



A summary of the representations submitted to the independent examiner

Ref no	Name	Summary of Comments
Representations received at Submission consultation stage		
RwK 001	Highways England	Comments that: the boundary does not incorporate any section of the A64, which remains a key part of the strategic infrastructure in the area (and for which we would continue to encourage the plan to be aware of any potential impact from it, at this location). However, has no formal comments at this point in specific regard to the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
RwK 002	Indigo Planning OBO Novus Investment Ltd	Particularly supports: allocated site RK H3 and Policy No. RwK 01 and Figure b. Have promoted the site for residential use through the emerging local plan. Confirms that the site is available for development now with a willing landowner. Without this proposed allocation there would be no proposed housing development in Knapton which could put the neighbourhood plan at risk of challenge. No technical reasons why the site should not be developed. Notes that the new NPPF states ' <u>...detailed amendments to [Green Belt] may be made through local authorities, including neighbourhood plans.</u> ' As such, the RwK Neighbourhood plan can establish the village envelopes and can/should allocate this site for housing; Proposes an amendment to Policy No. RwK 11 – Housing Mix – 'Housing development proposals above 5 units should provide a mix of housing types...'
RwK 003	[REDACTED]	Supports Plan.
RwK 004	[REDACTED]	Supports Plan.
RwK 005	[REDACTED]	Supports Plan.
RwK 006	RwK Parish Council	Supports Plan.
RwK 007	The Coal Authority	No specific comments.

RwK 008		Supports Plan.
RwK 009		Supports Plan.
RwK 010		Supports Plan.
RwK 011		Supports Plan.
RwK 012	Johnson Mowat OBO KCS Developments Ltd	<p>Suggests that that the timing of the Neighbourhood Plan aligns itself with the Local Plan, as one of the key topics of debate in the emerging CYC Local Plan will be the Green Belt boundaries. The Rufforth with Knapton Parish Boundary is tightly constrained by the Green Belt. It is likely that there will be Green Belt boundary alterations in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Welcomes the reference at paragraph 8.1.3 which acknowledges the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Local Plan. Advises that Policy RwK01 makes reference to supporting the finalised Green Belt boundaries in the Local Plan, or at least references the City of York Council through the Plan preparation process of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Maintains objection in the policy wording which states that “No development outside the Village Envelopes will be supported other than that considered appropriate in the Green Belt as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.”, as is too restrictive and does not allow for future potential housing allocations in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Considers Policy No. RwK12 – Housing Mix inflexible. The justifying text to this policy should refer to the latest draft Local Plan, rather than the 2016 Preferred Sites Consultation as referred to at paragraph 8.12.2</p> <p>Concerned with the sentence at paragraph 8.13.2 which states “Development in rural areas such as Rufforth with Knapton Parish will be severely constrained.” This Plan should recognise that the eastern boundary of the Rufforth with Knapton Parish Boundary abuts the western urban edge of York. The boundary doesn’t seek to restrict development on the edge of the City which would be contrary to the City of York housing growth strategy. This point links back to the wording of Policy RwK 01.</p> <p>Suggests some summary text is also included at paragraph 8.13.15 to acknowledge that should</p>

		additional land be required to meet the housing requirement then the Neighbourhood Plan would be prepared to reconsider the Chapelfields site.
RwK 013		Supports Plan.
RwK 014	Rufforth Church	Supports Plan.
RwK 015		Supports Plan.
RwK 016	Historic England	<p>Supports the inclusion of a specific Historic Character section and policy. However, doesn't name the significant parish features or sites of local interest.</p> <p>Suggests that: a schedule of significant parish features are included in this section or as an appendix; a schedule of sites of local interest, incorporating addresses and/or precise locations is included in this section or as an appendix; a map is included indicating and distinguishing the location of all significant parish features and sites of local interest; and the criteria for selecting significant parish features and sites of local interest are based on the advice contained in historic England advice note.</p>
RwK 017	CYC	<p>Comments that: as York does not have an adopted Local Plan, it is necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. Within this context the appropriate strategic Green Belt polices are the saved policies of the otherwise revoked Yorkshire and Humber Plan Regional Spatial Strategy (2008) (the RSS).</p> <p>Supports all policies, but makes the following comments on the policies below:</p> <p>RwK01: Support the content of the policy. The interim GB boundary on the policies map is not identical to that proposed in the emerging York Local Plan and we would therefore seek changes to the settlement limits.</p> <p>RwK02: Support the policy. Please note that the owner of the Rufforth Allotments submitted a notice to cease the lease of the allotments in November 2017. This issue is ongoing and may influence the designation of the land as Local Green Space.</p> <p>RwK13: No policy – renumbering required?</p> <p>RK H2 (allocation): This site is not allocated in the emerging York Local Plan and is within the draft Green Belt</p>
RwK 018	North Yorkshire County Council	<p>Comments that: The NYCC Council Plan sets an ambition to 'deliver a modern integrated transport network'.</p> <p>Notes that the A1237 York ring road passes through the plan area, and that this provides strategic connectivity</p>

		<p>with routes serving the wider North Yorkshire area. Policy No Rwk07- Public Transport requires an improved availability and frequency of public transport and requires our co-operation. This will not be achieved without access to additional funding, for example from the Parishes or businesses.</p>
RwK 019		<p>Broadly supportive of plan. Comments that: The 'Green Belt' around the Knapton village should be maintained to prevent coalescence with the main urban area of York. In the Plan there is a suggested area at the north end of the village envelope which would be suitable for a very small in-fill development. Suggests this be restricted to 4 houses.</p> <p>Objects to the doubling of the Northminster Business Park as would involve the loss of further prime agricultural land, and the access road is already busy.</p>
RwK 020	DPP Planning OBO Linden Homes	<p>Supports: the Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. The Developer has demonstrated that RK H1 is available, that the land is suitable for development and that development of housing on RK H1 is achievable.</p>
RwK 021	DPP Planning OBO Linden Homes	<p>Objects to: the RK H1 Extension not being considered within the Neighbourhood Plan. Developer is not aware of any such agreement not to pursue the residential allocation of the RK H1 Extension nor does the landowner and the landowner's agent. The LPWG advocated on 10th July 2017 that RK H1 be increased in size to include the land referred to as the RK H1 Extension to meeting the housing requirement. However, Members resolved that the recommendation was not accepted. Linden Homes have shown in submissions that the decision by Members not to properly meet the housing needs of the housing market area is unsound and on this basis the Local Plan is also unsound in that it does not identify sufficient housing land, a permanent Green Belt or provide Safeguarded land to ensure that the Green Belt does not need to be altered at the end of the Local Plan plan period.</p>