plan twitter feed/facebook page was used to publicise the consultation, both at the start of the consultation and towards the end of the consultation period to make people aware that the deadline for comments was approaching.
- There was an article on the consultation in the summer edition of Your Voice, a free newspaper featuring news of council activities and useful information for residents which goes to every household in York.
- An article about the consultation was placed in the online internal newsletter for City of York Council staff. A headline was also included on the council's intranet to alert staff to the consultation (recognising that City of York Council is one of the largest employers in York).

4.4 A series of meetings and exhibitions were also arranged to publicise the consultation and engage with interested parties. Three exhibitions at locations across the city were organised. The exhibitions were staffed by officers and provided the opportunity for members of the public to find out about the consultation. Consultation material and area based maps were also available to view. Exhibitions were held at the following locations:

- B and Q, Hull Road, 2.30pm – 7.30pm, 10 June;
- Monks Cross Shopping Park, 2.30pm – 7.30pm, 26 June; and
- York City Centre, 10am – 4pm, 2 July.

4.5 A briefing session for parish councils was held on 7 May with the York Local Council Liaison Group. Eight area based meetings with councillors, representatives from parish councils and planning panels also took place. Three council Officers attended these meetings, delivering a presentation and answering questions. It was intended that the people who attended these meetings would disseminate the information to their constituents. The areas covered reflected the locations of the sites being consulted on. The further sites consultation did not include any sites in the Guildhall Ward, as such representatives were invited to attend any of the meetings should they want to.

4.6 The meetings that took place included:

- Dringhouses and Woodthorpe, Micklegate, part of Rural West (Copmanthorpe) and Bishopthorpe; 6.30pm, 12 June;
- Hull Road, Fishergate, Fulford and Heslington, 6.30pm, 16 June;
- Clifton, Rawcliffe and Clifton Without, Haxby and Wigginton, 6.30pm, 17 June;
- Derwent, Osbaldwick, Heworth and Heworth Without (Dunnington), 6.30pm, 19 June;
- Wheldrake (Elvington, Wheldrake and Escrick) 6.30pm, 23 June;
- Huntington and New Earswick, 6.30pm, 24 June;
- Acomb, Holgate, Westfield and remainder of Rural West, 6.30pm, 25 June; and
- Strensall and Towthorpe, 6.30pm, 1 July.

5.0 Main issues raised

5.1 Approximately 9,595 responses were received from 3,903 respondents. Respondents included residents, interest groups, parish councils, prescribed bodies², developers, agents and land owners. To facilitate accessible consultation respondents were able to send comments through a variety of methods. As a result responses were received by letter, email, comments form and online survey. In addition to individual responses five petitions were submitted during the consultation period, containing a total of 1,664 signatures:

- Petition 1 collected by Strensall Ward Liberal Democrats against the allocation of Site 810 (Land to the East of Strensall Road Earswick) in the draft Local Plan – submitted by Cllr Runciman - 111 signatures
'We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the plan by City of York to allocate land to the east of Strensall Rd, Earswick (Site 810), for housing development. We ask that the allocation of the site as safeguarded land be deleted from the Local Plan.'
- Petition 2 – submitted by Cllr Doughty - 536 signatures
'We the undersigned petition City of York Council to oppose Labour's plans to build houses on the Strensall Road site (Site 810).'
- Petition 3 – submitted by Cllr Reid - 155 signatures
'Against developing the Green Belt area of York (ST10 Moor Lane).'
- Petition 4 – submitted by Cllr Ayre - 517 signatures
'Opposed to the proposed use of Green Belt land in the Heworth Without area (Land East of Metcalfe Lane – ST7 and North of Stockton Lane – Site 187).'
- Petition 5 – submitted by Elvington Action Group - 345 signatures
'I object to the following proposed developments contained in CYC's additional sites proposals. *Petitioners were given the option to tick which of the following sites they objected to:* Site 747 – 341 signatures, Site 22 – 322 signatures, Site 802 – 331 signatures, Site 97 – 317 signatures (including 3 objecting to part) and Site 815 – 322 signatures.'

² Under the Duty to Co-operate Local Authorities are required to demonstrate cooperation in plan making with adjoining authorities and other organisations. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 prescribes those bodies to which the Duty to Co-operate applies.

5.2 It should be noted that there may be duplication between individual responses received and signatures on a petition with some residents signing a petition and also putting in an individual response on the same topic. There was also a further e-petition running through www.democracy.york.gov.uk which closed outside of the consultation period on 26th December 2014 and an additional petition presented to Council meeting by Councillor Reid on 9th October 2014. These are separate from the further sites consultation, as the closing date ran beyond the end of the consultation period and the other petition was submitted after the further sites consultation. It should also be noted that the second additional petition makes reference to a site in the preferred options local plan, not the further sites consultation:

- Save Earswick Green Belt - 249 signatures
‘We the undersigned petition the council to oppose Labour’s plans to build houses on the Strensall Road site. Labour run York Council have published plans to remove 88 hectares of land east of Strensall Road and adjacent to Willow Grove from the Green Belt (Site 810). Council reports reveal that the site may be ‘excluded from the green belt’ and ‘considered for development’. Based on similar sized sites across York this could mean around 2000 houses are eventually built there.’
- Councillor Reid on behalf of Strensall Residents – approximately 150 signatures
We the undersigned object to the inclusion of site H30 (land between the village and the railway line) in the draft local plan. Strensall is already over developed and its current infrastructure – roads, traffic flow, parking, drainage, shops, school capacity – has long since been out grown. The site in issue is home to a host of wildlife including newts, deer and owls and it would be fundamentally wrong to lose this ‘green belt’ land for yet more development. We are concerned that a developer is already drawing up plans for this site to accommodate 60+ houses which we feel is premature in the context of the local plan process. We call on York City Council to take account of our concerns when considering which sites will be recommended for including in the preferred options for the local plan.

5.3 The purpose of this section is to outline the main issues raised by consultees as part of the further sites consultation. The issues have been grouped under the relevant sections of the further sites consultation documents. It should be noted that the views expressed below are of those who submitted representations as part of the consultation and not necessarily the views of City of York Council.

New residential, employment and retail sites considered

Site 125 Morrell House Elderly Persons Home

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this site provided full consultation is given to all relevant parties.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queried where the elderly residents go will if this site is developed. • There is a shortcoming of care home availability.

Site 182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support the allocation, confirmation the site will be developed by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust and will be developed to reflect reflect the density and character of residential developments in the vicinity. • More housing is needed and will allow negotiation with developers to improve facilities. • Using this site for mixed housing will restore the balance of the village to a mixed age community.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has a value of general open space, particularly for dog walkers and provides green infrastructure value. • Development would be detrimental to the open space provision between New Earswick and Huntington. • It contributes to the landscape setting of New Earswick, adjoining the edge of a conservation area. Need to evaluate if the loss of this area would harm the elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the city. • The fields are needed to soak up water, otherwise flooding may be an issue. • No evidence of the impact on the A1237 and on local transport infrastructure that is already under pressure. Will worsen air quality. • The ring road must be dualled before any development takes place. • Brownfield first policy should be applied. Development of green belt sites is unnecessary and damaging. • Will put intolerable strain on already stretched services.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a mandatory minimum 20m landscape buffer zone along Haxby Road. • The boundaries of the proposed development should reflect the actual areas rather than development areas plus green infrastructure. • Request that the site name be changed in order to avoid the implication that the site should be treated as a past or current playing field.

Site 183 Land to the North of Escrick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is sustainable, viable and deliverable. • A suitable area to build some much needed housing. It will stimulate growth in local infrastructure. • Generally in favour of the proposals.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is unsustainable and the amount of land proposed is unrealistically high, too big for the village. • Prime agricultural land will be lost and green belt land. Brownfield sites should be used first. • It would be an appendage to Escrick but under a different authority and will destroy the character of the village, creating a divided

Site 183 Land to the North of Escrick

	<p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some additional housing is supported but the quantity of houses should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of services, about 10- 20% increase or 75 dwellings for the joint allocation of both councils (York and Selby). Any new dwellings should meet the needs of Escrick and it would be unsustainable for York to meet its own needs by leapfrogging the green belt. • The site is near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. • The A19 through Fulford has insufficient capacity to cope with additional traffic. No explanation is given to how the council will obtain investment to upgrade the A19. • Access to local and urban services are problematic and schools and medical facilities will be inundated and will not be able to cope. • Development of this site would reduce the separation between the main built up area of Escrick and Deighton. • The site adjoins the boundary of Escrick conservation area. • Will need to evaluate whether or not the loss of this open area and its development would be likely to harm the elements that contribute towards the special character and setting of the city. • Selby District Council is also considering development on green belt farm land in the village. • Evidence submitted to demonstrate planning and wider benefits of allocating a wider site.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. • Not objecting to this site, but reserving position pending further information and discussion. Before the proposed site is confirmed, important that there is clarity and agreement with Selby District Council as to how the proposed allocation is to relate to the village's designated Service Village Status and role with the Selby Local Plan Core Strategy. • The proposal should not be considered in isolation. • Infrastructure must be in place to support the new houses without affecting existing residents.

Site 187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site represents an accessible and sustainable location which is viable and deliverable. There are no technical constraints. • Support for plans to allocate site 187.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to services is poor, leading to increased car usage along Stockton Lane. • Infrastructure could not cope including drainage, sewerage, schooling,

Site 187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane

	<p>healthcare and public transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague on how any development will be served by or integrated into existing transport links. • This parcel of land was last assessed and rejected in June 2013, it is included among valuable areas of the green belt because it maintains the pattern of historic green wedges and contributes to the setting of the historic city. • Seems likely to harm the elements that contribute to the special character and setting of the city. • Opposed to use of the green belt. All brownfield sites should be used first. • Site 187, alongside an extended ST7, will lead to unacceptable level of over development. Sites must be considered together. • Will create further pollution when York already has poor air quality.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of protected species are present in the area; mitigation will be required and work to ensure habitat can be connected. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Site 298 Sites at Connaught Court

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with inclusion in the plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2008 conservation area appraisal identified the historic parkland as a landscape setting for the Connaught court building and a strategic gap to maintain the separation of Fulford village from the main urban area of York. Development of any of the remaining open space within the park would therefore undermine the central reasons for extending the conservation area to include the whole of the site. • There would need to be some evaluation of the contribution this open area makes to the character of this part of the conservation area and the impact that its loss and development would have on its significance.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If pursued should be mitigated with flood defences and measures to manage the flood risk in the area. • Pleased to see part of the site designated for green space.

Site 733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with recommendation for the inclusion of the site in the plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner of this piece of land has no intention of developing the garden, question why it has been included. • Lack of real open green space in the area.

Site 733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village will no longer be a village but an extension of Boroughbridge Road. • The amenities in this area are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for. • Will contribute to the appearance of urban sprawl. • Lack of consideration given to brownfield sites. • Inadequate road system for all the proposed developments in this area.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of this site to ST2 makes the strategic green space that has been added to ST2 seem almost without purpose.

Site 757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation to include this site and its redevelopment.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The closure of an elderly care facility when demand is likely to increase does not seem a prudent strategy. There are not enough homes for the elderly. • The home needs refurbishment but is in a good place for old people to access local services and see local activities. Concern regarding where the elderly residents will go. • Concern about cumulative effects of developments of this and other sites in Haxby, including impact on traffic flow and services. There are too many houses planned. • If the site is removed as an elderly persons home should be used to provide much needed parking or possibly a small park and ride facility for residents.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development should be carefully monitored to ensure the openness of Ethal Ward playing fields is maintained and that it can be enjoyed by residents.

Site 779 Land at Boroughbridge Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site will make an important and quickly deliverable contribution to York's housing. It is unconstrained in terms of potential delivery. • The site is a sustainable site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to urban sprawl involving the loss of agricultural and green belt land when there are numerous brownfield sites. • Should be considered in connection with ST1 and ST2 as the cumulative proposed developments will have a major impact on Boroughbridge Road. • This site is part of a significant green corridor and should be left undeveloped to prevent coalescence. Would adversely affect views towards the city and its rural setting (previously identified as warranting protecting in the Historic Character and Setting Technical

Site 779 Land at Boroughbridge Road

	<p>Paper Update June 2013). The sites development seems likely to harm the special character and setting of the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will give rise to traffic issues on the A59 and A1237. • Small businesses are already complaining about travelling to work. • Infrastructure and services are already stretched, particularly in relation to leisure facilities, medical services, schools, policing and drainage and sewerage. • The number of houses should be reduced. Represents over development of an area.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important that development does not result in adverse cumulative highways impact on Boroughbridge Road. • People have to be housed, there is nothing wrong with using this area provided extra schools and medical facilities are provided. • Concern that the allocation of the site as a strategic site has the potential to undermine the anticipated short term delivery of the site. Estimated phasing for the site should be short term (years 1-5).

Site 97 Airfield Business Park

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with inclusion in the plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends into agricultural land in the green belt constituting inappropriate development for which there are no special circumstances. • Brownfield sites should be used for industrial development not the green belt. • No proven need for extra industrial development, there is still vacant units on the existing site. • Increased HGV traffic in the village will worsen having an adverse impact on B1228. Resultant noise pollution a concern alongside increase road safety risks for residents. • Speed restrictions on Sutton Bridge needed. • Scale of the proposals disproportionate and excessive for a village in a rural setting. • The additional of B2 uses are not suitable for the location. • Allocating land on the brownfield airfield site would make the best use of previously developed land and protect open countryside and remove the need to take land out of the Green Belt. • Part of the site is a haven for wildlife and plants, there would need to be buffer zones.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. • Could be acceptable is restricted to B1 uses and if heavy goods traffic

Site 97 Airfield Business Park

is restricted through the centre of the village.

Site 742 Poppleton Garden Centre

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that that the site be included in the local plan for B1b/B1c/B2/B8 uses.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot see how further employment is possible unless the garden centre were to close one third of the area of the present garden centre. • Any development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building. This helps to maintain the green corridor to the city. • Heavy good traffic from wider employment uses could have impact on the Northfield Lane/A59 junction requiring major infrastructure investment. • Located alongside the most congested section of the outer ring road, not attractive to the market/potential employers. • The site should also be allocated for B1a uses, there is no rationale as to why B1a is excluded from the proposals. Also consider that the site is suitable for retail use in the longer term subject to required impact test. • Unnecessary proposal, all new employment should be met by Northminster Business Park before other sites are considered.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the scale of development in the vicinity. The council must reassess its wider ambitions for the area and be realistic about what is achievable without forcing local infrastructure to breaking point.

Site 800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation is supported, also considered that the site is suitable for B1a and retail uses.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should remain as a developed site in the green belt. The land was specifically assessed in 2011 as being important to the setting of the city. • Development would substantially increase the extent of the built up area and bring buildings closer to Bishophorpe. Therefore seems likely to harm elements that contribute to the special character and setting of the city. • Would threaten the integrity of Fulford Community Orchard which should be protected as the only managed traditional heritage orchard of any significant size in York. It constitutes an integral element of the local wildlife corridor. • Located near to already congested A19 which would only get worse. • Site provides a mix of uncultivated woodland and grassland, query how landscape and habitat assessment for the site found to have no adverse impact.

Site 800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strong permanent boundaries, constitutes unrestrained urban sprawl into the green belt.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts of the site are located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Flood risk sequential test required to ensure there are no alternative sites at a lower level of flood risk. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. • Could make a positive addition to the southern edge of the city provided adequate provision is made for parking and work is done to mitigate increase in traffic flows. • Location is potentially attractive to employers but query whether a site appended to the back of a designer outlet centre is the best available opportunity for a key employment site.

Changes to allocated sites

Site 247 (H6) Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reduction in development to protect land surrounding St Leonard's Hospice is welcomed.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detail given to clarify the options for vehicular access to the site, nor is the likely increase in congestion to the already busy Tadcaster Road addressed. • Reducing the site boundary will result in an illogical gap, which would lead to proposals for logical infill in the future. Preserving the site to protect a view is not a planning consideration as the site is not within an area of special landscape character. Requested that the original site boundary remains and any issues and concerns regarding design be dealt with at an appropriate time by development control. • This is a green belt site and will bring development closer to the A64, compromising the setting of the city. • The city's economic growth in part depends upon attracting outside companies, and those companies have executive staff requiring housing. Would be advantageous to present an area such as The Square, overlooking green belt land, as an example of accommodation that York can offer. • Site is bordered by mature trees which must be preserved and the area is a haven for wildlife which would be lost if developed. • Would cause dust and noise pollution to residents of The Grove and the area is already an air pollution hot spot. Increased development will result in more traffic and pollution. • Strong case for further changes that would allocate Site H6 for healthcare facilities. Suggested amendment to the proposed site allocation H6, in order of preference is allocate all or part of the site

Site 247 (H6) Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road

	for future healthcare facilities, delete housing allocation and safeguard land for future development, if the council maintain the allocation for housing, an area to the east and south of the Hospice should be identified as a no-build zone.
--	--

Site 639 (E11) Annamine Nurseries

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • No objection to the inclusion of the site for office use as well as other employment where this is connected to the adjacent use.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the restriction that office, or any other employment use, must be connected to the adjacent site which is unreasonable and unnecessary and contrary to the guidance in the NPPF. Policy EMP2 of the Local Plan should be amended to include B1a office use in the range of employment uses that can be accommodated on the E11 site. There should be no restriction that any office or other employment use must be connected to the adjacent use.

Site 627 (H11) Land at Fredrick House

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residential development on this site would be acceptable but is important to retain the whole of the woodland area to the east end of the site. This is of considerable local amenity value for residents on Kilburn Road. • Support the amendment to expand the range of potential uses of the site to include residential development and/or community uses (including medical, education or local retail).
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is currently in employment (B1 office) use. To enhance the potential for mixed use on the site and to remove uncertainty for the existing occupier about the continued use of the site, suggested that B1 office use should also be added to the range of potential uses on the site. The site is also close to the town centre and on a high frequency bus route that would make it attractive to potential hotel operators. Therefore suggest that the range of uses for the site should be Housing, Education/Nursing Home, Medical Facility, Hotel, Office and non-residential Education/Training Centre. • Proposals Map does not properly identify the full extent of the Frederick House site and should be amended.

Site 654 (H19) Land at Mill Mount

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the expansion of the range of potential uses.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The range of uses could be expanded further. The range of suggested uses therefore included but is not exclusive to Housing, Education/Nursing Home, Medical Facility, Hotel, Non-residential

Education/Training Centre and Office.

Changes to strategic sites

Site ST1 British Sugar/Manor School

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a key brownfield site and should be developed as a priority. • Designation of strategic green space is welcomed. • The alteration to the allocation boundary is supported and welcomed and is required to assist a comprehensive and holistic approach to the regeneration of the site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation should not preserve the location of any designated green space area as it is premature and prejudicial to the work of the master plan and planning application. • The site shouldn't be developed to maintain the green wedge from A59 towards the railway. • Concerns about the increased vehicular traffic especially Boroughbridge Road and the bypass. • The infrastructure and local amenities within the area, including schools, doctor's surgeries, chemists and nurseries, are currently oversubscribed and will only worsen should further development occur. • The number of houses proposed should be reduced. • The site should be safeguarded to expand Manor School.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change to the site boundary will not impact upon continuing discussions between the Environment Agency and interested parties. • Remains a need for further interconnected green space for the amenity of residents and to preserve wildlife. • The site is located directly adjacent to National Grid's Poppleton Substation which is an essential part of the transmission network and the site is considered to be 'operational land' for which there may need to be further essential utility development at the site in the future. The site is also crossed by National Grid's high transmission overhead power lines which must remain in-situ and it is preferred that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. • It is important that the site's impact on Boroughbridge Road is carefully considered, especially on account of the nearby Civil Service Sports Ground site (Site ST2) and the land at Boroughbridge Road (Site 779).

Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement with inclusion of the site in the plan. • Clarification concerning replacement playing field and sports facilities to compensate for this site's loss sought at preferred options, now satisfied that previous objection has been resolved.
----------------	--

Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be developed so as to prevent coalescence with Manor Academy, the trading estate and Poppleton Park and maintain the village and rural setting of Poppleton. • This open area contributes to the setting and approach to the city from the north-west. The development of the southern part of this site, therefore, looks likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the city. • Opposed to loss of open space, the site has been used as recreational land for at least 40 years and should be protected for this use. Should not be built on unless in certain exceptional circumstances, which do not seem to apply here. Particularly given the development of the British Sugar site, from which there will be an increased demand for recreation land. The loss of the sports ground will exacerbate this. • Cumulative impact with neighbouring proposals should be taken into account. The scale of the proposals should be reduced. • The ring road and the A59 are already very busy. Additional cars from this development will be problematic. • Already stretched infrastructure which may not cope including shops, schools, medical centre and other facilities. • Sewerage and drainage facilities close to the site have been unable to cope with existing pressures. • There are a number of brownfield sites identified in the York area which should be utilised before using Green Belt land. • There is a restrictive covenant not to build on this land. • The site is in a conservation area.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is considered less suitable for development compared to the British Sugar site (ST1). • The developer should be required to provide the remaining land as a substantial green wedge between the existing housing near the A59 and ring road roundabout and the housing north of Beckfield Lane. It should also include new cycle track and footpaths well separated from the A59.

Site ST7 Land to East of Metcalfe Lane	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions to the site's boundary are essential to achieve a full access system for the site and to ensure that the capacity of around 1,800 dwellings can be achieved. There are no currently perceived viability issues affecting the delivery of this site. • Noted that the parts of the site allocation within flood zones 2 and 3 are proposed for greenspace. The Environment Agency strongly supports this approach to designating areas at flood risk to greenspace use. • Intention to include new open space which is welcome if development becomes inevitable.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of high quality agricultural land.

Site ST7 Land to East of Metcalfe Lane	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the council's decision to increase the overall site of the proposed Metcalf Lane Development. • There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site should be taken out of the Green Belt. • The additional areas of green space will be some mitigation but is largely superficial and does not compensate for this additional urban sprawl and will not affect the overall impact of this development on the existing community. • Whilst it is acknowledged that the two green corridors will form an important component of the final design proposals it is not considered appropriate at this stage to seek to fix their location and extent ahead of more detailed assessment work. • The allocation and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • An extended ST7, alongside site 187 will lead to unacceptable level of over development. Sites must be considered together. • Concern about access to the site, given its scale and close proximity to the A64. • Potential for exacerbated congestion, particularly at peak times from increased traffic flows and associated increase in air pollution. • Local services and infrastructure is already over subscribed. Access to services is problematic and it requires major infrastructure investment. No clear plans for essential supporting infrastructure. • In a parish already poorly provided with green and open space it will lead to the deterioration of the local environment and lower the quality of life.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • Recommended that consideration is given to the development of a small area of hard standing to accommodate an ambulance response building. Further investigation is underway for such provision at ST7. • Site is crossed by a National Grid underground cable. National Grid has legal rights to enable efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of electricity transmission network. Required that no permanent structures are built over or under cables or within the zone specified in the legal agreements. • Interest in land within the site being available for self builders.

Site ST9 Land North of Haxby	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed extension to the site is required to ensure the development of a high quality sustainable scheme that takes into account a number of design criteria and development principles. • Shortage of houses in the area. • Support for the addition of strategic green space.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be protecting agricultural land to enable self sufficiency to provide our own food.

Site ST9 Land North of Haxby	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites should be used before any green belt land is used. • Any extension to Haxby on this scale is unacceptable, as the settlement is already overdeveloped. • Do not support the addition of 16 acres of strategic green space to the proposed north Haxby development and consider that the proposed changes to the north Haxby development are largely superficial and the whole proposal should be withdrawn. • Infrastructure and access to services is already inadequate. Concern regarding impact on amenities and that any new facilities will be aimed at meeting needs of new residents as opposed to current deficits. The existing drainage, sewage and flooding problems experienced in Haxby and Wigginton remain serious and unless addressed at the very outset of developments, will only worsen. • The concerns already expressed by many Haxby and Wigginton residents about the impact that such a large scale development will have on the communities' existing infrastructure (schools, doctors, parking and sewerage/drainage) have been completely ignored by the council. • Strategic green space along the Moor Lane and Usher Lane boundaries is not shown which is essential if the suburban development is to be visually acceptable. • Whilst accepting that strategic green space will be provided along the northern boundary of the site, opposed to the green space allocation of part of the site near the existing settlement which has not been determined as part of a rigorous site assessment. Any green space should be determined through a proper analysis of the constraints and opportunities provided and the needs of that particularly site within the community. Therefore best determined at the detailed master plan stage. Should be deleted from the allocation. • Concern about cumulative impact of proposed sites including ST9, ST11, SF4 and site 810. • Haxby has existing congestion problems. Increases in traffic movements could change the character of the main routes into town which could be harmful if not properly managed and the ring road should be made into a dual carriageway before building is considered. • Sufficient space for further extension of Haxby and Wigginton burial ground must be allowed.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is crossed by National Grid's high transmission overhead power lines which must remain in-situ and National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. • If the site goes ahead will be important to implement improved infrastructure such as roads and schools.

Site ST11 Land at New Lane, Huntington

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an opportunity for imaginative high density housing within the site which would be in keeping with the nearby developments at Monks Cross. • Site is deliverable and in a highly sustainable location. There are no issues that would preclude the development of the site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site includes the Roman Camp on Huntington South Moor, which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No evaluation of what contribution the site makes to the significance of the monument, it is not possible to ascertain whether the area identifies as Strategic Green space is of sufficient size to ensure that the development of this area will safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the Monument. • Huntington Grange, to the west of the area, is a Grade II listed building. No assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the setting of this building and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon this aspect of its significance has been undertaken. • Will have a significant impact on the local infrastructure and amenities (schools, doctors, drainage) which is already overloaded, particularly the local road network. • Concern about the cumulative impact of this and sites ST9, SF4 and 810. • Erosion of the green belt which should be resisted. Green belt should only be used as a last resort after all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. There are many Brownfield sites available. • Addition of strategic green space doesn't do enough to alleviate the wider damage from development. Original concerns at preferred options ignored. • Concern over the close proximity of the site's boundary to the existing cemetery. Suggested that a strategic greenspace is implemented where the boundary is shared with the cemetery. • Provision of a strategic green wedge should be omitted from the allocation plan. No evidence has been presented to justify the identification of green space in this area of this site, and of the size identified. Consider this to be a detailed planning point that should be discussed following a review of all the relevant detailed technical reports. Identification of such an area is premature
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst no objection to the provision of new housing, concerns about the provision of adequate infrastructure to support the expanded community.

Site ST14 Land to the North of Clifton Moor

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in a sustainable location which can deliver much needed new homes within York. This is a deliverable site and that development
----------------	--

Site ST14 Land to the North of Clifton Moor	
	<p>could commence at the earliest opportunity within the Local Plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more considered site as it creates amenities, therefore not draining other saturated resources. • Support for the addition of strategic green space.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is unsustainable, unrealistic, undeliverable and unnecessary. York cannot cope with this unnatural growth. • Directly adjacent to the already highly congested A1237 Northern Outer Ring Road. Will increase traffic problems beyond the current road network capacity. No explanation has been provided on how the council intends to obtain the funding to dual the outer ring road. • Would add an intolerable burden to existing infrastructure including schools, shops and doctors. • Lies in the open countryside beyond the northern ring road in an area which forms part of the rural setting of the historic city. By development extending beyond the Ring Road, it will not only fundamentally change the relationship of the northern edge of York with the settlements of Skelton and Haxby, but also threaten the separation between these settlements and the main built-up area of the city. • Development on both sites of the Ring Road will also alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the city within an area of open countryside. • The proposed strategic green space has made little difference to the impact which the development of this site would be likely to have upon the special character and setting of York. • Do not support the addition of 102 acres of strategic green space to the proposed Clifton Gate development and consider that the proposed changes are largely superficial and the whole proposal should be withdrawn. • No definition of strategic green space is provided and how it will be protected from inappropriate development. Do not consider it appropriate for the woodland of Nova Scotia Plantation to be included within the boundary of ST14 and should be identified as a site to be retained for ecological reasons. • Strategic green space is a concept that can be best defined at the detailed application stage when all matters can be properly considered on a case by case basis. Suggest that the Local Plan incorporate a criteria based policy to provide a clear steer on the requirements of any development at the site. • Unacceptable impact on the village of Skelton.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ambulance Service currently expects that provision is made for the development of a small area of hard standing to accommodate an ambulance response building. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership

Site ST14 Land to the North of Clifton Moor

with City of York Council.

Site ST15 Whinthorpe

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is deliverable and viable. The landscape buffer with A64 will ensure visual separation. • Single ownership enhances the sites deliverability.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that this proposal is likely to significantly harm the important breeding bird assemblage of Heslington Tilmire SSSI and may, due to changes in surface and ground water flows, affect its tall herb fen plant communities. Important to understand that the strategic green space are both robust and deliverable as well as being sufficient and appropriate designed to safeguard the nature conservation interest of the SSSI. • Cannot be considered a sustainable settlement. • Would be a commuter town for Leeds. • Opposed to loss of high quality agricultural land in the green belt land when there are many brownfield sites available. • The changes do little to alleviate the concerns in relation to impact on the villages of Fulford and Heslington and cumulative impacts which have not been assessed. • Elvington would become a suburb of Whinthorpe. • The allocation and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Proposed changes to the Whinthorpe development are largely superficial and the whole proposals should be withdrawn. • Inadequate infrastructure, including schools and drainage • Concerns over access to site, its impact on congestion of the A64, A19 and A1079 and its impact on the local environment and flooding. • Question the rationale behind a new settlement and substantial allocations in lower order settlements/villages when there is scope to provide a greater number of sustainable urban extensions which are better related to existing and well established services and facilities for day to day living. • Proposed strategic green space does not represent an appropriate buffer that will fulfil its various functions.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ambulance Service currently expects that provision is made for the development of a small area of hard standing to accommodate an ambulance response building. • Further flood risk modelling work being undertaken. Provided that it can be demonstrated that flood risk can be managed on site the Environment Agency has no objections to the changes and the site being taken forward. Must also be demonstrated that any future development of the site will not alter the hydrology of the SSSI in a way that has a significant impact on the flora and fauna that it supports. • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the

Site ST15 Whinthorpe

	<p>A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.
--	--

Site ST19 Northminster Business Park

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial current demand from existing occupied for expansion space. • Internal site infrastructure is already in place to allow employment land delivery immediately upon allocation.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of agricultural land. • Concerns that no strategic green space has been included to screen the development. • Would further erode the green belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton. • Would represent a huge incursion into the open countryside and will threaten the separation of the business park from the village of Knapton. Therefore likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Poor access, recommend that a highways impact study is carried out. Already heavy traffic on the A59, located on the most congested section of the outer ring road. Additional traffic means more air pollution. • Inadequate infrastructure makes the development unsuitable. • Employment uses including B8 will increase the level of noise, alongside the size of buildings and heavier traffic make the proposal unacceptable for residents of nearby houses.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the land at the business park has been changed from safeguarded land to land for employment and it is not clear why this has been recommended. • If there is a need for this and it generates business then it should be allotted, however the odour at Harwood Whin should be resolved prior to any expansion.

New and revised safeguarded land

Site 813 (SF3) Land at Whinthorpe

Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan • Would prefer to see purpose built development at a 'new village' where investment in facilities and infrastructure could be optimised. This site with ST15 looks sensible and should be maximised with appropriate facilities provided.

Site 813 (SF3) Land at Whinthorpe	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of valuable agricultural land. • Safeguarding of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Given the importance of Elvington Airfield for wildlife (as assessed by CYC Technical Officers), believe that a substantial buffer zone is required, not only to protect the Tillmire but also to protect the wildlife of Elvington Airfield. This would have major implications for the proposed Whinthorpe development (ST15) and also for the proposed safeguarded land adjacent to this site. The designation of land at the southern end of SF3 is entirely unacceptable. • Green Belt land should be protected. This development would harm the openness of the Green Belt and cause a visual intrusion. Brownfield should be used first. • Excessive development. Housing allocation at Whinthorpe already being proposed for 5000 new homes and this safeguarded allocation is capable of achieving an addition 4200 homes. If all of these were to be developed Whinthorpe would dominate what is currently a very rural landscape. • ST15 and SF3 should also be pushed further away from York in order to ensure development appears as a separate village. If the gap between the proposed development area and the urban edge of York is compared with the distance between the urban edge of York and other standalone settlements around York then the gap is much wider elsewhere. We do not see that there is a special case for a narrower gap for site ST15, especially given some of the comments about landscape quality. • Safeguarded land is a misleading term.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Site 814 (SF4) Land North of Haxby	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • Support the plan around Haxby. • Very important to continue future development of the area. Younger and future generations have no option but to leave the area as the availability is not there. If this development does not go ahead then Haxby is not going to have a future past the people who currently live in the area.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems from ST9 will be exacerbating if SF4 is developed. • Will increase traffic problems beyond the current road network capacity.

Site 814 (SF4) Land North of Haxby	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not the infrastructure in place to support this development. • Haxby and Wigginton is already suffering greatly from over-development. • Loss of agricultural land. • Not organic growth of the existing settlement, but a major and unsustainable expansion of the existing urban area. • Unacceptable to forfeit Green Belt to the detriment of wildlife and the surrounding population, especially as there are still Brownfield sites in York. • The drainage in Haxby and Wigginton struggles to cope now and the site is known to flood.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land North of Haxby is crossed by National Grid's high transmission overhead power lines. These overhead lines must remain in-situ and National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. • Not against revision of the number of dwellings provided there is a good mix of size and prices of properties to be built. • If this goes ahead, Haxby and Wigginton will need improved infrastructure e.g. more roads, schools, better bus service etc.

Site 793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is substantial current demand from existing occupiers for expansion space. The Park works alongside the Park & Ride on Northfield Lane and there is a train station at Poppleton, and direct link to the cycle network. • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is in the Green Belt. • The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York. • Land should retain agricultural status. • Development of this area in conjunction with ST19 would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Area has a high water table and flooding cannot be ruled out. • Recommend that a highway infrastructure/ traffic impact study be carried out before any further development is considered. • Any safeguarded land should be on site ST19 so that development occurs between the present Business Park and the new Poppleton Bar Park & Ride. • If developed alongside ST19 would increase what is already an expanding unattractive sprawl around the Poppletons, along two key approach roads for York, A59 and A1237. • Traffic flow is a problem now as the ring road cannot cope with existing demands. • Safeguarding is a misleading phrase.

Site 183 Land to the North of Escrick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally in favour of the proposals. • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safeguarding and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • The A19 through Fulford has insufficient capacity to cope with additional traffic. No explanation is given to how the council will obtain investment to upgrade the A19. • Access to local and urban services are problematic and schools and medical facilities will be inundated and will not be able to cope. • The site is near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. • Prime agricultural land will be lost and green belt land. Brownfield sites should be used first.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not objecting to this site, but reserving position pending further information and discussion. Before the proposed site is confirmed, important that there is clarity and agreement with Selby District Council as to how the proposed allocation is to relate to the villages designated Service Village Status and role with the Selby Local Plan Core Strategy. • The proposal should not be considered in isolation. • Landscaping is required to maintain the area. • It would be an appendage to Escrick but under a different authority and will destroy the character of the village, creating a divided community.

Site 811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • Site is considered suitable for delivery of c.150 homes. Site is in sustainable location in close proximity to facilities available in Dunnington. Technical reports indicate no technical matters that would preclude development of this site. Site is currently available and achievable for immediate residential development.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access is unsuitable. • Loss of productive agricultural land. • No exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status as green belt land. • Overdevelopment of the village. • Village already facing major extensions to the urban footprint of the village, concerns over the sustainability of adding a further 105 dwellings to the village. • Will add to congestion and overload existing infrastructure. • Proposed expansion would harm the character of the village and have

Site 811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington

	<p>a severe impact on the Green Belt area of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is home to many species of wild British birds and other wildlife.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Site 802 Land at Elvington Village

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • Site is available, achievable and suitable (in a sustainable location well related to the existing built form and is accessible from the main transport network, and does not warrant Green Belt status). Site considered to be both deliverable and a viable location for future housing development. Scheme will seek to avoid development in Flood Zones 2 and 3.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed site extends into green belt. There are no special circumstances attached to this site which would warrant the breaching of the green belt status. • This land was designated as green belt to protect from future development, and prevent the character, beauty of the countryside being taken over by urban sprawl. Safeguarded land is a misleading term. • Brownfield should be used first. • Loss of agricultural land. • If developed the site would be out of proportion for the needs of the village and given the rural nature of the village. There is no proven need for an increase in housing of this proportion. • The infrastructure, school, medical practice and sewage system would be inadequate for the significant extra burden. • Proposed site would adversely affect the centre of the village which is a conservation area. • The extra traffic generated from 100 extra houses would choke the main road B1228 to and from York. The increased traffic will cause a hazard to children and there will be an increase of pollution. • There is very limited opportunity for the creation of jobs in Elvington therefore the occupants of any new developments would have to travel to find work. As there is no effective public transport this would mean a car journey into work. • Proposed homes on the site must be considered alongside the existing Local Plan proposals for Dauby Lane and Church Lane, as well as the other safeguarded and employment allocations at the Business Park and the seven Traveller pitches and three Showpeople

Site 802 Land at Elvington Village	
	<p>pitches in the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of flooding. • Safeguarding a misleading term. • Would change the character of the village and its setting, making it more of a commuter suburb rather than a village.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Site 815 Elvington Industrial Estate	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate development in the green belt and there are no special circumstances to warrant taking the site out of the green belt. • Loss of agricultural land. • Huge increase in the size of the industrial estate without justification. There is no proven need for extra industrial development here. Scale of the proposals is disproportionate to the village. • Would have huge adverse effect on B1228 which is already congested. The road bridge over the River Derwent is narrow and humped back. • Will only add to the strain on the existing infrastructure which is already at breaking point. • Unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre which will worsen the existing safety risk to residents and children. • When considered alongside other proposals in the village, the overall scale of development proposed for the village is disproportionate to its size. • The existing brownfield land at the airfield should be used as opposed to building on green belt land. • Part of the site is a haven for wildlife which needs protecting. • Safeguard is a misleading term. • The existing business park is not full. • Increase in noise and air pollution will be a serious loss of amenity for those living nearby.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Site 815 Elvington Industrial Estate

- Landscaping is required to maintain the area.
- Support further development as it would provide more local jobs and be of benefit to the local economy however development should be restricted to use class B1 and heavy good traffic should be banned from using the route through the centre of the village.

Site 810 Earswick

Key Issues Raised

Support

- Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
- Represents an exciting opportunity for Earswick to grow into a community with facilities being provided that would be expected of a village environment.
- Welcome and support the identification of the site as safeguarded land however, also request that the site is considered for allocation for housing.
- Site has no amenity value and no particular environmental value. Development would bring facilities into an area that currently has none.
- The site is suitable for allocation for housing as it would not harm the historic setting or character of the city. It is deliverable. Reasonably accessible and sustainable. The loss of the site would not harm the five purposes of the Green Belt.

Objection

- Have not taken into account the village's parish plan.
- The village is already being over populated. The village of Earswick would lose its identity as a pleasant rural village.
- Loss of agricultural land and reduction in green space.
- Brownfield sites should be developed first.
- Access will be major issue, particularly if it is accessed via a further roundabout off the A1237, which is already suffering from extreme congestion at peak times.
- Increase in air pollution and noise which will have a major impact on the health and quality of life for existing residents.
- Infrastructure already at capacity.
- Concern that sites 775 and 777 were rejected on grounds of failing to meet criteria for Residential Access to Services, and yet the two sites taken together make up 75% of Site 810. If two individual sites have been rejected, they should have failed on the same grounds when submitted together as one site allocation.
- The site at Fossbanks Farm should have been included as this site is more appropriate for development (site ref 569).
- By extending development beyond the Ring Road, it will not only fundamentally change the relationship which the northern edge of York with Earswick, but also threaten the separation between the village and the main built-up area of the city. As such, development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city.
- Concerned with cumulative impact of this and sites ST11, SF4 and

Site 810 Earswick	
	ST9. These four sites represent a very intensive scale of development over an extended period of time to the north east of York.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. • The site is crossed by National Grid's high transmission overhead power lines. These overhead lines must remain in-situ and National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. • No objections to the development but making the council aware that that there is a pig farm down Strensall Road which spreads slurry on the surrounding areas. If the development does happen, does not want complaints of smell due to the spreading of slurry or from the noise of the alarms which sometimes go off due to heat etc. in the summer.

Site 752 East Field, Wheldrake	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • Advanced landscape planting to be agreed with the council will be carried out should the allocation be confirmed in the adopted Local Plan. • Confirmation that the land owner will support the safeguarded land designation at the Local Plan Examination.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this area seems likely to harm one of the elements which contributes to the special character and setting of York. • Substantial increase to existing footprint of the village and when taken alongside other development proposals in Wheldrake, will have an obvious impact on its character and setting. • There are no indications as to how the existing amenities in Wheldrake will cope with the increased population. Of particular concern is Wheldrake Primary School which is already consistently oversubscribed. • The land is green belt and is used for growing crops which should be continued. • Would bring development beyond the natural boundary of the village. Wheldrake will change out of all recognition.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheldrake is a sustainable settlement with the current facilities that it has and this proposal could be accommodated. Would be a perpetuation of the settlement form and character of the village. Concern about the access. Would object strongly to any access from Beck Lane other than to provide emergency access. This access could be unacceptably close to main habitable rooms causing present and future occupiers an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance

Site 752 East Field, Wheldrake

which would be extremely damaging to residential amenity.

New open space

Site 206 Temple Road, Copmanthorpe

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information is required as to the likely sports, community involvement, times of use, proposals for floodlighting etc. Impact of additional traffic into and through Copmanthorpe, especially at the junction of Station Rd and Main St and through the conservation area of the village is required. • Copmanthorpe Parish Council is currently seeking the views of Copmanthorpe residents on proposed alternative uses for some of this land. • The land is good and productive agricultural land.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be disappointed if this open space proposal were only intended as a 'peace offering' in order to try to dissipate the community's resolve against the proposals for 600 new homes in the village.

New renewable energy sites

Site 772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the use of renewable energy. Landscaping needs to be considered as part of the development. • As a pilot, no concerns regarding glint and glare to aircraft operating in the vicinity.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will interfere with the activities of the airfield and particularly the flying of microlight aircraft. • Council currently insisting on resubmission of Yorwaste application for recycling and waste transfer building to maintain rural aspect, a solar farm would be detrimental to these efforts. • Glare from solar panels should be a consideration, particularly on busy Wetherby Road. • Space should be found on brownfield sites, such as York Central. • Will adversely impact upon views of the countryside. • Solar Panels are better suited to roofs. • Loss of agricultural land to produce food. • Do not support the council's plans' for a 6 acre solar farm on Green Belt land between the villages of Rufforth and Knapton.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar power is needed but in smaller numbers not farms. • Will result in relatively modest level of electricity generation but could be substantially increased is further sites were allocated.

Site 750 Land Northwest of Hermitage Farmland

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the proposals.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree that the green belt land to the northwest of Stockton Heritage is an appropriate location for a solar farm. • Site is too close to Stockton Hermitage and Strensall Common Nature Reserve and could have an adverse impact on local wildlife. • Solar Panels are better suited to roofs. • Space should be found on brownfield sites. • Loss of agricultural land to produce food.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will result in relatively modest level of electricity generation but could be substantially increased if further sites were allocated. • The proximity of the SSSI should be noted and any effect the proposals would have on wildlife. • Need to appropriately assess the potential impacts of the proposal, also recommend that any and all opportunities for biodiversity enhancement should be sought. • Careful consideration needed to be given to whether a solar farm is suitable at this location and any impacts on the openness of the green belt. • There is Himalayan Balsam present at the site.

New and revised sites for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Recommendation 8a To use the figures produced by ORS as the basis for defining the need for accommodation when progressing the local plan

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that the Policy should make it clear that the study may have underestimated need from unauthorised development and housed Travellers and that the 66 additional pitch target for 2015 – 2030 should be treated as a minimum, with the study kept under review.

Site 3 (YORK001) Chowdene, Malton Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site forms a part of the green wedge centred on Monk Stray which penetrates from the open countryside into the heart of the built-up area of the city. Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan. • Welcome the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent.
----------------	---

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable for this use.
------------------	--

Site 9 (YORK002) Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the site is located within flood zone 3, and is therefore not compatible with a highly vulnerable use in flood risk terms, which caravans for permanent residential use are categorised as according to Planning Practice Guidance. • Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, its withdrawal of it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan is supported. • Pleased to note the removal of the proposed gypsy site, emphasised again that the ecological importance of the nature reserve would be impacted by any form of development of the land originally proposed as a gypsy site. • Welcome the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the proposed deletion of the Gypsy and Traveller site for the provision. Site is considered suitable.

Site 36 (YORK005) Land at Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns remain about any extension until the Council is able to run the existing site properly. Any further expansion would be totally inappropriate given the setting of the site. • Welcome the fact that the site has not been considered suitable for further expansion or intensification.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that comments submitted on the original planning application to expand the site were disregarded by the council. The site was badly managed and to have extended it will only aggravated the mismanagement.

Site 220 (YORK007) Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should never have been considered, it is totally inappropriate for this use. Would have ruined the small quiet community. • Welcome the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent. • This site should remain as Green Belt.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support the council's recommendation to confirm the withdrawal of the proposed Knapton Showpeople site.

Site 22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is small in size and is proportionate and appropriate to the size of Elvington village. It is a suitable location for the proposed use with safe access to the main road network. B1228 has had the speed limit reduced which can only benefit towards its safety. Existing access is privately owned and linked to the site. Also good safe pedestrian access. Village amenities within walking distance. Bus stop directly outside the site provided bus service to the city centre and surrounding villages. • The site is screened, little visible impact on the village residents and visitors. Settled family, integrating a small showmans site/family into a village is helping to tackle racism and misunderstanding. • Children already part of the local school so no added pressures on the school. Already registered with local doctors so no added pressure. • If the family were forced out of the area it would be detrimental to the children's education. The family are very much part other school community. • Environmentally friendly sewerage system installed to no added pressure on local sewerage system. • The family own this land, work hard and contribute to society. The children are settled and attend the local school. The site is tidy and the location well suited to the nature of their business. • The travelling showpeople family are already using the land and have been for some time. It is no longer Green Belt.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission for this site has already been rejected twice by City of York Council and the rejection was confirmed on an appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in 2011. • Site is known to be at risk from flooding and has already been turned down as being unsuitable for residential or employment development. • Travelling Showpersons use large and heavy vehicles which are unsuitable for operation on this type of site and should be based in an industrial area where they could operate in relative safety. The B1228 is already at saturation point and would be further pressured if this development is allowed. • The infrastructure of the village would be seriously affected by any increase in population. • This site should not be removed from the Green Belt. • Access is on a particularly dangerous point on the B1228 where a number of accidents have occurred. • Site is an eyesore on the approach to the village. • Overdevelopment when consider the new low cost housing development near the site.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two additional pitches would not seem unreasonable. • The family living here do contribute to family life and do present a current need. Further screening could be explored to mitigate the impact on neighbours.

Site 747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is directly opposite the industrial estate. On the same side of there are sewage works and other utility buildings. This cannot be considered rural or Green Belt. There are frequent visits from chemical tankers and other heavy goods vehicles, which has a higher effect on traffic than the proposals would. • The site borders the main road, therefore would provide direct access to the road network without causing any inconvenience. • There are sufficient safeguards and caveats in place to ensure that appropriate measures can be taken to mitigate against undue pressure on infrastructure and amenities. Current site can easily provide without any difficulties.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of this site is totally inappropriate being opposite the children's play area, medical centre and sports field and clubhouse. • The loss of privacy and risk of accidents would be unacceptable. • Site is known to be at risk from flooding and has already been turned down as being unsuitable for residential or employment development. • The site would detract from the visual appearance and character of the approach to the village. • The increase of traffic generated by the site would be significant on what is already a congested route. • The infrastructure of the village would be seriously affected by any increase in population. The school, medical practice and sewage system would be inadequate for the significant extra burden placed on them by this site and other extra sites, and would be unable to cope. • There is no proven need for further Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the York area and there are unoccupied pitches at nearby privately managed sites. • This site is in Green Belt and a brown field site should be allocated first. • The size of the site is unsustainable for a rural village. • The development is disproportionate to the village as we already have a site for touring caravans and a site for Travelling Show People. • Strongly opposed to the integration of travellers into residential areas – it can only cause friction between the two parties. • The site has previously been rejected for housing and there can be no justification, given the same planning principles apply for both uses, for it to be considered to house travellers if it is not suitable for residential house building.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided the travellers maintain the site properly and it is under the supervision of the council there is no objection to this site. Question whether there is a brownfield site and how appropriate it is near to the doctors and sports club.

Site 772 (YORK013) Land at Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan. • Do not consider this site to be suitable for Traveller site development. • Agree with the recommendation not to pursue this site.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not contemplate providing anymore of these sites until the council can better manage the ones it already has and can collect the rents and revenues from the uses of these sites.

Site 253 (YORK017) Site adjacent A1237/A64, Askham Bryan

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan. • Agree with the recommendation not to pursue this site. • Do not consider this site to be suitable for traveller development.
----------------	---

Recommendation 8b Actively seek further sites for consideration through this consultation

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Travellers Trust have employed a planner to review the viability and suitability of the sites suggested during the Plan's preparation of the next few months and use the contacts with the Traveller community to try and identify sites. Will also liaise with the council's site consultants over and above this. However, the number of land for new sites found has been disappointing. • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
----------------	--

Recommendation 8c Offer all promoters of new sites for travellers the possibility of either council purchase or offer a partnership to ensure delivery with the owners

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation seems sensible. It is clearly aimed at facilitating two easier routes for development of new sites. • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan, hope that the council proceed with recommendation.
----------------	--

Recommendation 8d Propose the use of small parts of the largest sites to contribute to provision (ST7,8,14 and 15)

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly support this recommendation. However, given that the needs
----------------	---

Recommendation 8d Propose the use of small parts of the largest sites to contribute to provision (ST7,8,14 and 15)

	<p>are immediate and sites delivered through this option may not come until later, it can only be one of a number of approaches. The policy should require the provision to be on-site or on a nearby suitable site in the developer's ownership. Extremely cautious (to the point of opposition) of the idea of offering landowners the possibility of paying a commuted sum. The threshold for allowing a developer this option must be set very high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is existing provision at Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick and proposed additional pitches on adjacent land, on-site provision at ST7 seems to be unworkable and would add to existing tensions within the wider community. Funded by commuted sums is the only realistic way forward. • Unviable to make provision for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on ST14. However prepared to discuss the potential provision on another suitable site in landowners ownership or the provision of a commuted sum on the understanding that any funds collected could then be used to pay for provision of facilities on any other identified sites and the purchase of sites by the council. • Strongly opposed to recommendation of holding owners of strategic sites to ransom by insisting that they either provide a section of their sites for use as a Travellers site, land elsewhere under their ownership or a commuted sum. • In relation to ST8, there has been no consultation on developers providing land for travellers as part of their development. • This is not appropriate, new housing developments would be less attractive when in close proximity to such sites and overall the development of large areas and traveller sites would reduce the attractiveness of the area and the prices of existing properties. • There is no explanation or justification of the strategic site size threshold of 50ha, or where the use of less than 1% of the site area is derived, nor is there any explanation of the priority of on-site provision first, followed by off-site provision on land in the same ownership and finally, a commuted sum. Further explanation is required.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to require developers to provide accommodation is untested and there is no evidence that any consultation has taken place to determine whether the proposals are realistic.

Recommendation 8e Actively encourage travelling showpeople provision on employment sites

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan. • Hope that the council proceed with recommendation.
----------------	--

New education sites

Site 794 University	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for additional land for the long term future development at the University. Request that a policy is included in the plan to ensure expectations of development are made clear.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late inclusion in the plan. • Little or no explanation of how traffic will be distributed. There should be no direct access from the site when developed into the village other than field lane. • All existing public routes and public rights of way should be retained un any completed development. • Loss of high quality agricultural land in the green belt. • Site forms a vital part of the attractive setting of the city and of Heslington Village. • Would radically change the rural character of the area. • Disproportionally large scale development. • Would bring development within 130m of the ring road which is likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Cannot believe that sufficient student accommodation would be provided and HMOs have already ruined several residential areas locally. • Heslington will cease to be a village.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to look at cumulative impact of this and other sites on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. • May have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Highways Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. • The university should be required to build more accommodation for students. • Proposed that a specific allocation for employment uses of 12ha be included in the plan using the university as a catalyst. Further evidence submitted. • Existing controls (at Heslington east) on the environment impact need to be maintained. • Need more information on how the proposal will be managed. • Appreciation for the positive economic impact that a thriving university has on the city, also note the varied impact the university expansion has had on immediate neighbourhood properties who may not benefit from the economic impact.

Site 230 Land to North of Manor School	
Key Issues Raised	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposal to link the site currently identified as open space with the existing Manor School designation.

New transport sites

Site 241 Land North & West of A1237/Wigginton Rd Roundabout

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that owners have control of land to assist delivery. Measures will be put in place to bring this forward within the first five years of the plan which could assist with the sustainability of ST14.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic green space required as mitigation for the loss of agricultural land. Lies in the open countryside in an area which forms part of the rural setting of the historic city. In conjunction with ST14 would see a large section of the open countryside and alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route. Would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Park & Ride is preferable to housing. Agree with landscaping requirement.

Site 800 Land to the south of Designer Outlet

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation for the expansion of Park & Ride facilities is supported.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would substantially increase the extent of the built up area and bring buildings far closer to Bishopthorpe. Allocation seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the city. Could also impact on the setting of the Bishopthorpe conservation area. Large area of Green Belt land of agricultural and biodiversity value. Located close to already over congested A19 into York via Fulford and would only make congestion worse. Direct threat to viability and integrity of Fulford Community Orchard.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of the site is located within flood zones 2 and 3, requested that the site is subject to the flood risk sequential to ensure that there are no alternative sites at a lower level of flood risk. Clarification sought regarding the existing Park & Ride site and what is proposed for the existing site following relocation.

Site 253 Site Near Askham Bryan

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location is appropriate due to being close to suitable infrastructure. Supportive of a scheme that will make for easier distribution around the city in smaller vehicles powered by 'greener' gas.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could lead to impacts on the water quality of Holgate Beck which runs from the site then north to Askham Bog. As such Holgate Beck is important to the hydrology of the SSSI. Loss of agricultural land, strategic green space required as mitigation. Proposed use is inappropriate in this location. Non agricultural

Site 253 Site Near Askham Bryan	
	<p>building within the Green Belt should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has strategic views of the Minster. • Do not support the proposal for a compressed natural gas fuelling station and freight consolidation centre off the ring road at Askham Bryan. • Safety concerns for nearby residents. • Inevitable significant adverse impact on traffic and approved development at Askham Bryan College will accentuate the situation. In particular increased HGV traffic around Askham Bryan and Copmanthorpe would increase on an already congested network. • No proven need for such a facility in York, but if there is should be on a brownfield site. • No assessment undertaken to assess whether the project would be financially viable. • Would lead to a consolidation of development around Askham Bryan College and threaten a gap which currently separates Askham Bryan from Copmanthorpe. Likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Noise, odour and air pollution concerns for local residents.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation must be supported by appropriate evidence that the site will not contaminate the water course and Askham Bog SSSI. • Will require additional information demonstrating the impact of the site. The Highways Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council.

Technical appendices

- 5.4 The work undertaken to analyse proposals for new sites and revised boundaries received through the preferred options consultation for the City of York Local Plan, as well as analysis of additional evidence to consider sites that had previously been considered but had not been identified as potential allocations was presented in a series of technical appendices. Only those new sites or existing sites with proposed changes that were considered viable and deliverable were featured in the main consultation document and comments sought. For the large number of sites where analysis concluded that a site was not viable or in the case of an existing site with proposed changes was to remain unchanged these sites remained in the technical appendices. A number of consultee responses were however received on these sites. A summary of the main issues raised and how they have been taken into account for the technical appendices sites (for sites not covered already by the main consultation document) can be found at Annex C.

Non related and general comments

- 5.5 A number of comments were also received that were not related to the further sites consultation, for example comments on overall housing figures, preferred options

sites and policies. Please see the 'non FSC' summary tables available online for more information. In addition, several general comments were made on the further sites consultation which can also be found online.

6.0 Conclusion and next steps

- 6.1 The Local Plan will be the development plan for York over the 15 year period from 2015-2030. It will include a vision for the future development of the city and a spatial strategy and covers both strategic policies and allocations, alongside detailed development management policies. The preparation of the Local Plan follows on from the previous Local Development Framework process and local plan preferred options consultation in 2013. The further sites documents were subject to considerable consultation. It should be noted that because of the different forms of response some respondents may have sent an individual response and signed one or more of the petitions, leading to some duplication. However, the overall level of engagement and response was good for this type of consultation.
- 6.2 The consultation comments received as part of both the previous preferred options consultation and this further sites consultation, alongside further technical work will be used to help come to a conclusion on the portfolio of sites to include in the publication local plan. The publication local plan will be subject to another round of consultation. This will give everyone another chance to object, support or comment on the sites and policies. After which, a final plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.

Annex A

Copy of Comments Form

City of York Local Plan



Local Plan Further Sites Consultation Comments Form

Responses on this form should only relate to the sites and / or information set out in the Further Sites Consultation documents. We will seek your views on the Publication Local Plan later in the year.

- The submission deadline is Wednesday 16th July 2014.
- Please complete a **separate form for each site** you are commenting upon.

Please complete all sections of the form in **BLOCK CAPITALS**.

SECTION 1: YOUR CONTACT DETAILS

Name			
Organisation (if relevant)			
Representing (if relevant)			
Address			
	Postcode		
Telephone			
Email			
Signature		Date	

SECTION 2: YOUR SITE COMMENTS

Site Name	
Site Reference	
Gypsy, Traveller, Roma and Travelling Showpeople Options (if applicable)	
Page Number (Please specify which document e.g. main report or which appendices)	

Please use the space below to make your comments on the Local Plan Further Sites Consultation. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary, noting the section reference to which you are responding.

Your Comments

Your Comments

Declaration:

I understand that the personal and other data I provide will be used to inform the council's emerging planning policy framework for its duration and will also be used to help ensure the accuracy and completeness of information held for other council purposes.

I understand that the details submitted may be made available to the public if required by the Freedom of Information Act or other legal provisions.

All responses should be returned by 16th July 2014 so that we can take your views into account.

If you have any queries, please contact us:

Tel: (01904) 552255

E-mail: localplan@york.gov.uk

Please return completed forms

(no stamp required) to:

FREEPOST RTEG-TYYU-KLTZ

City of York Council

West Offices

Station Rise

York

YO1 6GA

How did you hear about this consultation?

Do you have any general comments on this consultation process?

Annex B
Copy of Consultation Letter



City & Environmental Services

Planning and Environmental
Management
West Offices
Station Rise
York
YO1 6GA
01904 552255

2nd June 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

City of York Local Plan

Work is currently underway on preparing a new Local Plan for the City of York. The Local Plan is a citywide plan which will help shape future development in York up to 2030 and beyond. It sets out the opportunities and policies on what will or will not be permitted and where, including new homes and businesses.

Local Plan Update

In June and July 2013 we undertook public consultation on the Local Plan Preferred Options. In total we received responses from 4,945 individuals, businesses and organisations, covering around 17,500 comments. All of the responses received have been published on the Council's website for the public to view. As a key part of processing the responses, officers have summarised the comments received by section and policy. These summaries can also be viewed on the Council's website and can be used to interpret the full responses. For more information, please go to www.york.gov.uk/localplan.

Further Consultation

We are now seeking your views as part of a supplementary sites consultation. During the Preferred Options consultation, additional information on sites was submitted by landowners and developers. This included the submission of new sites and further evidence on existing sites. This information, alongside an assessment of new evidence, has led to a number of potential changes to the sites consulted on at the Preferred Options stage. Namely, the identification of:

- potential new sites;
- the reconsideration of some sites that were previously rejected; and
- potential boundary changes on some of the strategic allocations.

Further work has also been carried out in relation to sites for safeguarded land and Gypsy, Roma & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople.

Before making any final recommendations on sites to include and making other changes to the draft Local Plan following last summer's consultation, the Council would like to understand your views on this additional information and associated work.

You can view the Local Plan Further Sites Consultation documents on the council's website at www.york.gov.uk/localplan. Alternatively you can view the document at the council reception at West Offices and in Libraries across York. During the consultation we will also be holding a number of exhibitions where you can view the sites and speak to an officer. The exhibitions are as follows:

- B&Q Foyer, Hull Road (Tuesday 10th June from 2.30pm to 7.30pm)
- Monks Cross Shopping Park – Car Park (Thursday 26th June from 2.30pm to 7.30pm)
- City Centre – Parliament Street (Wednesday 2nd July from 10am to 4pm)

Comments can be made by completing a Local Plan Further Sites Consultation comments form available on the website at www.york.gov.uk/localplan (this can be printed out and posted or completed online), or pick up a form from the libraries, West Offices reception or any of the exhibitions. Alternatively you can email your comments to localplan@york.gov.uk or post them to FREEPOST RTEG-TYYU-KLTZ, City of York Council, West Offices, Station Rise, York, YO1 6GA.

The closing date for comments is **Wednesday 16th July 2014**.

Next Steps

The comments received as part of this consultation will help inform future recommendations on the portfolio of sites for inclusion in the final draft Local Plan (Publication). There will be a further opportunity to comment on the whole of the final plan later in the year before it is submitted to the Secretary of State to be examined by an independent inspector.

We look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours sincerely



Martin Grainger
Head of Planning and Environmental Management

Annex C
Further Sites Consultation
Technical Appendices-
main
issues raised through
consultation

Appendix 1: Residential, Employment and Retail Methodology

Residential, Employment and Retail Methodology	
Key Issues Raised	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree that criteria 4 should be divided and access to transport separated from facilities and services. Consider that this should be treated as a whole. • The site selection does not seem to take account of the defined settlement limits as agreed with the third set of changes, the draft Green Belt agreement with West Riding County Council in the 1970's, protection of the Green Belt provision as objectives previously laid down by yourselves, the area preventing coalescence with city of York by retaining a physical separation of the two settlements and Poppleton rural setting previously its individual identity. Notes that on Figure A1.2 York's Green Belt Character Areas (2013) an area retaining the rural setting has been included roughly between A59 and Knaption Village and the A1237 and Beckfield Lane. • The site selection process only appears to consider five criteria. Recommended that the issue of unstable land due to former coal mining activity be fully considered prior to the final site selection being made. • The chosen distances from various facilities are somewhat arbitrary and are not particularly meaningful. • Assessment methodology used to assess sites on criteria 4 is ultimately flawed. The decision to use multiple locations across the various sites for proximity assessments provides a false positive. The correct approach would be to either use a fixed point, most sensibly the centre of the site, or to analyse what percentage of the site falls within the required distances as other local authorities have done.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every single site within the shortlisted sites assessment has been given a maximum 4 for economic development. This demonstrates that no objective assessment has been made to establish which sites are more or less economically attractive, and would suggest that scoring of '4' has been used to improve the rating of all shortlisted sites. • Unclear about criteria 4a and distance to residential services and how this is calculated.

Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 2 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 2 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

Site 9 Land at Corner of Hassacarr Road and Common Lane, Dunnington	
Key Issues Raised	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to technical officer comments. Flood risk was the only show-

	<p>stopper identified. No other obstacles to the potential allocation of the site for residential development. Initial masterplan shows how development could be accommodated on the site with built development on the land outside the flood zone with gardens, open space and areas of ecological enhancement in the flood zone areas. Request that the site is allocated for residential development.</p>
--	---

Site 13 Land at Station Yard, Wheldrake

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with technical officers' comments and the conclusion on the site's suitability. Housing development of the site will deliver significant local community benefits and will make a meaningful contribution towards meeting local housing needs and support the services and community infrastructure of the village. The site serves no Green Belt purpose. The existing allocation of land to the north of North Lane (H28) is demonstration of the council's appreciation that Wheldrake is an appropriate and sustainable settlement, suitable of accommodating new residential development. Requested that the site be included as a housing allocation.
------------------	--

Site 67 Land at Millfield Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with technical officers' recommendation for failing criteria 1. Housing in this location would contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans in the area. Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable. This land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites 733, 67 and 215 are all within the village boundary, need to look at these proposals as a whole and to think extremely about what expansion the already overstretched village can withstand.

Site 76 Duncombe Farm, Strensall

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that this site is in an unsustainable location. The site is currently within the Green Belt.
----------------	--

Site 83 Main Street, Knapton**Key Issues Raised****Support**

- It is important to maintain the Green Belt around York's villages and avoid settlements merging.

Site 88 Land at Villa Pond, Wigginton**Key Issues Raised****Objection**

- At the preferred options stage the site was submitted for tourism, leisure, sport and recreation uses, comprising a small holiday lodge development of 22 eco cabins grouped around the existing fishing lake and featuring the formation of a new second lake. It is considered that these proposals would meet the requirements set out in the NPPF and requirements of the draft Local Plan to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. Whilst it is important that residential sites have access to facilities, services and transport, the criteria are not relevant in assessing the site which proposes eco cabins as part of a holiday lodge development. Reference to failing criteria 4 should be omitted. Request that the site is identified for tourism, leisure, sport and recreation uses in the Local Plan.

Site 112 Brook Nook, Osbaldwick Way**Key Issues Raised****Objection**

- The site is suitable for housing. Planning permission granted for a caravan park, development has started.

Site 137 Land at Heworth Croft**Key Issues Raised****Objection**

- Disagree with the technical officers' assessment of issues relating to open space and recreation and flood risk. Confirm that the loss of the pitches at Heworth will be more than adequately compensated by the development of the new sport centre at Haxby Road, and that the remaining issues highlighted as amber in the assessment can be resolved. Request allocation of land at Heworth Croft as student housing.
- Satisfied that evidence shows that the combination planning approvals and the specification of works give a clear indication of the University's intention to satisfy the qualitative elements of Sport England's assessment. No objection to the site coming forward for development.

Site 138 Hull Road Playing Fields**Key Issues Raised****Objection**

- Disagree with the technical officers' assessment of issues relating to the loss of playing fields. Confirm that the loss of the pitches at Hull

	<p>Road will be more than adequately compensated by the development of the new sport centre at Haxby Road. Request allocation of land at Hull Road as housing or for Science Park uses as an extension to the existing science park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfied that evidence shows that the combination planning approvals and the specification of works give a clear indication of the University's intention to satisfy the qualitative elements of Sport England's assessment. No objection to the site coming forward for development.
--	---

Site 139 Biorad

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should be included in the local plan for housing as it is brownfield land, the site is largely covered in tarmac, so development would be good for the immediate environment, and would enhance the green corridor. Similar development was authorised last year through the planning application process. Developing the site would reduce water run-off into the River Foss, and reduce flooding in the area.
------------------	--

Site 170 Pond Field, Heslington

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier submission at preferred options stage makes detailed points that address some of the technical officers' issues but these do not appear to have been taken into account. Without clear and strong justification, it is considered unreasonable for the council to insist that the site be retained in isolated agricultural use. The land should be allocated for residential development to contribute to meeting the city's widespread housing needs.
------------------	---

Site 171 Lime Tree Farm, Heslington

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the technical officers' assessment and decision not to allocate this site for housing. Detailed comments provided on setting, character, rights of way, separation and agricultural character to demonstrate why the land should be allocated for residential development to contribute to meeting the city's housing needs.
------------------	--

Site 175 Land at Askham Bryan

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and support the decision to reject the site for housing.
----------------	--

Site 176 Land at South of Station Road, Haxby

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unclear how the site can be rejected if it was previously a preferred location for Haxby station. If part of the allotment can be relocated to make room for a car park it can be for housing too. Housing can be used to fund the station.
------------------	---

Site 180 Land at Malton Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support council's determination that flood risk at the site is considerably different to the data supplied by the Environment Agency.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This site provides modest, sustainable extension to the city which is in line with the council's sustainability and environmental objectives. Disagree with officers' assessment. Removing the green wedge allocation on the southern part of the site would not affect the overall coherence of the Green Belt to the north-east of the city. It would not alter key historic views to the Minster or other elements of the historic city. Consider the discounting of the southern part of the site from being a developable proposition is unjustified. Land at Malton Road provides more sustainable and appropriate location for development than a number of other sites out with the existing urban area of the city.

Site 184 Land to South of A1237

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should reconsider the findings with a view to allocating the land for residential development. Would look to develop up to 50% affordable housing on site as part of any scheme subject to a viability assessment. Green Belt Appraisal found that not all the area of land between Haxby and New Earswick needs to remain open and undeveloped in order to prevent coalescence. The assessment also found that land to the north of New Earswick and south of A1237 could also be excluded from the Green Belt because it also would not lead to coalescence of New Earswick and Haxby because a sufficient gap would be maintained between the two settlements. Would not inhibit the openness of the wider area and would uphold the five purposes of the Green Belt.
------------------	--

Site 185 Land South of Tadcaster Road

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The land is suitable and sustainable for release for housing from the Green Belt. Site is accessible to existing facilities and services in the village and its development would minimise car journeys through accessibility to the new Oark & Ride facility at Askham Bar. It is
------------------	--

Site 185 Land South of Tadcaster Road

located on one of city's cycle routes and has access to several local bus routes. Site does not fulfil any purpose as part of Green Belt. No evidence available to support council's assessment that the site fulfils a role in preventing coalescence. Existing gap between Copmanthorpe, York and Bishopthorpe will remain open in the event of the site's development and is protected from development by the presence of Askham Bog to the north and flood zones to the east. Will not lead to pressure to develop the area any further. Site is well contained by surrounding uses. Site's boundaries are well defined on all sides. East Coast Mainline provides recognisable boundary to Green Belt that is likely to remain in place for the foreseeable future. Site is more appropriate for release than those currently preferred by the council to the west of the village (Site ST12 and ST13). Has some local support and will be included as a proposed allocation in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Assessment appears to have been made within the confines of existing outdated documentation and has had no regard to the evidence submitted previously to the council. Council's assessment of the site lacks wider strategic consideration of sustainability objectives such as the need to minimise car journeys, and is supported by out of date, insufficiently detailed evidence.

Site 191 Land at Avon Drive, Huntington

Key Issues Raised

Support

- Welcome that the site has been found to fail the technical assessment.
- This field is a valuable green space used by many for recreation and is home to varied wildlife. Many of the gardens bordering this land struggle with excess water over wet periods, developing this land would exacerbate this problem and harm the wildlife in the area.

Objection

- Only red score related to transport. Further transport evidence provided in form of proposed road layout options, together with illustrative masterplan layout. Demonstrates that dualling can be achieved largely within the alignment of the existing ring road and where additional land is required to widen the carriageway this can be provided to the north of the existing alignment. The incorporation of a dualled and/or grade separated junction on the ring road does not have significant implications for the viability of a deliverable residential layout on the land north of Avon Drive. Residential development will not prejudice proposals for dualling the ring road and residential development can be achieved without adverse effects on residential amenity, arising from dualling the ring road. Propose that the site is allocated to ensure the short term delivery of needed housing and there is no need to delay an allocation because of the potential dualling of the York ring road as one does not prejudice the other.

Site 215 Land at Manor Close, Upper Poppleton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with technical officers' recommendation for failing criteria 1.• Housing in this location would contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement.• The present infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate such large plans in the area.• Roads in York are already inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable.• The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sites 733, 67 and 215 within the village boundary, need to look at these proposals as a whole and to think about what expansion the already overstretched village can withstand.

Site 220 Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This site is not suitable for housing. It is a greenfield site of historic character. Would impact on Knapton village.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site satisfies criteria 1, 2 and 3, but fails on criteria 4. However an assessment of services and facilities indicates that the site is accessible to local services and indeed will be providing additional facilities in the form of a substantial area of public open space as part of the development and as such meets all of the necessary criteria. Confirm that the site is suitable for residential development (including open market, affordable and student properties) and for the provision of public open space in the Local Plan.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds than quoted

Site 221 Land at Sim Balk Lane

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To restrict the use of this land by Green Belt designation will have adverse economic effects and restrict the potential for logical further development. The land is available as a new education site on the same basis as sites 794 and 230. There are no showstoppers in respect of site delivery.
------------------	--

Site 250 South of A59

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the technical officers' recommendation to fail criteria 1.• Will impact on the villages of Poppleton and Knapton.
----------------	---

Site 250 South of A59

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to designation of area retaining the rural setting within part of the site and the continued designation of the whole area of the land at North Field as Green Belt. Additional evidence submitted, including site location plan, site layout/land use plan, Transport Strategy Report, and Objectively Assessed Need for Housing Report. Land at North Field is considered a suitable site for the location of housing to meet the future housing needs of the city.
------------------	--

Site 297 Land to Rear of Main Street, Elvington**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern at introducing a lot of new housing to the village.
----------------	---

Site 676 Rufforth Airfield South of Southfield Close**Key Issues Raised**

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was rejected with reference made to limited services and transport options despite passing criteria 4 for services which assesses both of these issues. Increasing the population in the local area will support existing services and potentially lead to new services being delivered e.g. a more frequent bus timetable.
------------------	--

Site 719 Terry's Carpark and Land to South**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with officer rejection of the site, would affect setting and/or flood risk.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical officers' conclusions are incorrect and not supported by a clear evidence base nor the council's own assessments. The land offers a sustainable location for new development being located on the edge of the urban area with access to public transport, schools, shops and community facilities. Redevelopment suitable for a number of uses such as residential, doctors surgery/health centre, nursery etc. The car park is previously developed land. It is now considered unlikely that the car park site will be required to provide for as much car parking, to serve the new uses on the main Terry's factory site as previously anticipated. Does not perform any of the roles necessary for inclusion in the Green Belt. Development of a similar scale and overall height to the decked car park (likely to be approximately 5.5m once one has taken into account vehicles parked on the upper deck) is likely to be most acceptable. This would be equivalent to a single storey building.

Site 720 Land to East of Terry's**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with officer rejection. Would affect setting and/or flood risk.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical officers' conclusions are incorrect and not supported by a

	<p>clear evidence base nor the council's own assessments. The land offers a sustainable location for new development being located on the edge of the urban area with access to public transport, schools, shops and community facilities. Not necessary to keep the site permanently open to achieve any of the purposes required for including land within the Green Belt. Should not be included in the Green Belt boundary and the beneficial use of this land for sustainable development to meet the future needs of the city should be positively encouraged. Suitable for residential or educational uses.</p>
--	--

Site 736 Land to rear of Hilbra Avenue, Haxby

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has all of the necessary attributes for allocation, especially as it is a brownfield site that would not conflict with the openness of the countryside in practical and visual terms and which is deliverable now. Greystones site (H37) has been included following revisions which include a stretch of landscape/ open space to the south. Site 736 could also have this enhancement and become an extension to the Greystones site. Submitted a design and access statement for residential development at the site.
------------------	---

Site 737 Stockhill Field, West of Church Balk, Dunnington

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land should be included for development. Would not place too great a strain on the current infrastructure of the village. Will allow easy access to roads away from the village centre. The grounds for rejecting this site are unsound. This housing development meets criteria for development. This site is centrally located within Dunnington and could be regarded as limited infill within the Green Belt. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village.
------------------	---

Site 739 The Old Rectory, Moor Lane, Haxby

Key Issues Raised

Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how the site can be rejected when land opposite (ST9) has been allocated. This site is just as suitable/not suitable as the land across the road.
----------------	---

Site 740 South of Yorkfield Lane at the end of Learmans Way, Copmanthorpe

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field is a historic area and failed criteria 1 for development. York field is the oldest mentioned on medieval maps. Askham bog would become unmanageable and destroyed.
----------------	--

Site 742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would object strongly to any residential development on this site.• Amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.• Agree with the technical officers' recommendation for failing this site.• Opposed to additional housing in the rural west ward.
----------------	---

Site 744 Bull Balks, Dunnington**Key Issues Raised**

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Future development in Dunnington should be aimed at making the village more concentrated (nucleated), which this site would achieve, rather than spreading out into the rural end of Eastfield Lane.• This site is centrally located within Dunnington and could be regarded as limited infill within the Green Belt.• Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village.
------------------	---

Site 749 North of Riverside Gardens, Elvington**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern at introducing a lot of new housing to the village.
----------------	---

Site 751 Off Fordland's Road, Fulford**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the rejection of this site because of its contribution to the historic setting of Fulford and the city.
----------------	--

Site 754 Land to the West of Strensall Road, Earswick**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.
----------------	---

Site 755 Land to the East of Strensall Road, Earswick**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.
----------------	---

Site 763 Land West of Upper Poppleton**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would strongly object to any development on this site.• The plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement.
----------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for. • It is important to retain the historic and village setting of Poppleton. Any development on this site would ruin the village setting.
--	--

Site 764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would strongly object to any development on this site. • Would represent a loss of Green Belt with subsequent detrimental impact on the setting of the historic city and setting of the Poppletons. • The plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. • Would put huge extra pressure on the A59 and local roads which are already struggling to cope. • Disproportionate to the existing Poppleton villages.
----------------	--

Site 766 112 Strensall Road, Earswick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development of this site will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.
----------------	--

Site 767 Land East of A19 (Selby Road) Fulford

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the rejection of this site because of the contribution to the historic setting of Fulford and the city as set out in the 2011 Historic Character Technical Appraisal Paper.
----------------	--

Site 769 Oaktree Nursery, Upper Poppleton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with technical officers' recommendation for failing criteria 1. • The amenities in this area are already under great strain. • This land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. • There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians.
----------------	---

Site 773 Land North of Skelton Village

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the council's assessment of site. Object to the identification of the land to the north and north east of Skelton as being important in preserving the setting of the village or that of York and the Minster. The areas designated Flood Zone 3a could easily be designated as forming part of such areas. Subject to appropriate measures being taken, such a designation would be capable of
------------------	---

	enhancing the biodiversity of the overall site. Question efficiency of site selection methodology. Without allocation of this land as Safeguarded Land there would be no more development in Skelton for over 25 years and housing needs would go unmet.
--	--

Site 774 North of Railway Line adj Millfield Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1. • A greenfield site of historical importance. Would impact on Poppleton. • Road network, schools and amenities cannot support the volume of housing proposed.
----------------	--

Site 775 Land at Boroughbridge Road/Millfield Lane Site 1

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1.
----------------	--

Site 777 Amalgamated Sites East of Earswick

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond. • The principle of using Green Belt for new development is wrong as it will significantly change the character of the village. • Housing on this site would be unsustainable and put serious strain on the infrastructure (roads and schools). It will devalue properties in the parish.
----------------	--

Site 778 Land West of Chapel Fields

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes made to the proposals and evidence produced to address those issues raised in the technical officer assessment. The proposed housing site would comprise 102 housing units, resulting in a small expansion of the western edge of the city. Request that site is allocated for housing.
------------------	---

Site 780 South of Knapton Open Space

Key Issues Raised

Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with officer assessment. The site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds.
----------------	--

Site 781 Land to the West of Strensall Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Any development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.
----------------	---

Site 782 Foss Bank Farm

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Any development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The main reason for the site not being allocated is one of sustainability with. no school or doctors surgery within a specified distance of the site. It would appear 220 acres of land opposite the site (site 810) has been earmarked for future development. Unclear how this can be. If this site is not sustainable, then how is the land over the road. Informed that the developer of 810 will be required to build a school, shops etc. which will then make the site sustainable, if that is the case then surely this site should also be considered sustainable, removed from the Green Belt and safeguarded for future development.Suggest that the site scores highly with regards to access to transport as there is a bus stop outside the entrance to the site with buses with a frequent service. Recommendations for site 810 should apply to this site. Site 782 should be included as safeguarded land within the local plan, in the same way site 810 is.

Site 789 Land to West of Beckside Elvington

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concern at proposals that would introduce a lot of new housing to the village.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Initial assessment identified no reasons why the existing road network cannot accommodate development of the land.Development to the west of the proposed site did not uncover any archaeology. Therefore do not envisage that this site would be of archaeological interest. Appreciate that a desk based report would be required if the land is to be considered for allocation. However, such a report is not necessary if the land is only to be safeguarded.Do not see that the visual impacts of safeguarding the land would be harmful, or undermine the purposes of Green Belt given that the land does not fulfil Green Belt policy objectives.Cannot see how development of the land would visually impact on the conservation area, given it is physically separate and should not be visible from within the conservation area.The appraisal suggests development of the land would impact on a number of residential receptors and PROW. However, no one has the right to a view, and development on the edge of settlements invariably abuts existing properties thereby changing existing views. The

	proposed area of land for safeguarding will, therefore, represent the development opportunity which has previously been identified and which the existing road layout is intended to facilitate.
--	--

Site 790 Northfield, North of Knapton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failed technical officer comments, agree with this assessment. A greenfield site of historic character, development here would impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a typing error in the officers' comments.

Site 796 Outskirt of Knapton Village

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to any development as this is a green field site of historic character. Would impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with officer assessment. The site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds.

Appendix 3: Employment/Retail Site Assessment Proformas

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 3 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 3 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

Site 87 Wills and Ellis Garage, Boroughbridge Road

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with technical officer comments. Ingress and egress from this property on the A1237 major road and the A59 is at best problematic and at worst congestion producing in the extreme with no provision for passing or joining the oncoming traffic.
----------------	---

Site 246 Whitehall Grange

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has particular advantage for the current occupiers, Autohorn. Its main advantage is its proximity to the company's clients in the city and on the Clifton Moor industrial estate. This means that journeys to deliver cars to clients and customers are short. If the company was forced to move its car storage further out of the city, delivery journeys would be longer and therefore less sustainable. The inner boundaries of the Green Belt have never been determined in a statutory Local Plan. The council is therefore in the position of deciding whether land should be included in the Green Belt and not whether land should be taken out of the Green Belt. Autohorn is an important local employer with a specific development requirement. Meeting the needs of that
------------------	---

	<p>employer can therefore be considered to be contributing to sustainable development. Object to failure of site due to compromising the historic character and setting of York. Further justification submitted as to why it would not compromise historic character and setting.</p>
--	--

Site 742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that this site should not be considered for extensive retail use.
----------------	---

Site 798 Land to East of Designer Outlet

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the rejection of this site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to rejection of site. Believe site is deliverable and developable for leisure and employment opportunities. • There are inconsistencies between technical officer comments on this site and land to south of designer outlet (site 800). Both sites are in the extension to green wedge designation in the historic character and setting 2011 update but only site 800 is proposed to be removed. Do not consider that development of this site would have an adverse impact on landscape character or habitat. Further ecology and landscape evidence submitted.

Appendix 4: Changes to Allocated Sites

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 4 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 4 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

Site 37 (E3) Ford Garage, Jockey Lane

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be allocated for retail and associated A use classes to reflect the sub regional shopping function of Monks Cross Shopping Park.
------------------	---

Site 46 (H30) Land to the South of Strensall Village (amalgamated sites)

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the officer assessment • Boundary shouldn't be enlarged because of the environmental impacts and poor access.
----------------	---

Site 55 (H26) Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree with the exclusion of land to the west of H26 within the
------------------	---

Site 55 (H26) Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington

- allocation. No intention to develop here and consider that it would be beneficial to the land if it were to be brought under positive and beneficial management.
- The land is designated SINC and is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. It is therefore protected from development. If access to the woodland is excluded, the SINC would be of limited value to the community. This would restrict inappropriate use of the woodland by the public and limit the level of disturbance on wildlife. Without management, the value of the woodland would naturally decrease over time. Over time, the ecological value of the area will therefore be permanently lost without management.
 - The land to the west of H26 contains structures built during the second world war. These buildings are redundant and in poor condition. If the buildings are left in situ, they are likely to decay and may be misused. It would be better to demolish these buildings. Positive and beneficial management would enhance the biodiversity of the area and secure the long term value of the site. It is considered that it would be much better to create formal access into the Woodland, with a well-defined footpath that guides members of the public through the SINC. This would allow the public to appreciate and benefit from this area.

Site 72 (H33) Water Tower Lane, Dunnington**Key Issues Raised**

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Objection | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional land should be allocated which was rejected in the further sites consultation. Additional land could provide an additional 13 affordable dwellings. Sole ownership and agreement with Cobalt. Rejected extension to boundary at technical officer comments due to landscape impacts – need to retain separation to A166 and prevent encroachment. Sets out case that development could incorporate a separation to A166 by way of green buffer/Public Open Space. Could show as indicative greenspace as for other sites. Would help to maintain character and setting of Dunnington and create a clear settlement limit and defensible boundary. |
|------------------|--|

Site 197 (H24) Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road**Key Issues Raised**

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with officer assessment that this site is not suited for retail/petrol station. Remedial decontamination has already been undertaken for this former petrol station site which could be suited for community use or housing. Retail use would adversely affect nearby local shopping parade in the conservation area leading to pressure to convert to inappropriate uses for traditional shop units. |
|----------------|---|

Site 46 (H30) Land to the South of Strensall Village (amalgamated sites)**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the officer assessment• Boundary shouldn't be enlarged because of the environmental impacts and poor access.
----------------	--

Site 202 (H4) St Joseph's Monastery**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support removal of burial ground and would propose that given the shortfall of public open space within the immediate area, open space provision should be required on site in any housing development.• Supportive of the allocation of the site for housing under site reference H4 and further welcome the proposed alteration to the site boundary which is to exclude the graveyard from the site development boundary. Consider it important that the emerging Local Plan gives explicit recognition that this site could be suitable for student accommodation or as a market housing scheme.
----------------	---

Site 258 (H30) Land to the South of Strensall Village**Key Issues Raised**

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any extension to site 258 must be resisted for the reasons identified in the technical officers' comments.
----------------	--

Site 696 (H2) Sites by the Racecourse, Tadcaster Road**Key Issues Raised**

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contend that additional information submitted demonstrates that the technical officer assessment is factually incorrect or at least based on factually incorrect information. Ecology survey carried out which concludes that the site is not ecologically sensitive. It is feasible to design a scheme that will retain the rural character of Cherry Tree Lane (a sketch scheme has been prepared). The proposed housing allocation at H2 will have some impact on the character of the west end of Cherry Lane, but utilising the proposed access to H2 the remained of the Cherry Lane site can be developed without having any greater impact on the character of Cherry Lane.
------------------	---

Site 791 Amalgamated Site West of Chapelfields**Key Issues Raised**

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Further evidence submitted. Not accepted that site has an impact on the wider open landscape or the setting of the city.
------------------	--

Site 792 Land off Askham Lane/South of Foxwood Lane, Acombe

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Disagree with officer assessment. Disappointed at council's rejection to enlarge allocation at Foxwood Lane which has proximity to local facilities, is not identified as any ecological interest and will establish new Green Belt boundaries. Any landscape impacts would be limited to the immediate surrounds with little by way of long distance views defined by mature vegetation. Further evidence submitted.
------------------	---

Site 799 Designer Outlet Existing Site

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Support the rejection of the site for further retail expansion and agree with the officer conclusion that it would impact negatively on the retail offer in the city centre.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consider that there is further scope for the York Designer Outlet to fulfil its role as a retail draw to the city of York from a wider sub regional context and as a tourist destination. Retail study has not been able to properly factor in the sub regional draw of the outlet and the extent to which it supports not competes with the city centre.

Appendix 5: Changes to Strategic Sites

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 5 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 5 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

ST6 Land East of Grimston Bar

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall do not think that ST6 is a suitable site for development but if it is absolutely necessary, the area of site recommended in the technical assessment should be the absolute maximum. Agree that the site should not be extended.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Wider area considered suitable for housing. Further information submitted including revised masterplan approach, updated transport assessment and landscape appraisal.

ST10 Land at Moor Lane

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Opposed to the proposed boundary change asked for by the developers within the Local Plan.Agree with the officer view that this site should not be further extended.The proposed expansion would have the potential to adversely affect the Askham Bog SSSI.
----------------	--

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the principles of the allocation but disagrees with some of the technical officer comments and believes that there is a real opportunity to allocate a larger site for development. Further information submitted.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that latest proposals are little different from previous one.

It should be noted that a significant number of responses were received on ST10. However, the majority of these comments made no reference to the revised boundary that was considered, and rejected at the further sites stage. As such, these comments have been considered as non related comments with regard to the further sites consultation. These general objections to ST10 can be found in the summary tables published online under 'Non FSC' comments. This includes Petition 3 which received 155 signatures objecting to the site. The comments set out above and discussed below relate only to those comments that directly relate to the proposed revised boundary. Whilst many representations 'objected' to the revised boundary they have been recorded as 'support' as the technical officer assessment concluded that the revised boundary was unsuitable and no changes are proposed to the ST10. In many cases, there remains objection to the allocation of ST10 more generally; however this was not a matter for the further sites consultation.

Site 185 (ST12) Land at Manor Heath, Copmanthorpe

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to any extension of ST12, it is prime agricultural land. Any further housing will make already busy roads worse. The land is Green Belt which supports a diverse range of wildlife. • Agree that this boundary should not be extended westwards.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significantly more sustainable and attractive development can be delivered if ST12 is extended which will bring greater benefits to existing and residents and provide a more appropriate western edge to the village and an enhanced gateway to the historic city.

Appendix 6: Safeguarded Land Assessment

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 6 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 6 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

SF1 Land South of Strensall

Key Issues Raised

Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although included in table A6.1 does not appear to have been amended and the parish council's responses made at preferred options still apply.
----------------	--

Appendix 7: Open Space Proformas

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 7 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 7 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

Site 756 But Keech Bowling Green, Sycamore Place

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is located within an area of high density development and the retention of open space would be visually beneficial to local residents. Challenge the councils' recommendation that the site is not considered suitable for retention as open space.• There is a prospective purchaser for the site that is willing and able to return it to active sports uses.• If the site was used as courts for the school, they would be willing to enter into a community use agreement in order to provide some public access and to ensure a community recreational benefit.
------------------	---

Site OS1 Land North West of Manor School

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the technical officers conclusion and their recommendation.• Agree with allocation as open space.
----------------	---

Site OS3 Land to North of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the technical officers conclusion and their recommendation.• Agree with allocation as open space.• This area should be retained as open space which provides recreational activities for children and adults.
----------------	--

Appendix 8: Renewable Energy Proformas

(Note – not all sites from Appendix 8 received comments through the consultation, only those sites where response were submitted feature below. Please see Further Sites Consultation Technical Appendix 8 (2014) for a full list of sites.)

Appendix 8 Methodology

Key Issues Raised

Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disappointed to see that Appendix 8 was restricted to solar photovoltaics. In the Local Plan Preferred Options maps there are many crosses indicated suitable sites for wind turbines. By suitable, this means that they are suitable as regard to the wind. No other criteria appear to have been considered. We believe that this gives
----------------	---

	<p>a wrong impression and other criteria for selection should have been flagged up (for example the openness of the Green Belt) even if only as a caveat, particularly as these criteria have been well used in assessing residential (Appendix 2) and employment/retail (Appendix 3) sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no need to use greenfield sites for solar energy. The council has yet to make full use of its own social housing for the installation of solar panels and there are many commercial and industrial buildings suitable for photovoltaic energy generation.
--	---

Site 178 North Selby Mine

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the council's recommendation not to remove the site from the Green Belt. When amending existing Green Belt boundaries preference should be given to sites that no longer fulfil any of the five purposes for its original inclusion. From the limited explanation offered it would appear this clear stance has been overlooked by the council in their assessment of Site 178. Where it can be demonstrated that the site no longer fulfils the purposes for its inclusion within the Green Belt, the boundary should be amended accordingly. • Considered that the site doesn't fulfil the five purposes of Green Belt and should be taken out of the Green Belt. Current designation as Green Belt would compromise the future operations of the site and place unnecessary restrictions on its future use. The allocation of the site and its removal from the Green Belt would duly recognise the site's ability to deliver a renewable source of electricity and therefore make an important contribution to upholding the council's own aims and aspirations.
------------------	---

Appendix 9: Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment

Appendix 8 Methodology

Key Issues Raised

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to the 2013 Draft Plan gave a detailed appraisal of the data being used to support the increase in provision of sites for gypsy, Roma and travellers, disappointed that this has been ignored. • Being expected to bear the burden when other towns and cities do not have the sort of ratio of gypsy pitches to permanent homes that York already has.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the need to work with local residents to help earmark and eventually provide sites for Gypsy, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The council's approach has alienated local residents and setback the prospects for delivering these sites. This included earmarking sites in the preferred options plan before publishing the detailed evidence. Had this been published before the sites were allocated it might have helped to set the scene and allow residents to

Appendix 8 Methodology

understand the need for the sites. Instead the sites were launched into a potentially hostile atmosphere with inevitable consequences.

Appendix 10: Education Site Assessment Proformas

No consultation comments received on this appendix.

Appendix 11: Transport Proformas

Site 260 South of Southfields Road Strensall and land South of the Village

Key Issues Raised

Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This site has been identified as a possible car park for Strensall Rail Halt. The subject of providing such a rail facility has been raised many times and there has been no decision to proceed at any location. The response by the parish council in June/July 2013 which was to consider a joint facility with Haxby on Towthorpe Road still applies. The officers' assessment also indicates that the site is subject to 'the landowner giving permission for this purpose' this appears to indicate there is little commitment to the provision of a rail halt.• The proposed site is very close to an existing bus terminal for the number 5 bus which already runs to the main York railway station. It is unclear why it is thought necessary to provide a train link in addition to a bus link. The proposed platform is so close to the level crossing that it would appear necessary for the level crossing to be closed if the train is approaching and stopping at the platform from either the north or the south. This would lead to traffic congestion at the site and stop travellers getting to the site. It is unclear from the consultation papers as to where exactly the station platform is to be sited but I presume it is next to the proposed car park. If this is the case it would seem a very unsustainable location as there is no current cycle network linked to the site which would permit people to cycle to the station and take the train into York.
----------------	---

Appendix 12: Sustainability Appraisal Technical Note

Sustainability Appraisal Technical Note

Key Issues Raised

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical officers' comments noted, look forward to its inclusion in the final submission.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The current technical note only assesses non-strategic sites. The further sites (including extensions to existing sites) have not yet been subject to further appraisal in the sustainability appraisal. Advised that this appraisal is carried out as soon as possible to inform the selection of preferred sites to be taken forward to the submission stage of the plan.• The matrix supplied in this appendix is helpful in showing how criteria

	scores were applied to the various sites. This is a better arrangement than the need to search the council's website for a similar document in the June/July 2013 consultation.
--	---

Appendix 13: Potential Quantum's for Development

Appendix 13	
Key Issues Raised	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the way the information is portrayed in Table A13.3. It suggests that further sites, which have not passed the criteria process will be considered to be taken out of Green Belt and classified as 'safeguarded'. • The quantum of new dwellings to be provided on ST14 would be based on an average density of between 30 -35 dph and not the 50dph in Appendix 13 on Potential Quantum's for Development. • Objection to the number of houses indicated in this section.