

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	<p>Comment –local context, page 47, under the character and setting of the city heading, fourth paragraph should include reference to the historic environment of the villages which should likewise influence their growth and development. Local context, page 49, under the environmental assets heading, second paragraph, sits of local interests to be protected and managed should include village greens and street verges which might be eligible for inclusion on the lost of local heritage assets. Local context, page 59 under the green belt heading, in defining the inner boundary of the green belt it is important that conservation area boundaries and other built or natural environmental designations are respected so that the greenbelt boundary does not cut through an existing designated site.</p>	188/13936	
	<p>Objection – local context, factors which shape growth, gives the impression that the assessed development needs of the city will be the starting point for the plan and that after then necessary sites have been found to accommodate this development a green belt will be defined which will safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city. To provide an effective framework for the protection of the historic city the definition of the green belt boundaries must be the starting point for the plan, once the eland which it is necessary to permanently keep open in order to safeguard the special character and setting of the city has been identified then the assessed development needs should be factored in. The policies which defined the extent of the green belt (SS5) should be set out before SS3 which identified the sites for development. A new sub heading should be inserted following the factors which shape growth 'York's unique historic environment', the fourth paragraph (relating to the historic environment) should be moved under this new heading. Bullet points on page 47 should be amended to reflect the six principal characteristics of the city which are identified in the Heritage Topic Paper. Move the paragraphs relating to the green belt to follow the new section on the historic environment. The white areas on figure 5.3 may also fulfil other green belt functions and therefore should be included within the green belt, the paragraph following figure 5.3 should be amended accordingly.</p>	238/14050	English Heritage
	<p>Objection – take issue with the approach to the Green Belt set out in the Local Context under the heading of 'the role of York's Green Belt and Safeguarded Land'. There is no requirement for exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated as a pre-requisite of the identification of land for development since the detailed boundaries of the green belt within York have never been adopted. The correct approach is set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 82-85.</p>	540/16734	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	<p>Support – the forum welcomes the emphasis on preserving York’s green belt character areas and environmental assets in paragraphs 47 to 49.</p> <p>Objection – page 45, local context, drivers of growth, there is insufficient information about the scenarios presented and it is impossible to tell whether the projections are all realistic. Have they been checked by an independent expert and/or has a second opinion been commissioned? The figure of 16,000 jobs over the plan period is considered to be flawed. Do the projections allow for ‘drivers for loss’ i.e. job losses in already established sectors/businesses due to the global economy and other factors?</p> <p>Page 46, population and housing growth – impossible to know how realistic the predictions are, particularly since actual growth over the past ten years has been somewhat lower than the annual average growth rate. The logic of the relationship between predicted population growth and dwellings is difficult to comprehend.</p> <p>Disagreed with the preferred approach to the factors which shape growth and consider that rather than taking balanced approach priority should be given to the environmental principles.</p>	1665/12927	York Environment Forum
	<p>Comment – it’s not green belts that are important but green wedges which York already has, thanks partly to the rivers. Making rules that new building must only take place outside a greenbelt pushes people to live further away from the city where they probably work, meaning they have to commute further and thereby cause more pollution.</p>	4787/12083	
	<p>Comment - to deliver sustainable growth for York there is an urgent need (no timetable) for a Green Infrastructure Strategy and delivery plan. The sub group have provided evidence for over 10 years as to why this is so important. The York City Beautiful ‘towards an economic vision plan’ identifies GI which is used in future developments and any planning decisions.</p>	4819/14315	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	<p>Comment - there is an error on page 49. It should read 1958 not 1858.</p>	6213/15748	
	<p>Support – support the aspirations contained within the spatial strategy.</p>	6351/17631	Gladedale Estates
	<p>Objection – do not agree with the preferred approach to spatial distribution, consider that option two (prioritising development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through provision in the villages subject to levels of services is more appropriate as this makes use of existing infrastructure and ensures that new development will be in a sustainable locations.</p>	6357/16058	Ainscough Strategic Land
	<p>Comment – paragraphs 5.29 and 5.30 recognise strategic issues but there is no mention of the Local Highways Authority and the highway network in North Yorkshire.</p>	6385/16124	North Yorkshire County Council Highways



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area</b>	Objection – criterion ix of the policy relates to adjacent local authorities and as river catchments often dissects through more than one local planning authority's boundaries, water resources should be acknowledged. Disappointed that waste has not been addressed. Suggest the following wording for criterion ix ' development within the city of York area will not lead to environmental related problems such as flood risk, air and water quality, waste and transport congestion for adjacent local authority areas'.	3/11625	Environment Agency
	Support – supportive of the overall spatial strategy and the York sub area approach outlined in SS1. The strategy recognises and builds on the city's roles as a key economic driver and higher order economic, retail and service centre. The approach reflects longstanding agreement and support for this role, both in terms of the York sub-area and the role and influence of the city in the wider region.	6/11638	Ryedale District Council
	Support – pleased to see that the assessed growth needs will be met within the plan area without putting development pressure on neighbouring local authorities such as Hambleton. Particularly like the commitment in SS1 to not adversely affecting local authority areas (e.g. congestion and pollution) and delivering benefits to the wider sub region (e.g. shopping, leisure, education and economic driver/employment) which Hambleton's residents and businesses appreciate.	7/11645	Hambleton District Council
	Support – Selby broadly supports York's recognition of itself as the gateway to north Yorkshire and the spatial planning responsibilities that brings as the leading settlement in the sub region (after Leeds). Selby is pleased to be recognised as a key district that supports York's role though providing a ready workforce and customers and also that Selby provides an attractive countryside setting for the city. Selby is well placed to benefit from the economic overspill of York whilst it retains its own rural character. Selby is satisfied that York can realise its growth aspirations within its own territory.	9/11650	Selby District Council
	Support – East Riding of Yorkshire Council supports SS1 which recognises the important relationship between the city and neighbouring authorities. In particular it states that the Local Plan will ensure the housing needs of York's current and future population are met within the York local authority area.	10/11660	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Support – the county council supports SS1 in that it seeks to reflect the roles and functions of places in the York Sub Area, the North Yorkshire and York sub region and the Leeds City Region and commits to ensure that that the housing needs of the city's population now and in the future are met within the city of York administrative area.	11/11672	North Yorkshire County Council

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	<p>Objection – SS1 is unbalanced and puts far too much emphasis on economic and housing growth at the expense of the city’s unique historic and natural assets. In particular the parish council considers that York should not be a key economic driver for the Leeds City Region as this is incompatible with preserving the open countryside setting of the city. York should not seek to meet within its area all the housing needs arising from economic and institutional growth. If York is to be a key economic driver for the city region it is reasonable that other authorities should help to meet the housing needs which arise from this economic growth. Criterion vi) should be reworded to delete references to the need to balance preservation of the cities outstanding historic and natural environment with economic growth. It is noted that criteria i) and ii) relating to economic and housing growth aspirations are not subject to similar provisos. Criterion ix) should be reworded to make clear that the local plan will need to avoid environmental problems, including flood risk, air quality and transport congestion within its own area as well as for adjacent local authorities. Whatever the intention the current wording gives the opposite impression.</p>	62/12690	Fulford Parish Council
	<p>Support – the spatial strategy which recognises that the City will; fulfil its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region. It is important that the housing needs of the City of York’s current and future population are met as recognised in criterion iii.</p>	144/17756	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	<p>Support - for criteria i and iii in Policy SS1 that the Local Plan will ensure York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region, and the housing needs of City of York’s current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area. To achieve such aspirations it is important that York provides sufficient housing numbers across a wide range of deliverable housing sites to ensure it realises the growth envisaged.</p>	145/13857	Home Builders Federation
	<p>Support – the chamber broadly welcome the thrust of the spatial strategy. In particular the intention of the plan to ensure York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds city region and the north Yorkshire sub region.</p>	187/13909	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	<p>Objection –the City’s heritage assets should be the starting point for the development strategy. Criterion vi. Should be moved to the beginning of the list of criteria. Should also delete reference to the natural environment in criterion vi. Whilst it is well recognised that the historic environment of York is outstanding can the same be said of its natural environment? In any case, the natural environmental is already adequately addressed in criterion vii and so it would be far simpler and more accurate</p>	238/14048	English Heritage

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	if criterion vi simply dealt with the historic environment. Criterion viii should set out the primary purpose of the green belt as set out in saved RSS policy YH9c 'a greenbelt is defined around York which will safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city, the outer boundary of which will be about 6 miles from the city centre'.		
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	Objection – for Policy SS1 to be sound it is considered that amendments are required throughout the plan to ensure the most appropriate land is released for development. Significant weight must be given to ensuring that York fulfils its role as a key economic driver whilst also meeting the housing needs of both the current and future population. It is vital that sufficient land is outside of the green belt designation to ensure that housing need and demand can be met without having to develop on greenbelt in the future.	528/16658	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Support – Policy SS1 sets out a comprehensive range of objectives that the local plan is intended to achieve. Support in particular the objectives that York intends to become a key economic driver in the region and that York plans to meet the current and future housing needs of the population including that arising from economic and institutional growth.	534/16697	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – Policy SS1 is not justified. Failure to recognise the RSS creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16742	
	Support – criteria i) and iii), it will be important that such aspirations are to be met the city provides sufficient housing numbers across a wide range of deliverable housing sites to ensure it realises the growth envisaged.	659/15067	Persimmon Homes
	Support – criterion i and iii in Policy SS1 that the Local Plan will ensure York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region, and the housing needs of City of York's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area. To achieve such aspirations it is important that York provides sufficient housing numbers across a wide range of deliverable housing sites to ensure it realises the growth envisaged.	673/16836	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Support - Welcomes the reference in Policy SS1 (iii) that the Local Plan will ensure that the housing needs of the City of York's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth are met within the York local authority area. Halifax Estates also welcomes the reference in Policy SS1 (viii) that the Local Plan will ensure the outer and inner boundaries of York's Green Belt are established. Objection - whilst Halifax Estates supports the principle of Policy SS1 (ix), we are concerned with the reference within the policy that development within the City of York	1337/17273	Halifax Estates

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	area will not lead to transport congestion for adjacent local authority areas. Halifax Estates believes that the reference to transport congestion is unclear and could be inappropriately interpreted against development proposals. Halifax Estates therefore refers to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Taking into consideration the above point would recommend that the end of Policy SS1 (ix) is amended as follows: "The Local Plan will ensure....Development within the City of York area will not lead to environmental problems including flood risk, air quality and severe transport congestion for adjacent local authority areas."		
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	Support – agree with the preferred approach.	1457/17388	
	Support – the Monks Cross north consortium supports criterion i and iii in Policy SS1 that the Local Plan will ensure York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region, and the housing needs of City of York’s current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area. To achieve such aspirations it is important that York provides sufficient housing numbers across a wide range of deliverable housing sites to ensure it realises the growth envisaged.	1514/17469	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Support - supportive of the spatial strategy for York which recognises that the City will fulfil its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region. It is important that the housing needs of the City of York’s current and future population are met, including that arising from economic and institutional growth, as recognised in Policy SS1 (iii).	1523/17492	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Support – welcome points raised under criterion vi) vii) and ix) which relate to the built and natural environment of the city. Comment – would like to see reference to the protection of long distance and key views introduced given some are of regional and national importance. Whilst the policy is locally focuses it is not a policy, instead it is a series of statements defining the spatial strategy of the plan which is based upon the aspirations for the future role and function of York.	1592/17590	York Civic Trust
	Support - Policy SS1 sets out a comprehensive range of objectives that the Local Plan is intended to achieve and in particular there is support for the objectives that York intends to become a key economic driver in the region and that the City of York’s plans to meet the current and future housing needs of the population, including that arising	1663/9956	DPP



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	from economic and institutional growth.		
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	Support – agree with the preferred approach for a locally derived policy to guide strategic approach to the York sub area.	1665/9981	York Environment Forum
	Support - no objection to the wording proposed in Policy SS1. However, on this basis, it is very important that the Council ensures that the Local Plan sufficiently delivers part iii of the policy which says that "The Local Plan will ensure the housing needs of City of York's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area." Have concerns that York will struggle to deliver its housing requirements due to issues such as a high dependency on flats across York, unrealistic high density requirements and evidence surrounding the housing needs over the plan period. It is therefore imperative that the Local Plan carries out part iii of the Policy.	1668/15024	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Support – welcome the inclusion of SS1, following the deletion of the Regional Spatial Strategy it is important for the Local Plan to recognise the role the district places within the region on a strategic level. It also provides a means of demonstrating the duty to cooperate. Comment – disappointed that the thrust of criterion i) does not appear to have filtered through into policies and proposals. Consider that the proposals within the plan do not fully reflect the wider economic drivers and where actual demand for employment lies.	1674/9755	William Birch & Sons
	Support –the recognition of the role and function that York plays in the York sub area, Leeds city region and north Yorkshire sub region. Support the list of criteria in Policy SS1, in particular criteria i), iii) and vi). Comment – subsequent policies in the plan need to be drafted to reflect the objectives in SS1. For example it is considered that the plan as currently drafted does not meet the housing needs of York's current and future population.	1705/9778	Gladman Developments
	Support – Policy SS1 sets out a comprehensive range of objectives that the local plan is intended to achieve. Support in particular the objectives that York intends to become a key economic driver in the region and that York plans to meet the current and future housing needs of the population including that arising from economic and institutional growth.	1801/9886	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Support – support for Policy SS1 in respect of acknowledging that it is vital to ensure that there is provision of sufficient land to support sustainable development in York whilst addressing the housing and community needs of York's current and future population Comment – for Policy SS1 to be sound amendments are required throughout the plan	2769/7316	



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to ensure the most appropriate land is released for development. This will include appropriate green belt release.		
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	Objection – the basis for the plan is economic growth for York that exceeds that which is realistic or desirable for this 'special' city.	2789/7392	
	Objection – congested roads will be a disincentive to firms who might be considering locating in York.	2797/7421	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach.	2846/7539	
	Support – agree with the strategy outlined in SS1	4355/11596	Henry Boot Development
	Support - supportive of the spatial strategy for York which recognises that the City will fulfil its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region. It is important that the housing needs of the City of York's current and future population are met, including that arising from economic and institutional growth, as recognised in Policy SS1 (iii).	5245/14329	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Support – Policy SS1 sets out a comprehensive range of objectives that the local plan is intended to achieve. Support in particular the objectives that York intends to become a key economic driver in the region and that York plans to meet the current and future housing needs of the population including that arising from economic and institutional growth.	6160/15661	
	Support – Policy SS1 sets out that the preferred option of the distribution of development in the York sub area and states that the local plan will ensure the housing needs of the city of York's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the local authority area. This strategy approach is supported.	6166/15683	Yorvale Projects LLP & Maple Grove Developments Ltd
	Support – Policy SS1 sets out a comprehensive range of objectives that the local plan is intended to achieve. Support in particular the objectives that York intends to become a key economic driver in the region and that York plans to meet the current and future housing needs of the population including that arising from economic and institutional growth.	6349/16030	Linden Homes North
	Support – it is important that York provides sufficient housing numbers across a wide range of deliverable housing sites to ensure it realises the growth envisaged. Support criterion i).	6351/17626	Gladedale Estates
Objection – the plan rightly extols the virtues and uniqueness of York as an individual city of enormous distinction. This sits uncomfortably with the constant references to its being subsumed into the 'sub region' of Leeds. This subservient tone is both unnecessary and wrong if the city is to archive the ambitious future which the plan	6363/17698		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	purports to set out.		
<b>Policy SS1 York Sub Area Continued</b>	Support – support a locally derived policy for the York sub area Objection – should build strategic relationships with the regions that surround it in terms of promoting local supply chains for food, goods and services and establishing positive relationships between urban areas and surrounding countryside. Not convinced that an approach based simply on limitless economic growth will actually lead to a better quality of life for York’s residents (criterion i). Can see no advantage in terms of sustainability in seeking to attract car borne shoppers from across the region who could far more effectively shop nearer to where they lie (criterion ii). Not supportive of the highly expensive widening of the outer ring road which will only contribute to increasing traffic levels which will soon fill the extra capacity and worsen air quality (criterion v). Does not support HS2 but if the project does progress would want to see investment in improved rail/tram-train and sustainable transport links to the station as opposed to generating additional car travel into the city centre.	6518/16363	York Green Party
<b>Para 5.02</b>	Objection – given that not all of those elements which contribute to the historic character of the city are ‘built’ it would be more appropriate and accurate to refer to ‘York’s unique historic environment’.	238/14049	English Heritage
<b>Figure 5.3 York’s Green Belt Character Areas</b>	Objection – Figure 5.3 and its supporting text needs to make it clear that land beyond the ring road can also contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city.	238/14051	English Heritage
	Support – wholly support the fact that figure 5.3 shows that ST13 does not perform any green belt or other spatial planning objective purpose. Figure 5.3 is based on a thorough assessment of the purpose of the including land within the greenbelt and will ensure the effective delivery of development in accordance with national policy.	534/16702	DPP One Ltd
	Objection - pleased to note that Whinthorpe is not included within the land which the Council wants to leave open, however, there are concerns with the continued reliance on a study from 2003. Clearly, since this appraisal was undertaken in 2003, the amount of land required for housing has increased, which is reflected in this Local Plan. Therefore, there are concerns that Figure 5.3 has now been superseded by a more up-to-date site selection process and may not be consistent with the Local Plan and the Proposals Map. Therefore for the purposes of clarity and consistency, the recommendation is that Figure 5.3 is deleted.	1337/17271	Halifax Estates
	Objection – land at Drome Road will not lead to the merging of any settlements and that the designation on Figure 5.3 is not correct on its southern edge. Propose that Figure 5.3 be amended to show land to the north of Drome Road to be excluded from	1801/9891	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	the preventing coalescence designation and allocated as safeguarded land for potential future development.		
<b>Figure 5.4 York's Nature Conservation Sites</b>	Objection – does not show Hassacarr Nature Reserve as a SINC. The nature reserve is greatly appreciated.	1109/17176	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York	Support –the approach is entirely consistent with Ryedale’s emerging Development Plan which recognises the functional economic area of the City of York, travel to work patterns and housing market dynamics.	6/11639	Ryedale District Council
	Support – ambitious growth targets are acknowledged and supported in principle.	9/11651	Selby District Council
	Support – approach will help to support sustainable patterns of development in the York Sub Area and reduce unnecessary development pressure beyond the green belt boundary. Agree with view that it is important for economic and housing growth to be linked.	10/11695	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Comment – supports the principle of planning for economic growth in order that the city can perform its sub regional role to the full. Notes and supports the identified need to link economic and housing growth, however the precise mechanism proposed for ensuring this is not clear. Would be concerned if housing land take up outstripped economic growth as this would impact in levels and patterns of commuting. Suggest a robust mechanism to ensure a balanced release of housing land in line with economic growth. Insufficient information available in relation to the resilience of the A64, A1237 and wider transport infrastructure to withstand the development pressures inherent within the plan. Detailed work is required to enable an understanding of the consequent cumulative impact upon the highway network.	11/11673	North Yorkshire County Council
	Objection – absence of effective and diligent collaboration with adjoining local authorities and infrastructure and utility providers. Failure to consider what the attendant infrastructure requirements will be, particularly for Whinthorpe. No evidence that the potential for new settlements beyond the city (or green belt) boundary has been considered therefore not all reasonable alternatives have been examined.	46/12593	Heslington Village Trust
	Objection - inflated and unrealistic housing targets. Support Arup figure of 850 a year. National Planning Policy Framework specifies that a plan should be realistic, but paragraph 10.3 of the plan acknowledges that delivering 1090 homes a year will be challenging there is no coherent strategy to explain how step change from existing completion levels will be accomplished. Think that the key trends in population and jobs since 2001 are a sound base to extrapolate. Adopting more realistic housing aspirations would eliminate the perceived requirement for the wholly inappropriate new settlement proposed on good quality agricultural green belt land.	47/12580	CPRE (York and Selby District)
	Objection – absence of effective and diligent collaboration with adjoining local authorities and infrastructure and utility providers. Failure to consider what the attendant infrastructure requirements will be, particularly for Whinthorpe. No	48/12602	Heslington Parish Council

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	evidence that the potential for new settlements beyond the city (or green belt) boundary has been considered therefore not all reasonable alternatives have been examined. Housing target is unachievable, targets based on population figures which greatly exceed the Sub National Population Projection. 15% buffer seems excessive.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection – concerned by the overall scale of this plan and the detrimental effect 22,000 homes will have on surrounding countryside and approaches to York. This degree of development, much of which will be on valuable agricultural land, is wholly unnecessary and unsustainable. Urge that a more realistic approach is taken.	53/12608	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection – employment has dropped by 11% so how have these growth rates been determined? Where are the jobs coming from? How will these employees enter the housing market? Should housing be developed at the proposed rate, where will the residents come from to occupy them? As part of the Local Enterprise Partnership with Leeds does York wish to see itself as suburban Leeds? Building on green belt land is a last resort and should not be undertaken if the main justification is unproven economic growth targets. Prime arable land should not be built on.	56/12609	Clifton Without Parish Council
	Objection – plan is predicated on 16,000 new jobs but over the last decade York has actually lost jobs overall. York has higher than average dependency on public sector employment and lower than average level of productivity and enterprise making the job market especially vulnerable to reductions in government funding. No evidence has been put forward to demonstrate how such an unprecedented number of jobs will be created. Housing growth figure assumes population will grow by 50,000 compared to expert forecast to 2026 of 20,000 and actual growth between 2001 and 2011 of 17,000. If housing figures are not reduced to a more realistic level, the plan will allocate more land than is actually required and developers will pick off those sites which are easiest to develop and brownfield sites will be left. Misleading to say that the plan is creating a permanent green belt, by reducing it by 5% it is partially destroying the existing green belt to the detriment of Copmanthorpe and many communities around York.	57/12613	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – green belt should be used as a material consideration in respect of any proposed development. The plan should accept the baseline scenario on job growth and reject Scenario 2. It is unrealistic and over ambitious in the current economic climate. Concerned that the population growth figures might be overstated. Arup believe the 2008 figures are overestimated and that more recent evidence would support a lower growth figure. The 2011 census also indicate a lower level of growth than previously forecast. This is further corroborated by the interim 2011 Sub	59/12629	Dunnington Parish Council

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	National Population Projections.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection – growth driver is the anticipated increase in employment in the area of 1000+ net jobs per year. The past three years there has been a net decrease. The growth target for jobs lacks any reasonable credibility. Oppose the removal of 5% of current green belt land. Prioritise brownfield site development within the ring road before any major developments proceed in green belt.	61/12683	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection - development would not be sustainable if it would damage the setting and special character of the historic city. The need to conserve and enhance York's historic and natural environment should guide decisions about the quantum of development to be planned for as well as its location. York should not be a key economic driver. York should not seek to meet within its area all the housing needs arising from economic and institutional growth, other authorities should help meet the housing needs. No good evidence that the jobs target can be achieved. Evidence shows that there was overall employment decline between 2001 and 2011. Development at the levels required to achieve the employment target would detract from the key assets which attract employers to York on the first place. Very real possibility that the employment target is not achieved but the matching housing proposals are implemented. Housing figure is too high and should be substantially reduced. They are not an accurate assessment of the objectively assessed needs of the city as required by National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). No need to add unnecessary 15% buffer to an already excessive figure. The targets produce a figure for housing land release which is totally out of scale with the city's needs and would greatly harm its setting and special character. It is highly unlikely that the build rate will ever be achieved as it is far in excess of current build rates and historic rates achieved in the city. Housing and employment targets should be related to the environmental capacity of the city. Do not consider that the green belt proposed in the plan would achieve the purpose of preserving the setting and special character of the city. Where development has extended up to and beyond the ring road (Rawcliffe) the damage to the setting and special character of the city is obvious and great – this should not be repeated (view shared by the green belt inspector). There has been no change in the purpose of the green belt. It follows that there are limits to the physical growth of the city. Principal test of whether a site should be included in the green belt is if it is necessary to keep it open to preserve the setting and special character of the city rather than determining boundaries on the basis that all identifiable development needs must be met in the city. If they can't be met they	62/12691	Fulford Parish Council

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>should be diverted to other areas applying that statutory duty to cooperate. NPPF paragraph 85 does not require that all development requirements are met when defining detailed green belt boundaries instead the paragraph makes clear that authorities should only provide for levels that current green belt land. Prioritise brownfield site development within the ring road before any major developments proceed in green belt. It would constitute sustainable development to propose development that would harm setting and special character of internationally, nationally and regionally important historic city. Almost identical conclusions were reached by the green belt inspector. Little significance given to encircling open countryside setting of the city, particularly views from the ring road. Do not agree that setting and special character can be maintained by simply protecting the green wedges and extensions to green wedges. Instead of safeguarding land, can achieve NPPF requirement that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period by taking the view that a significant proportion of development requirements should be met outside the city boundaries. Cumulative impact of development proposed will be highly damaging to the southern part of the city.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – take issue with the projections for housing growth based on the estimated increases in population, inward migration and employment; and have serious reservations about the proposals likely effects on green belt and the environment. Sceptical about estimates for employment growth given increase in unemployment in the York area and likelihood that adverse economic situation may last longer than anticipated. York is particularly vulnerable to public sector job losses and therefore seems unlikely to be able to support a faster rate of growth beyond the baseline Oxford Economic Forecasting. Would prefer to see a lower level of housing provision but recognise the needs for growth over the longer term – Arup’s Option 1 is the safest choice because all other options make inadequately grounded assumptions about demographic trends, economic growth, affordable housing provision and deliverability. The hasty creation of extensive new suburban area in the green belt, based on those assumptions is an irresponsible and improvident policy and that the more gradual approach embodied in Option 1 will meet York’s foreseeable needs.</p>	<p>65/12728</p>	<p>Heworth Without Parish Council</p>
	<p>Objection – fundamentally objects to building on Huntington green belt. Basic requirements in the plan are laudable, particularly the financial expansion and increase job opportunities. The huge increase in Huntington housing and therefore population is going to irreparably destroy the community.</p>	<p>67/12732</p>	<p>Huntington Parish Council</p>



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection – concerned about the infrastructure (roads, drainage) and caution against such rapid expansion. Slower growth is more likely to allow problems to be overcome. Deeply concerned that insufficient consideration is given to the adverse consequences for the existing economic strengths of the city, particularly tourism, the quality of life of residents and the historic nature/environment which attracts business. Very pleased that plan clearly recognises the advantage is protecting the villages, in particular the importance of keeping a clear green space between Osbaldwick and Murton.	69/12738	Murton Parish Council
	Objection – concerns about the scale of the proposed housing development around the city. This would have a large impact on the amount of traffic passing through the village.	72/12743	New Earswick Parish Council
	Objection – plan is too ambitious as far as jobs and housing are concerned. Question the sustainability of building over 1000 homes per annum and the inflexible link between new jobs and new homes potentially giving rise to erroneous infrastructure estimates. A figure of c800 homes a year is more realistic. More evidence is needed to support the estimated growth in employment given the number of jobs lost in York in recent years. A more conservative approach would result in a much smaller demand to develop green belt land.	74/12747	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection - basis of the plan is economic growth for York that exceeds that which is realistic or desirable for this special city. Pursuit of economic growth far in excess of that traditionally achieved in the city would require a substantial migrating workforce and greater use of available brownfield sites for industry. York should be protected from such metropolitan suburbanisation. Proposed housing growth is required to support inflated economic growth. Arup report confirmed that the proposed housing growth figures are not realistic for York and that 800 a year would be appropriate but still challenging to achieve. Plan should adopt 800 figure. This reduced target combined with increased use of brownfield sites would make the Clifton Gate development unnecessary.	75/12755	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – overlooked the Arup recommended level of development of 850 a year and insisting on a higher level. The rural villages have very different needs to that of the city so the one size fits all process which appears to have been adopted is not fit for purpose. Due regard must be made to the ‘factors which shape growth’ when planning for development in the rural areas as well as in urban locations. In Strensall services have not been provided to match the population growth that has occurred over the last 40 years. Residents of this village need to travel to York and beyond to	77/12761	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	employment due to the limited employment opportunities locally but there has been no encouragement to counter this situation. The whole plan is driven by the level of house building, which is above the Arup recommended 850 dwellings, to the detriment of all other considerations. Strensall has major problem with sewage infrastructure and the Walbutts Treatment Works does not have the capacity to cope with additional demands.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection – although not formally ratified the green belt areas around Upper Poppleton have been historically recognised since 1965 and should be retained in order to preserve village identity, character and environment. Feel that proposals H36, H45, ST19 and ST2, along with the development of British Sugar will combine to overrun the sustainability of the York outer area and alter irretrievably the character of the village.	78/12779	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – concern about the scale of proposed economic growth and the associated housing developments, a high proportion of which will be in green field location including current green belt land. Plan is based on ambitious growth which is probably unrealistic given the predicted state of the national economy over the next few years and unlikely to be supported by majority of existing residents.	79/12784	Wheldrake Parish Council
	Objection – the plan contains no ambitions to develop new of smaller employment sectors such as the renewable energy sector. The encouragement of growth in the large employment sectors is unsustainable since it will reduce the diversity of residents, weakening the sense of community and fails to recognise our dependence on fossil fuels. Plan should aim to promote the development of a sustainable economy rather than promoting sustainable economic growth. Policy must contain environmental considerations in the mix of development principles: carbon neutral, carbon reduction and mitigation of increased transport, but fundamentally in the construction and quality of the homes.	90/12823	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – housing target is inflated and unrealistic and led to very significant green field sites being allocated for new settlements on green belt land.	101/14236	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – shaky statistical evidence relating to economic growth. Assumption of economic and job growth far in excess of UK projections. Adopt more restrained projections which might earn credibility. Plan based on attracting more employers to York, thus justifying a perceived requirement to increase the previously agreed target of 850 homes. Significantly higher than regional or national trends. Arup state 850 is appropriate trend-based position for York. This would provide a choice of housing for those with jobs in York and also meet the present and projected need for	136/12870	Skelton Village Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	affordable housing. Although 850 still very demanding.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Support – welcomes SS2 to build strong, sustainable communities. Support exclusion of housing allocations and safeguarded land from the green belt.	144/12879	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Objection- concerned about the number of housing to be delivered without the appropriate investment in the outer ring road.	153/14985	Without Walls (York Economic Partnership Board)
	Objection- there is no proven need or demands such housing numbers will devalue the local communities and even cause congestion.	164/13884	
	Support- welcome the recognition of the link between economic and housing growth and support the intention to make provision for 1090 dwellings per annum with a 15% buffer.	187/13911	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Objection- objects that so much green belt land is being removed for employment and housing and especially as these areas has been considered important for the purposes of the green belt up now. The impact on the Green Belt setting of York will be considerable. Need to be confident that the economic ambitions for York are not at the expense of the setting and special character of York.	192/13991	
	Comment- for the number of these sites however there may be potential for some development to take place that would not harm the special character setting in York. There needs to be a more robust assessment of the impact which the development of these sites might have upon the six principal characteristics of the historic city which are set out in the heritage topic paper.	238/14032	English Heritage
	Support- supportive of the removal of the York Designer Outlet from the Green Belt.	244/14130	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Objection – see response 10J	268/14143	
	Comment- would recommend safeguarding a 'Cordon Sanitaire' of distance 400 metres for the works. This is reflective of the recommended distance used for planning purposes as outlined in the town and country planning (general permitted development) order 1995: part 6 (agricultural buildings and operations) which sets out a requirement that protected buildings should not have accommodation for livestock or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge location without 400 metres of their cartilage.	295/14167	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Support – the housing provision figure of 1090 per annum as a minimum requirement. Although additional sites need to be allocated to ensure the minimum requirement of 1090 dwellings per annum is achieved. The lead in times in terms of submission and approval of a planning application and site preparation will mean that	304/14173	Shirethorn Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	completions on sites will not be achieved for several years. The estimated completions for sites are in some instances overly optimistic.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Comment- Policy H3 assumes that the propped new settlement at Whinthorpe will create 4,680 dwellings between now and 2030. This can only be described as unrealistic. Bases upon our extensive experience the lead in time associated with creation of new settlements or indeed significant housing sites, is considerable due to need for substantial infrastructure works prior to actual housing development being able to commence.	305/14183	Taylor Wimpey (UK) Ltd
	Comment- should consider the needs of the bio-renewables sector as well as the potential for the city to provide a physical hub for expertise and enterprise in the sector	333/14188	Biovale Steering Group
	Objection – the statement that the green belt will be protected is not matched by the detail on the published plan which shows the total destruction of many parts of the existing propped green belt. A once in a lifestyle opportunity to set up an effective green belt will be missed if the housing is allowed to spread as far as the ring road. Leave space between the housing and the ring road wide enough to allow the planting of trees on both sides of the ring road say 800-1000 yards. The mature trees will absorb much of the CO2 gas generated by the traffic and will serve to improve the air quality in York as well as defining the start of the green belt if the proposed housing development is allowed to take place. The map shows large areas of housing up to the main A64 and the A1237. Appear to be planning to build on areas of flood plain.	419/16526	
	Objection- there is too much new housing shown for the east side of York (compared to the west) infrastructure to the east is struggling already, including roads and transport etc. Roads are grid-locked or very heavily congested regularly including on the A1079 and the roads will not cope with the substantial increases which will flow from the new east side developments.	421/16532	WR Dunn & Co. Ltd.
	Objection- the proposed developments are much too large. In favour of keeping as much green belt round the city as possible and feel that here is Osbaldwick, Dewenthorpe is about as large as any of the developments should be built. If the number of homes proposed were to be built York would without a doubt lose its identity. Would the infrastructure be able to support all these people? It would lose its popularity if already choked roads were to be made worse.	423/16533	
	Support – the two key priorities that sufficient land should be made available to support sustainable economic growth and to build strong and sustainable communities through the delivery of new housing. However feel that the overall	432/16542	Church Commissioners for England

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	strategy could be more ambitious in terms of the delivery of new jobs and houses.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection- do not accept the need for the higher figure chosen by the Council. The appropriate extend –based position for York of 850 dwellings per annum throughout the plan is surely the target to aim at.	433/16555	
	Objection- am surprised that the Local Plan does not concentrate more on ascertaining the opium size of the city in which t retain its unique and valuable character and to prevent services most notably the traffic infrastructure from reaching breaking point am dismayed that to this end an Urban Capacity Study has not been commissioned, especially given the length of time the city has had to deliberate over its local plan. In the absence of such a study regard the proposals to be fundamentally flawed.	458/16618	
	Objection- targeting out of town green sites which builders of course prefer but not good for York residents. Will create two car families due to the lack of facilities school, doctor, shops and regular public transport within walking distance. Is environmentally unfriendly which will lead to more road congestion and car pollution. Public transport is inadequate. There is a large amount of brown field sites within the City such as the Tear drop but no consideration is given to these sites. There is a need to look again at the Local Plan and develop brown field sites within the City.	459/16619	
	Objection- having reviewed the development plans for the whole of York it appears but the suggested expansion areas seems to be significantly larger to the North and South of York in comparison of the East and West. Suggest that the plans are reviewed again to make the development in all areas of York more proportionate. Any proposed alterations to the current infrastructure should be in place before any housing works take place. The current roads cannot cope with the current volumes of traffic.	497/16628	
	Objection- concerns regarding the loss of Green Belt. The council would appear to be hitting an already congested area with more housing.	514/16630	
	Objection – why are all the brown field sites not used up?	514/16631	
	Objection- serious questions as to whether the housing target can be justified- everything in the past suggests this. Reject 1090 and 15% buffet replace with 850 and 10% buffet.	527/16649	
	Comment – support SS2 in respect of acknowledging that it is vital to ensure that there is provision of sufficient land to support sustainable development in York whilst addressing the housing and community needs of York’s current and future population. However, question the proposed site allocations.	528/16659	York Diocesan Board of Finance

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see response 10G	529/16677	
	Support- based on a comprehensive and robust assessments of the factors that influence growth in and around of York and highlights the constraints and opportunities for new development.	534/16698	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – Policy SS2 is not justified. Failure to recognise the RSS creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16743	
	Objection – see response 10D	548/16779	
	Objection – see response 10B. The proposals relating to the Green Belt use for building and wind farms are completely unsustainable.	551/16792	
	Objection- the plan to build 20,000 + houses in the York area is unacceptable for the following reasons. The local infrastructure will be unable to cope. Run off from yet more homes and hard standing areas will exacerbate flooding risks. The environmental impact on green belt areas cannot be justified.	560/16794	
	Support- support the councils aspirations as set out within the York Economic Strategic 2011-2015 (2011)“to become an international and enterprising city and in time the most competitive city of its size not only in the UK but globally leading to increased growth in the overall economy and jobs” in order to achieve such ambition the Council will require housing growth to match the Council’s economic ambitions. At the stage we would like to note that the construction industry makes an important contributor to the local economy and provides a significant number of direct and in direct employment. This adds further weight to needing to ensure the housing target is ambitious.	659/15068	Persimmon Homes
	Objection- the allocation of an inflated and excessive amount of Greenbelt land should be avoided with emphasis placed on bringing forward existing allocated and consented land by the necessary de-risking through reduced or complete removal of affordable housing requirements.	668/16809	
	Objection- York City Council should reconsider the proposed plan to prevent encroachment of house building into the countryside and to protect the green belt which is so important for preserving the special historic character and setting of York.	670/16813	Mr & Mrs J M & L Hatton
Support – support the statements in Policy SS1 that the local plan will ensure “York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds city region and the York and North Yorkshire sub region and iii. The housing needs of City Of York current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area.	673/16837	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Comment- absolutely no building apart from wind farms/travellers sites absolutely no retail/industrial development. This sucks the life out of York and necessitates use of cars.	698/16867	
	Objection- the extent of development proposed is too long. Reasonable to predict the economic positive with any degree of certain.	703/16873	
	Objection- does not think that any green belt should be build on. York does not need to be any bigger.	731/16879	
	Objection – see response 11	737/16880	
	Objection – it is really necessary to build an extra 22,000 houses 66,000 people or more. Why not build a new town complete with the necessary infrastructure of services, drains, roads etc. This has to be located at least 10 miles away from York.	741/16886	
	Objection – see response 11	796/16891	
	Objection- the whole plan is predictable on a set of assumptions for growth which are just not backed up by the facts. A major infrastructure project such as part of the tear drop site. Major employers coming to the area part of a road restructure. A direct bus service, new rail holts.	801/4545	
	Support- believes strongly that York is a great place to live, great place because it is economically successful. People want to come to York to live and work; there is a desperate need for York to be allowed to grow. Support the proposals and would be happy to see lots of new houses in York. Bold step to the right direction.	832/16897	
	Objection – see response 10G. Figure 2.4 shows that currently one third of York based commuters are travelling to Leeds to work. This shows the danger that excessive building of housing in York will transform the city into a dormitory town for Leeds. This would increase CO2 emissions causes by commuting which is inconsistent with the Council’s stated ambitions. It would also be of no benefit to York.	835/16898	
	Objection- do appreciate the need for new properties but the new proposed option is totally unacceptable. Already have plans for extra houses why take up green field sites land when we already have problems with traffic, schools, draining, buses, and doctors. There is no mention of infrastructure.	837/16920	
Objection – housing targets are inappropriate for York and unachievable. For most adjoining local areas the targeted housing levels put forward by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) annual allocation 2008-26 have been adopted. RSS allocation for York is 850, average completions over the last 6 years is 724 indicating that a target of 850 is much more likely to be achieved than 1250. 850 is in line with the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA) and the level of population	863/16929		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	growth set out in the 2010 Sub National Population Projections. NYSHMA judged that other factors need to be considered including infrastructure constraints and important issue of character and setting of the city. Given this information, 850 houses per annum is a much more sensible, sustainable and achievable objective.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Comment – concerned that the housing ‘shortage’ has been considerably exacerbated by the university pushing its responsibility to house students on to the private sector which has duly obliged.	865/16934	
	Objection – whilst recognise the need for new housing in and around York, the proposals to utilise over 2000 acres of land taken out of York’s green belt for both housing and business over the next 15/20 years beggars belief. Green belt is intended to be exactly that: land reserved to remain as countryside to provide homes for wildlife and for recreation.	904/16938	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	917/3054	
	Objection – proposals are based on flawed premises and are economically and environmentally unsustainable. Although some of the housing is intended to be affordable, this is relative to the local property market which in York means higher prices. Where are all the jobs envisaged going to come from? People who own their own homes need a long term reliable income but little is being done to encourage investment in jobs. Plan talks about housing for locals but in reality many of these houses will be bought by people who work outside York, or live elsewhere and buy the property as a second home. There is not the infrastructure in place to cope with development on such a scale. There would be pressure on roads, schools, medical services, shops and public transport. Poor access to such essential facilities and services would impair social cohesion and quality of life and destroy communities.	940/16945	
	Objection – see response 10A	945/16985	
	Objection –opposed to any proposal to develop any more of the green belt land on the west side of the city. Green belt boundaries and the extent of Poppleton village development were agreed with West Riding County Council many years ago – this was not ‘draft’ but agreed boundaries. The village is having to face a coalescence which the residents do not want.	969/17000	
	Support – clear, well thought out and ambitious plan. York is very obviously the most desirable city to live in the region if there is sufficient work for all its citizens and there are enough available and suitable houses for all who wish to live here – the plan seems to fulfil these criteria. There are clear green corridors leading into the city centre and this is commendable.	973/228	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – if 2,000 acres is to be removed from the green belt then it should be an enlightened removal permitting the already choking populace to breathe more freely and not one that is likely to lead to the gradual and inexorable strangulation of the city. York has prospered unlike its neighbours during the past few years of recession so thus it is difficult to comprehend why it is suddenly considered necessary to start building more than twice as many houses for an improbable target population every year for the next 17 years, appropriating vast swathes of green belt land whilst permitting developers to forego the priority to build on brownfield sites which are fast becoming an increasing eyesore within the city.	994/17011	
	Objection – believe that the plans for thousands of new homes on the edge of York will threaten the very fibre of its green belt. The target is too high and large developments on Greenfield sites will destroy York's character. Much of York, one of Britain's oldest and most beautiful cities would be changed out of all recognition of thousands of houses are built on fields. The plans are unsustainable. York is a small historic city where the local infrastructure is already under strain. More homes could mean tens of thousands more cars on already over congested roads. Figures must be reduced to a more sustainable and manageable level.	995/17020	
	Objection – York is a small city and needs to remain that way to retain the things that make it special. Growth for growths sake is not sustainable. The local infrastructure of transport links, schools, sports and other facilities is already above capacity. The erosion of green belt land should not be allowed at all. The suggested creation of over 1000 new homes a year is ridiculous.	1027/17039	
	Objection – against the proposed number of housing. Where are the proposed numbers of jobs going to be from for people to live in the proposed houses? There is no industry at all here in York. Figures are not based on much fact.	1045/17044	
	Objection – with regard to housing, the plan does not take into account the fact that the university does not provide sufficient accommodation for students and that most affordable housing near the university has been bought up by private landlords and in general buy to let has made it difficult for ordinary families to buy their own homes. The answer is not to build more and more houses to be let to students, or if they are, students should be made to pay council tax. The green belt should be protected; people will not want to visit York if they have to drive through miles of suburbs or if our ancient city is swamped by urban sprawl. There are many empty business units on Clifton Moor, empty shops and offices in town, derelict and unoccupied buildings, all could provide space for housing.	1049/17046	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only	1053/3345	
	Comment – need to have a transport infrastructure that supports the proposed developments including dualling the northern ring road and use of non-road corridors e.g. beside railways, trams or small electric buses.	1054/17052	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/629	
	Objection – the building developments on green belt is nothing less than criminal given the numerous brownfield alternatives. The York ring road is already grossly overloaded and polluted. The additional costs involved in delays and higher carbon levels will make living nearby even more unhealthy.	1079/17060	
	Objection – York’s setting is protected by its green belt and the plan must work to ensure that the green belt is not eroded to the detriment of its setting in North Yorkshire. Many of the proposed sites for development are situated in or near a few of the village communities - the level of the proposal in some is just not viable. 22,000 new homes by 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2030 is an over estimate. Employment for the number of people envisaged will not be available in the city council area and just lead to more migration of workers into West Yorkshire and further afield to find employment. The needed developments must be spread both in the urban areas and the villages, rather than the large developments proposed for a small number of communities.	1124/17064	
	Objection – against any infringement on the green belt and planned building of 22,000 homes.	1134/17072	
	Objection – very few of the sites proposed for housing, green energy, minority groups etc. have been properly assessed for either need or suitability and without a full environment assessment of the whole of outer York and the surrounding authorities.	1170/17090	
	Objection – disappointed that cannot tell what is intended in concrete form or how it will be achieved.	1190/17099	
	Objection – development should, wherever possible, be constrained within the outer ring road. Creating new housing and commercial areas outside the ring road leads to increased conflict between through traffic and local traffic heading from the new developments into the city centre. This will only exacerbate the already serious problems with traffic flows at the existing intersections. It also makes it much more difficult to connect new developments by public transport. Linear developments are the best way to ensure good public transport links can be provided.	1207/17103	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – concerns regarding building so many new houses and bringing so many more people to live in the area. More people means more cars, more rubbish, more healthcare, more social care, more schools, more employment, more pollution and more concrete which means more flooding. Need to improve existing before expanding dramatically, the roads in and around York are gridlocked at time now. How going to cater for all these people’s needs? Where are they going to work? Why do we need to expand so drastically and spoil the character of beautiful city and surrounding countryside – will the tourists still come?	1232/17132	
	Objection – why determined to change York’s character and that of the villages forever? York has always retained a small feel owing to the mainly low rise buildings but over the last few years the height of new builds is increasing with blocks of flats being built everywhere.	1259/17134	
	Support – welcome spatial principles, in particular that the location of development will be guided by: ensuring accessibility to sustainable modes of transport and a range of services; and preventing unacceptable levels of congestion, pollution and/or air quality.	1264/17146	Highways Agency
	Objection - people rightly complaining about erosion of open space.	1272/208	
	Comment – pursuing a development strategy of around 1150 dwellings a year based upon an economic growth model. We would suggest that this target should be progressed as a minimum.	1301/17245	Diocese of Ripon and Leeds
	Objection – the whole plan seems to be based on Table 8.1 and the choice of scenario 2 – don’t see this as being realistic or desirable. The assumption is that 16,000 new jobs are needed, thus catering for an additional population of 35000 and the assumption seems to be that these will be migrants. The problem is more likely to be coping with redeployment of existing workforce and shortage of skills in many cases. Need for new housing units is inflated and do not believe that anywhere near 1090 dwellings per annum is achievable.	1331/17254	
	Support – fully supportive of the need to ensure that there is sufficient land released to support the sustainable economic growth to improve prosperity and to build strong, sustainable communities. The allocation of Whinthorpe is essential to help York meet its stated growth aspirations.	1337/17274	Halifax Estates
	Support – the general principles set out under SS2 which will act to provide an overarching framework for the delivery of sustainable growth. In particular welcome the intention to build strong, sustainable communities through addressing the housing and community needs.	1346/17262	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection – do not believe that only need arising from economic and institutional growth should be addressed, needs arising from demographic changes also need to be acknowledged. York has a significantly ageing population which will become increasingly significant as the Plan period progresses. An ageing population determines the need for both specialist housing, improved and adapted public transport, accessible local services and facilities and fostering stronger and more cohesive communities – including those that are dementia friendly. Whilst there are specific policies within the plan to address the various matters, demographic change still needs to be acknowledged within the overarching policies given the prominence of the issue impacts on the chances of sustainable growth successfully being achieved.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2                      Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – York does have an established green belt which the plan is not seeking to define but ‘redefine’. RSS green belt policies will be retained until the green belt is defined in a local plan. While York’s green belt very clearly needs to be adopted in the form of a local plan, the need for urgency on this should not be used as an excuse or a mandate to radically alter what has for so many years been York’s green belt. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that the essential characteristic of green belts is their permanence – the removal of 2400 acres of green belt for the development of houses and safeguarded land is therefore contrary to the NPPF. Great weight is attached in the NPPF to the importance of green belts in protecting both cities and rural communities from urban and suburban sprawl – this is being disregarded by the plan which proposes so much development on York’s long-established green belt. York’s green belt is vital in protecting and promoting the character and setting of the city. Not only is the beautiful countryside surrounding York a key part of its identity it is also as important as the historic architecture within the city in promoting the area as a prime tourist destination. It is also as important in protecting the identity of the city as it is in protecting the surrounding rural communities from suburban sprawl. It is very important for the local agricultural economy, with 30% of the land grade 1 or grade 2. It is also home to a lot of wildlife, included protected species and thousands of trees as well as habitats will be lost. It is also important in encouraging regeneration within the city. Much of what has been proposed in the plan is inappropriate (as set out in NPPF paragraph 87) and should be withdrawn. Clearly not adhering to the guidance in NPPF paragraph 84 and in many cases pursuing an opposite strategy, by prioritising brownfield sites in the city for employment based development and pushed additional housing out onto</p>	<p>1355/17313</p>	<p>Mr J Sturdy MP</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>York's established green belt. This should be reviewed as part of the consultation process. No strong arguments have been made to justify the radical changes to York's established green belt. The proposals to build 1090 new homes per year are of a scale much too high to be workable for the historic city of York and its surrounding communities. Targets are based on grossly inaccurate calculations of need and unrealistic assumptions on potential future economic growth and job creation in York. They will have potentially disastrous effects on the city by causing immense strain on the local infrastructure and having a hugely detrimental impact on York's character and rural setting. These unsustainable and inappropriate housing targets and loss of green belt could put York's future economic prospects at severe risk. The inappropriateness of the proposals could also harm one of the city's main economic driving forces: the University of York. The university's attraction to high achieving students, experienced academics and high value businesses relies heavily on the city's image as a small, historic cathedral city with a rural, green environment surrounding it. The significance of green belt in helping to develop good universities is implicit in the fact that all of the 20 English Russell Group Universities are located within green belt protected towns and cities. By redefining and reducing the extent of York's established green belt, the university and its importance to York's economy could deteriorate, having a long term economic impact. Plan is ultimately unsuitable and inappropriate for York. It will not promote the right type of economic growth that the city needs and it could be highly detrimental to the long term economic success of the city. The scale of development proposed is also unsustainable and it will place York's already strained local infrastructure under more pressure than it can cope with. The road network within the city centre suffers with severe congestion, and around York the roads networks are little better with the outer ring road and particularly the A1237 very slow moving for large periods of the working week. Many of the roads leading into the city are also severely congested at peak times. Adding potentially tens of thousands of cars to the road network without any guarantees that infrastructure will be improved could be hugely damaging to the local economy. It could mean that existing and well established large scale employers opt to move to other cities where the infrastructure is more adequate. On the whole York's schools are already well subscribed. By adding so significantly to the population it is likely that they would soon become oversubscribed. No guarantees have been provided that new schools would be built. The quality of education could suffer and it could become a less attractive place to live and work. York Hospital and the other health</p>		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	facilities in the city are already strained and to add so many new homes without the guaranteed investment in health services could place the quality of healthcare in York at severe risk. Development at the scale proposed will undoubtedly increase flood risk in the area, as the cumulative effect of surface water run off will increase the load in the waterways and the burden on existing drainage and sewerage infrastructure. Unless flood defences are improved it could deter future employers coming to the city or current employers staying.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – need housing but not this much.	1392/17345	
	Objection – before any new housing development there must be the creation of jobs and infrastructure to support it.	1394/17350	
	Objection – in order to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, a priority should be added relating to the delivery of a net gain in biodiversity and the establishment of coherent ecological networks that are resilient to current and future pressures. Wording suggested, see response for detail.	1399/17357	RSPB
	Support – plan takes a realistic and sensible approach regarding housing and the allocation of land to accommodate the much needed growth and housing for York.	1400/17372	The Wilberforce Trust
	Objection – support the principle of delivering sustainable growth in York but find this policy as expressed to be too vague to allow meaningful comment.	1457/17391	
	Support – welcome the reference in SS2(ii) that the location of development will be guided by the need to conserve and enhance the city's historic and natural environment, including the setting. Unclear how the results of the studies referenced in paragraph 6.6 will be taken into account and how these may influence the policy approach. This appears to be the only place in which the potential for housing in the urban centre is acknowledged. If there are vacant properties which could usefully provide residential accommodation, ten these need to be considered as part of the housing mix and opportunities sought to bring them back into use before releasing further green field sites.	1491/17443	National Trust
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1504/2185	
	Support – welcome the recognition that economic and housing growth should be linked. Welcome policy SS2 and fully supportive of the identification of Clifton Gate as a strategic site.	1523/17493	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Objection – See response 10c	1579/17523	
Objection – See response 10c. Were under the impression that land designated as green belt should not be subjected to applications from house building firms.	1580/17533		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – whilst support York’s green infrastructure that includes country parks with new parks created at the ring road, ask how this can be if development is proposed up to and beyond the A1237 e.g. sites ST2 and ST14. Much of York’s green infrastructure not only includes SSSI but also many ancient hedgerows and trees with its wildlife. Request that these be retained when areas of draft green belt are developed.	1589/17551	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should ensure that green belt boundaries are assured well beyond the plan period. The quantum of land being safeguarded and the uncertainty over deliver of elements of the housing provision mean that this is not being achieved. More flexible provision of deliverable sites will lessen the pressure for safeguarded land to come forward prior to the end of the plan period. In light of the uncertainty in respect of a number of the consented and proposed strategic sites in York, there is a clear need for additional sites which can be implemented early in the plan period.	1661/9945	Linden Homes
	Support – the priorities set out in SS2 demonstrates how sufficient land is to be provided to sustain economic growth and meet the housing and community needs of the district. Wholly support the last paragraph of SS2. SS2 plainly recognises the economic realities of development and this is welcomed. SS2 appears to be based on a proportionate and well considered evidence base.	1663/9957	DPP
	Objection – issues with (i) based on the calculations for population growth and housing given in the plan. Support the spatial principles listed in (ii) to guide development, though definitions of what constitutes ‘unacceptable’ levels of congestion, pollution and air quality need to be strictly determined. It is not inevitable that such massive chunks of existing green belt land should suddenly be swallowed up by development. This will greatly add to the urban sprawl that the green belt exists to counter. Agree that the boundaries and extent of the green belt must be confirmed but do not expect that it will change substantially from previously agreed boundaries. Alternative approach would be to adopt far more realistic figures for job and economic growth, with a strong emphasis on stimulating local business growth which lasts.	1665/12928	York Environment Forum
	Objection – plan does not clearly set out that housing need and growth is a fundamental part which needs to be supported and delivered via the plan. Support - support part (iii) which sets out that the identification of development sites is underpinned by the principle of ensuring deliverability and viability.	1668/15025	Barratt & David Wilson Homes

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – submit that the failure to consider any development in or adjacent to the village of Hopgrove, whilst at the same time proposing site allocations adjacent to villages on the edges of the borough unrelated to the urban area, runs contrary to national guidance and is therefore unsound.	1672/15053	Mitchells & Butlers PLC
	Objection- the proposals in the plan do not fully reflect the wider economic drivers and where actual demand for employment lies. The proposals map only shows spattering of small scale employment opportunities in the south east. The plan does not support the expansion of further development of these employment sites on a scale commensurate with existing demand or the potential for economic growth through the plan period. The plan in unnecessarily constraining economic growth within the district. SS2 has not been informed by local evidence base. Comment - there is reference to improving prosperity, but the policy is not explicit as to whether it is to be applied to the district or the region. This needs to be clarified in terms of its spatial application.	1674/9756	William Birch & Sons
	Objection – the scale and nature of the developments proposed in the plan are completely inappropriate for York. Proposals would harm an attractive environment, rich in open spaces and hitherto protected by the green belt, which attracts countless visitors to its pleasant rural setting in the Vale of York. The pleasant character of York’s local communities would also potentially be under threat from plans for 22,000 homes. This seems excessive for the number of new jobs that are proposed.	1681/9761	
	Objection – the scale and nature of the developments proposed in the plan are completely inappropriate for York. Proposals would harm an attractive environment, rich in open spaces and hitherto protected by the green belt, which attracts countless visitors to its pleasant rural setting in the Vale of York. The pleasant character of York’s local communities would also potentially be under threat from plans for 22,000 homes. This seems excessive for the number of new jobs that are proposed.	1682/9764	
	Objection – object to the proposals set out in the plan as much of the land exists in the green belt and the prospect of the wide ranging developments surely cannot be contemplated bearing in mind the irreparable damage that would be inflicted on the unique open environment around York. Conflicts with National Planning Policy Framework policy on green belts.	1692/9767	
	Objection- scale of housing is low. Housing requirement not based on meeting the full, assessed development requirements and should not be found sound at examination. It is unclear whether the Council have considered the implications of failing on this. Concern that a number of the urban extensions as stated in criterion iv	1705/9770	Gladman Developments

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of SS2 may face deliverability issues and would be directly at odds with the policy.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Comment- concern that location of new settlement for the delivery of housing needs careful consideration. Advantage should be taken of previously developed land, particularly where the land is not located to the north of the city such as Elvington airfield.	1736/9810	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – object to the large number of new houses proposed. Part of the attraction of York is that it is a small city. The existing large suburbs already cause many traffic problems within the city. An additional 20,000 houses will make the existing traffic congestion even worse. Existing facilities will become overwhelmed. Building more park and ride schemes and out of town shopping areas to mitigate the population increase will just make York like other overdeveloped areas such as Peterborough or Reading and put the valuable tourist income at risk. Accept that some additional houses are required to allow for the natural increase in the area's population. However, the proposed number of new houses as contained in the plan is far too great and despite repeated use of the word sustainable it is not sustainable and will have an adverse impact on York's resident' quality of life.	1743/9840	
	Objection – total plan does not take into account the public transport problems associated with the expansion of the city with more people living further from the established centre of the conurbation. The present public transport (buses) system fails to adequately provide for the present needs. A new plan for York needs a completely new approach to the bus service plan and provision. People living in new 'dormitory' areas will need adequate bus facilities to all other parts of the city.	1799/9874	
	Support- policy appears to be based on a comprehensive and robust assessment of the factors that will influence growth in and around York and highlights the constraints and opportunities for new development. Support the priorities set out in the policy in that it sets out how land is to be provided to seek to sustain economic growth and to attempt to meet the housing and community needs of the district. Welcome the growth that is proposed over and above the RSS rates. Welcome that the local plan has an integrated approach to employment creation and housing provision and that it seeks to address problems of commuting into York.	1801/9887	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Objection – appreciate the green areas in Huntington and this mass overdevelopment severely encroaches on these open spaces. Whilst accept the need for new housing, object to so much, especially when there are plenty of proposals planned in the city.	1846/9898	
	Objection – the proposed development of Whinthorpe, on top of proposals for Grimston and Murton, and Germany Beck, as well as the East Campus development	1883/9900	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	at the university, will take out a huge swathe of open green belt and high grade farmland. This is not sustainable development.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Housing projected on a rate of expansion far higher than anticipated for similar cities elsewhere in the UK. Justification that recent high rate of growth, mainly associated with University cannot be substantiated. Justification of growth around attraction of hi-tech service industries is tenuous.	1884/2	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1885/19	
		1886/27	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The calculations used for the forecasted housing need are spurious and based on false assumptions. Adding large numbers of houses in the green belt will only exacerbate York’s transport problems.	1888/2129	
	Objection - economic basis for plan overly optimistic.	1890/39	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No evidence of plans as to where employment will come from.	1892/1905	
	Objection – one of York’s great attributes is its green surroundings which give it a unique feel compared to many other cities. York’s main and increasingly only source of income is in visitors to the city; York should be preserving its unspoilt character to ensure these visitors are not put off visiting the city. Need to ensure that the long term use of the land around the city, especially the precious green belt, takes precedence over short term profit, short sighted use and development.	1893/51	
	Objection – York attracts tourists and people wanting to live in it in part because of its beautiful green belt so to destroy a portion would be short-sighted.	1894/28	
	Objection – targets are unrealistic and the aspirations do not attend to the infrastructure that the plans would require. Much more use must be made of brownfield sites.	1899/106	
Objection – see response 10F. Plan is out of proportion, over ambitious, unsustainable and ill thought out. Understand the need for development in York, but against the proposed massive increases in housing development. 22,000 homes will put huge strain upon York’s infrastructure. Where are the schools, doctor’s surgeries, hospital, community and religious buildings and the sewage treatment works to cope with this huge increase in population? Where are the jobs? There is no social or economic need in York for such an enormous increase in housing. The scale of developments must be sensible, sympathetic and proportionate and within the capability of York’s infrastructure to cope. All development must be sustainable.	1901/7802		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	<p>Objection – why is the population of York expected to increase by such an amount to support all these new homes, who will buy them and what will they do for a living in order to afford to pay for them? There no longer seems to be a significant employer in York and there does not seem to be adequate provision for employment in the plan for all the additional people. York appears to be very reliant on the tourist industry. The policy of building more homes to reduce the price is too simplistic. There is undoubtedly a need, there is always a need but why then are we not building? Should continue to increase the skills of the workforce who will work for companies wishing to invest in the beautiful historic city of York so they can all earn more. Building houses out of town on Greenfield sites for people that can afford them but do not work in York in order to have them commute elsewhere is unsustainable. Building houses out of town on green field sites for people that can't afford them is also unsustainable.</p>	1902/73	
	<p>Objection – the large house building programme does not state what provisions are to be made to supply the infrastructure needed for such an increase in local residents. Where are the roads, schools, doctors, local shops, playgrounds coming from? Where are the jobs in the area?</p>	1903/74	
	<p>Objection – object to the proposal to build on land that was included in the draft green belt in 2011. These areas should be protected from development and under no circumstances should they be built on.</p>	1905/78	
	<p>Objection – anything that is likely to add to the numbers of commuters (cars) on the roads without duelling the A1237 should be dismissed.</p>	1908/9909	
	<p>Objection – see response 10A</p>	1913/100	
	<p>Objection – against the proposed massive increases in housing and commercial development. These will have a detrimental and adverse impact on all local communities and may destroy the very nature of the city and its environs which are attractive to so many locally, nationally and internationally. The scale of development must be proportionate and within reason – for example 750 houses per year. All development must be sustainable and must take into account existing infrastructure. There s inadequate capacity in local schools and medical facilities to support such a massive development.</p>	1914/109	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	1917/120	
	<p>Support – believe that the city has a duty to provide new homes, particularly affordable ones, as there is clear need. New houses can be built incorporating appropriate infrastructure without destroying the charm and character of our great</p>	1918/121	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	city's rural setting.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection –opposed to removal from green belt. Object to new proposals to build on land which was formerly included in the draft green belt in 2011.	1923/135	
	Objection – vision of the future of York as a city with grandiose plans for masses of jobs is seriously in doubt as is the need for 22,000 homes. No due consideration has been taken of essential infrastructure and service improvements to sewage, water, and the electrical demand made by such expansions of populations.	1931/149	
	Objection – the green belt needs to be preserved and any development if necessary should be appropriate. Housing development needs to be limited, planned realistically and fully thought through.	1933/153	
	Comment – green issues are a high priority in all future development in the York area.	1935/159	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York cannot cope with 22000 houses without being swamped. It is already a crowded city. Infrastructure cannot support facilities, roads, streets, hospital, and schools are already full.	1940/180	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No evidence of plans as to where employment will come from.	1942/1547	
	Objection – opposed to the loss of green spaces, loss of greenbelt. Fields full of houses and beauty gone. Question the need for so many houses. Can the local schools cope with such a large influx of families? What about the huge increase in traffic on what are basically country roads? Won't these proposals put a strain on our already overcrowded local health services?	1946/202	
	Objection – how viable are the projections for population growth in York? The numbers and therefore the demand for housing is overestimated. Developing homes on the scale outlined means sufficient infrastructure needs to be in place.	1947/213	
	Objection – where will these 50,000 people come from? Where will they earn their living? What is the evidence on which these projections are based? The infrastructure associated with such vast development will be hugely expensive. York is a historical city of immense charm. Turning it into a sprawling conurbation is in nobody's interest.	1956/242	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The plan allows for far too many houses to be built. The requirement for the houses is based on a projected population growth that is unrealistic and, if it were to happen, would be unsustainable and undesirable. It is based on a projected economic growth that is unrealistic and, even if it were to happen may well be unsustainable and undesirable if the character of the city is going	1959/254	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to be altered in the way proposed.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1960/262	
		1961/270	
		1962/277	
		1963/285	
		1964/293	
		1965/301	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No new jobs will be created. All industry has been lost from York.	1966/309	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1967/317	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where will all these new jobs be created?	1968/325	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York and the surrounding villages do not need 22,000 houses.	1969/333	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should not be built on. No evidence that the houses are needed.	1970/341	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/349	
		1973/364	
		1976/385	
		1977/393	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York is overcrowded with cars and people now, further expansion is not needed.	1979/408	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The proposed level of house building would seem to be excessive. Projections of job creation on which this plan depends would seem to be less than robust. The addition to York’s population is just too high.	1980/416	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1982/431	
	1983/438		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Visitors come from all over the world to visit York and do not wish to see another urban sprawl. Where is the predicted economic growth to come from?	1984/441		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1985/449		
	1986/457		
	1987/465		
	1988/472		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. This volume of housing is not necessary, there are insufficient jobs in York for the current population and expansion is not needed.	1989/480	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1990/487	
		1991/495	
		1992/503	
		1993/511	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/532	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/540	
		1997/548	
		1999/562	
		2000/570	
		2001/578	
		2002/586	
	Objection – scale of the proposed housing development in Copmanthorpe is disproportionate to the size of the existing village. Concerned about the impact future housing developments will have on the local environment and on quality of life for existing and new residents.	2003/588	
Objection – concern about the proposed increased housing developments in York. Many will be built on areas prone to flooding, extra building with less land being available or drainage could exacerbate the problem. Increased traffic from increased housing will add to current traffic problems. Can York District Hospital cope with the extra number of patients from the extra housing? There should be considerable extension of facilities before extra houses are built.	2004/591		
Objection – see response 10A	2005/6480		
Support – agree that some new development in Copmanthorpe is appropriate due to demand and excellent links to the A64 Objection – do not need 600 new houses in Copmanthorpe which will swamp the small village centre and increase traffic Comment – if new housing developments would include new facilities i.e. shops and pubs this is good. Some new housing but not the scale proposed.	2006/594		
Objection – concerned about where new residents of Copmanthorpe will work. Do we need so many residents? Can they find employment locally, understood that new jobs will be available in Monks Cross and Clifton Moor so how will Copmanthorpe residents	2007/6482		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
 Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	get to these places?		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued</b>	Objection – see response 10C .What is to happen when the high numbers of cars and lorries belonging to new homes and business that are proposed hit the streets?	2009/6488	
	Objection –do not need 22,000 additional houses or 16,000 new jobs, we already have an excellent employment rate in the city. The infrastructure is already woefully inadequate for the current population	2010/6498	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/613	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How long are Hungate/British Sugar/York Central sites to stand dormant?	2012/621	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2013/637	
		2015/652	
		2016/660	
		2017/668	
		2019/682	
		2020/690	
		2022/705	
		2023/713	
		2024/721	
		2025/729	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/743	
		2033/785	
		2034/793	
		2035/801	
		2036/809	
		2037/817	
2038/825			
2039/833			
2040/841			
2041/849			
2042/857			
2043/865			
2044/873			
2045/880			
2046/888			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
 Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2047/896	
		2048/904	
		2049/912	
		2050/920	
	Objection – shocked by the vast housing estates on green belt land being considered.	2052/6505	
	Objection – should not be proposing to build thousands of houses on greenbelt land and agricultural land when crops can be produced. This land is protected by law. Cannot provide proper services now, have not thought of services like sewerage, traffic, schools, doctors, hospitals.	2054/6507	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2059/950	
		2061/964	
		2063/978	
		2064/986	
		2065/994	
		2067/1009	
		2068/1017	
		2071/1039	
		2072/1047	
		2073/1055	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2074/1063	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal to create thousands of new jobs in York not credible. Should concentrate on creating employment for those currently unemployed in York.	2075/1071	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2076/1079	
		2078/1094	
	2080/1109		
	2081/1117		
	2083/1132		
	2084/1140		
	2086/1155		
	2090/1182		
	2091/1190		
	2092/1198		
	2093/1206		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2094/1214	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new houses.	2095/5786	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2097/1235	
		2098/1243	
		2100/1258	
		2102/1272	
		2103/1280	
		2105/1295	
		2106/1303	
		2107/1311	
		2108/1319	
		2109/1327	
		2110/1335	
		2111/1343	
		2112/1351	
		2113/1359	
		2114/1367	
	2115/1375		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2116/1383	
		2117/1391	
		2120/1413	
		2121/1421	
	Objection – see response 11	2124/6510	
Objection - no evidence of requirement to build 22000 new homes over next 15 years. Scale of development unsustainable and out of character for city.	2127/1435		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2129/1444		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Priority should be given to assisting unemployed residents into work.	2130/1452		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. To build houses in hope this will attract people before there are sustainable jobs is putting the cart before the horse	2131/1460		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)	
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1468		
		2133/1476		
		2134/1484		
		2136/1499		
		2137/1507		
		2138/1515		
		2139/1523		
		2140/1531		
		2141/1539		
		2143/1562		
		2144/1570		
		2146/1585		
		2147/1593		
		2148/1601		
		2149/1609		
		2150/11584		
		Objection - 600 houses excessive for Copmanthorpe. Where will new work come from for extra people? Lack of industry, recent redundancies and laying off of workers adds to atmosphere of less work being available.		
		Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2151/1623	
			2153/1638	
			2155/1653	
			2156/1661	
			2157/1669	
			2159/1684	
		2160/1692		
		2161/1700		
		2162/1708		
		2163/1716		
		2165/1731		
		2166/1738		
		2168/1752		
		2170/1767		
		2171/1775		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	2172/1783	
	2173/1791		
	2176/1812		
	2177/1819		
	2178/1827		
	2180/1851		
	2182/1865		
	2183/1873		
	2184/1881		
	2185/1889		
	2186/1897		
	2187/1913		
	2188/1921		
	2190/1935		
	<p>Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Question the need for so much additional housing. Question how far York can compete as general state of economy improves. 200 homes for Copmanthorpe more realistic. Concern over calculations made on assumption of certain level of economic expansion – fraught with problems. Also concerned over how growth rate affects other factors such as housing and transport. If a significant number of houses need to be built need to consider whether should be a new settlement or add on to existing areas. New settlement requires new infrastructure to be put in place. Existing areas will need infrastructure improvements. Argument is not against expansion and development but the scale of it.</p>	2191/1943	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	2192/1951	
	2193/1959		
	2194/1967		
	2195/1975		
	2196/1983		
	2197/1991		
	2198/1998		
	2199/2006		
2201/2021			
2202/2029			

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2                      Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2203/2037	
		2204/2045	
		2206/2059	
		2207/2067	
		2208/2074	
		2209/2082	
		2210/2090	
		2211/2098	
		2212/2106	
		2214/2122	
		2215/2137	
		2216/2145	
		2217/2153	
		2218/2161	
		2219/2169	
		2220/2177	
		2221/2193	
		2222/2201	
		2224/2215	
		2225/2223	
		2226/2231	
		2228/2246	
		2229/2254	
		2230/2262	
		2231/2270	
		2232/2278	
		2233/2286	
		2234/2293	
2235/2301			
2237/2316			
2238/2324			
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local Plan is over ambitious. Will turn York into a building site for 20 years. Will turn off tourists and drive out existing residents.	2240/2339	



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2347	
		2242/2355	
		2244/2370	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2378	
		2246/2386	
		2248/2401	
		2249/2409	
		2250/2417	
		2251/2425	
		2252/2433	
		2253/2441	
		2254/2449	
		2255/2457	
	2256/2465		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of York. Historic cultural city for tourism and high tech business not an industrial suburb of Leeds.	2258/2480	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2259/2488	
		2260/2496	
		2261/2504	
		2262/2512	
		2264/2526	
		2265/2534	
		2266/2542	
		2267/2550	
2268/2558			
2269/2566			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis and Response 10C	2270/2574		
	2271/2582		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2272/2590		
	2273/2598		
Objection – would like to see the land put back in the green belt at Knapton/Wetherby Road	2276/2619		
	2278/6515		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2282/2637		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2283/2645	
		2284/2653	
		2285/2661	
		2286/2669	
		2287/2677	
		2288/2685	
		2290/2700	
		2291/2708	
		2292/2716	
		2293/2724	
		2294/2732	
		2295/2740	
		2296/2748	
		2297/2756	
		2298/2764	
		2299/2772	
		2300/2780	
		2301/2788	
		2302/2796	
		2303/2804	
		2304/2812	
		2305/2820	
		2306/2828	
		2318/2836	
		2319/2844	
		2321/2859	
		2322/2867	
		2323/2875	
		2324/2883	
		2325/2891	
		2326/2899	
2328/2913			
2330/2928			
2331/2936			

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Comment - the Plan is very optimistic. Fully understand economic reasons for draft proposals.	2338/3290	
	Objection - insufficient employment for scale of housing development. Roads cannot cope.	2340/3292	
	Objection – what is the basis for the scale of development? Why are so many houses necessary and where are the jobs going to come from? There doesn't seem to be enough consideration of the need to protect the character of the city.	2348/6528	
	Objection – see response 10A	2349/6531	
	Objection – proposed scale of housing development will make York a mass of sprawling housing estates with no green areas and York will become more and more like a never ending spread of Leeds.	2354/6539	
	Objection – see response 10C	2356/6540	
	Objection – green space and the environment will be threatened by new housing, new business, new employment and the need for a significant increment to the ring road. More visitors, more people, more building and more cars will all contribute to a significant increase in population. It is common sense to concentration development where there are existing utilities and services.	2358/6543	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2367/3160	
		2368/3168	
		2370/2964	
		2371/2972	
		2372/2980	
		2373/2987	
		2374/2995	
		2377/3016	
		2378/3024	
		2381/3046	
2383/3069			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis and Response 10C	2384/3077		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3085		
	2387/3100		
	2388/3107		
	2389/3115		
	2390/3123		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2392/3137	
		2394/3152	
		2396/3182	
		2397/3190	
	Objection – insufficient infrastructure to take all traffic that York gets from visitors, inhabitants, businesses and through traffic at every exit and entry to city. Planning to build 22,000 houses is a gross overestimate of houses needed and is impractical.	2404/6558	
	Objection – see response 10A. There are many eyesores within the city of York (Piccadilly is one) that could be used for housing.	2406/6562	
	Objection – the existing and proposed polices for green belt and environmental protection are not adequate for environmental security.	2416/6591	
	Support – it does not matter about green belt, it matters that people are housed close to their family and friends. Building will create jobs so less benefits for the Council/Government to pay out. Development should happen now, lets get York moving and active.	2418/6695	
	Objection – proposals do not reflect the level of housing really required at this time. York is a historic city and should be preserved as such.	2419/6701	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3205	
		2449/3213	
		2450/3221	
	Objection – the impact of a further 600 houses in Copmanthorpe on the water supply and drainage will be tremendous. Would be wise to concentrate efforts on maintaining and upgrading the existing system to cope.	2451/6727	
Objection – See response 10B	2456/6729		
Objection – with city constantly increasing in size and population in these times of cuts and austerity fail to see how facilities and services can be increased accordingly. Fear for adequate provision of schools and NHS facilities. Road system is greatest concern, traffic into and out of the city on A19 has become unbearable. York is proposing to expand and possibly making quality of life of current residents worse in the process.	2457/6736		
Objection – Crucial that new housing and employment sites are designed with committed public transport provision. Should specify that all new homes must be within a 5 minute walk of public transport and that the transport is available before the home is occupied. Attractive public transport is vital especially for the larger proposed housing developments.	2460/6738		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – shocked to see so many houses are to be built on green belt land. Realise it is very difficult for first time buyers to be able to afford a deposit and get a mortgage but how can building thousands of houses (most of which will not be affordable housing) help this situation? Need an enormous amount of additional employment to fill these houses. Already have quite a few unemployed people and insufficient work for them now. Huge amounts of investment would be needed to even begin to develop a thriving job market.	2466/2620	
	Objection – see response 10A	2467/6742	
	Objection – proposed scale of housing growth will ‘nibble away’ at the green belt or perhaps worse form holes and would set a precedent for the future leading to more encroachment over the coming years.	2469/6747	
	Objection – too many houses proposed, the road system and access roads would pose problems and might not be adequate to cope	2470/6748	
	Objection – the historic setting of the city of York is threatened by the very large spilling of new settlements, these proposals seem to be based onto optimistic figures for growth, and surely flood risk will be heightened by the scale of development proposed. Proposals lack any sensitivity. Question the figures used for industrial/commercial growth and oppose the spread into the green belt.	2471/6755	
	Objection – instead of trying to cram more into an already over stretched cit why don’t the Council improve the roads, hospitals, schools, doctors, dentists, traffic congestion, street lighting, bin collections etc. Increased city population will only compound an already unacceptable situation. In Moor Land, Woodthorpe area in particular has anyone even looked at the roads?	2482/6765	
	Objection – the Council will not encourage people to buy here if you clog all the roads, overcrowd the schools and hospital, no mention of planning for the already overstretched facilities. The proposed plan does not enhance any part of local living, extra pollution, extra traffic, overcrowding. Jobs are not paid to reflect the price of houses. The suburbs have an ageing community not a young one, who will buy all the properties? Talk of creating jobs but are knocking down Haxby Hall. This is a local facility that houses local elderly people and employs a large percentage of local people who are within walking distance of their employment. It makes no sense.	2484/6768	
	Objection – see response 10A	2487/6773	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2488/3236	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis and Response 10C	2489/3244	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2490/3259	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3361	
		2494/3369	
		2496/3384	
		2497/3392	
		2498/3400	
		2499/3408	
		2500/3416	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2501/3424	
	Objection – puzzled by the expected need for so many new housing sites. Do not allow development to encroach further onto green belt. Keep development within the ring road, the A1237 makes a sound boundary.	2513/6795	
	Objection – see response 10A. The Land behind the Holly Tree Court is unsuitable for housing. Firstly it's green belt, it supports barn owls and sparrow hawks. Secondly I believe there will be a drainage problem. I have had my garage flooded 3 times last year and can back this up with photos. Thirdly the infrastructure in Dunnington won't support it – traffic, schooling etc. Fourthly this side of the village has already had development with Hogg/Persimmon estate; further development would spoil the village.	2517/6802	
	Objection – see response 11. The city doesn't have the infrastructure to support all the new houses and where are all these people going to work? The local health service cannot cope and the roads are choked to a standstill, traffic cannot move. This plan would totally ruin everything the tourists come to see.	2521/4366	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2524/3337	
		2525/3353	
	Objection – see response 10A	2532/4367	
Objection – see response 10A	2533/6812		
Objection – opposition to the proposal to build 22,000 new homes and create 15,000 new jobs over the next 15 years. Whilst the jobs would be welcome, 15,000 jobs will not sustain 22,000 homes. Roads are already congested at peak times, with 22,000 additional cars the situation will just become worse. New estates in the green belt will just mean that the traffic problems will start further out from the centre. Rather than creating new jobs, the traffic issues are likely to deter new businesses from starting in or moving to York.	2538/6825		
Objection – see response 10A	2540/6828		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – need green area space to remain so. More houses means more strain on already broken roads.	2544/6831	
	Objection – population trends suggest that no more than 800 houses a year are required.	2546/6834	
	Objection – question the need for 22,000 extra homes. There is no evidence of any significant migration in Haxby and other areas of York. Could the figures be based on the increase in temporary migrants such as students and temporary workers and will these really buy houses in York? The demand for property in York is falling why do we need to build more? Existing development sites for both employment and housing have remained derelict for years. Problems with traffic delay near hospital. With an aging population York Hospital will need to find additional capacity, how can it also provide for the additional population living in 22,000 extra homes? Will there be a new police station? There is no need and no demand for development on this scale.	2549/6846	
	Comment – the concept of a village must not be lost, policy should dictate that villages must not be joined to adjacent towns/cities. There are more acceptable options.	2550/6851	
	Objection – taking into account the current economic climate cannot see justification for the large number of new houses proposed in the projections. Growth suggestions appear more of a desire rather than an educated projection. Totally object to the proposal to build over 22,000 new houses throughout York.	2559/6884	
	Objection – see response 10A	2560/6891	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3314	
		2571/3329	
	Objection – until there are better roads, more bridges and wider roads York cannot really cope with anymore traffic. The green belt is essential to keep a balance between towns and countryside. York already has flooding problems which will increase if more building goes ahead. Why has the bypass only got single lanes, it is always solid with traffic what will it be like if the present plans goes ahead?	2574/6905	
	Objection – there is no real defined information to support the expectation of the continued expansion of jobs within York. There is no justification for the expansion of York when it could retain a structure of approximately the same size while becoming a more prosperous place for all to live.	2580/6920	
	Objection – the evidence to suggest York jobs will increase in years to come is weak.	2585/6931	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There seems little provision for new employment possibilities in the plan.	2589/3306		
Objection – see response 10E	2595/6953		



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Percentage increase in housing totally unsupported by any economic justifications.	2608/3431	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Duty of care for the environment and the green belt that must be upheld.	2609/3439	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are thousands of new jobs coming from?	2610/3447	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2611/3454	
		2612/3462	
		2613/3470	
	Objection – more houses and businesses mean more cars and roads are already gridlocked at busy times of the day.	2619/6961	
	Objection – see response 10A	2624/6968	
	Objection – see response 10A	2628/6971	
	Objection – the green belt and villages surrounded the city are as important to the special nature of York as its historic core.	2631/6974	
	Objection – see response 10A	2633/6981	
	Objection – see response 10A	2634/6983	
	Comment – what are the plans for new schools, medical facilities and shops to cope with the proposed increase in population that the local plan would create?	2635/6990	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2640/6018	
	Objection – see response 10A	2646/7013	
	Objection – there is no information about the infrastructure improvements required to make the plan work. The outer ring road needs to be dual carriageway all the way and there needs to be more schools, health provision etc... Are flood plains being protected?	2650/7022	
Objection – do not support the policy of economic development at all costs.	2652/7028		
Objection – the proposed new housing must be very carefully considered, York does not have the infrastructure, flooding is a huge issue and the roads are already heavily congested.	2660/7041		
Objection – see response 10B	2668/7063		
Objection – too many houses being proposed on green belt land. Building so many houses on an area that floods already does not make sense. Drains in the area are already overloaded. Impact of proposals in Huntington, Haxby and Rawcliffe on air pollution as well as severe congestion in the area and on the A1237. Is this number of	2669/7067		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	properties really needed throughout York? This is a historic city not a dormitory town for Leeds. The proposals are unsustainable. There is not the infrastructure in place to cope with such developments. Schools, doctors and social care services are all struggling to cope.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – there is an explicit assumption that 50% of the population of York by 2030 will be inward migrants.	2673/7077	
	Objection – object to plans to build more houses and business properties in York, there are quite a lot of business premises stood empty now – why build more? Where will all	2676/7090	
	Objection – the underlying basis and analysis of housing numbers is incorrect and based on hugely inflated expectations. There is no indication of how the infrastructure is to be enhanced to accommodate the predicted expansion and no funding proposed. How will the health service cope, bearing in mind they state they are currently running at capacity?	2678/7101	
	Objection– see response 10A	2679/7108	
	Objection– see response 10A	2682/7118	
	Objection – object to the use of green belt for housing development and for the number of houses in excess of those that studies suggest is needed, that is 25,000 instead of 17,000. Traffic volumes along the Malton Road will be hugely increased and this is not good for the local environment. What are the impacts of these out of town developments? Would it not be better to build up the town centre to make it a more thriving and attractive area?	2686/7137	
	Objection – see response 10D. Oppose all plans to build on precious green belt.	2687/7140	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2689/3580	
	Objection – see response 10F	2696/7146	
	Objection – see response 10A	2707/7814	
	Objection – no way there is employment for any expansion. Taking away green belt is sacrilege.	2713/7201	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Objection – to plans to build on green belt land when there is more than enough brownfield sites in the York area. Need to rethink the size of developments with regards to where all the people who live on the developments will work. York’s infrastructure is not big or efficient enough to cope with this size of development. What about all the extra vehicles and air pollution? The ring road and all roads out of the city get gridlocked now.	2737/7252	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see response 10B	2739/7255	
	Objection – unclear as to why it is necessary to plan for so many houses to be built, when in the middle of austerity measures which are likely to continue for a long time, with the resultant loss of jobs. The result will be that York will become even more so a commuter town for the Leeds City Region. Proposals will mean a dramatic change to the city which will no longer be attractive to tourists and economy will suffer as a result.	2743/7262	
	Objection – See response 10B	2759/6654	
	Objection – See response 10B. Completely against building on Green Belt.	2763/42	
	Support – acknowledge that it is vital to ensure there is provision of sufficient land to support sustainable development in York whilst addressing the housing and community needs of York’s current and Future population. The most appropriate land should be released for development and this will include green belt land.	2769/7317	
	Objection – there should be no building in green belt area. Brownfield sites only.	2772/7335	
	Objection – can see no economic or social need for the proposed huge increase in housing. Plan is based on city creating 1000 jobs annually for next 15 years. This is highly speculative and would like to know who will be employing all these people. Road infrastructure to the north of York is at times gridlock and cannot cope with present volume of traffic.	2784/7375	
	Objection – York cannot build itself out of a housing problem. Land is a finite resource so York’s housing stock should be managed better than it is now.	2788/7391	
	Objection – the basis for this plan is economic growth for York that exceeds that which is realistic or desirable for this ‘special’ city. Pursuit of economic growth far in excess of that traditionally achieved in the city, even in times of good national economic performance, would require a substantial migrating workforce and greater use of the available brownfield sites for industry. This has increased the allocation of land on agricultural land and Greenfield sites. York should be protected from such metropolitan suburbanisation. The Arup report confirmed that the proposed housing growth figures are not realistic for York and than annual growth of closer to 800 would be appropriate, but still challenging to achieve. Therefore the plan should adopt a housing figure of less than 800 a year. This lower figure, combined with increased use of brownfield sites would make the Clifton Gate and Whinthorpe developments unnecessary.	2789/7393	
	Objection – there is no social or economic reason in York for a huge increase in housing. Local roads will be unable to cope with the increased traffic. Hundreds of	2796/7416	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	acres of farmland and woodland would be lost and this will have an affect on wildlife.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – new employees will add to existing congestion on the ring road at peak times and congested roads will be a disincentive to firms who might be considering locating in York.	2797/7422	
	Objection – the use of green belt land will affect the character and beauty of our city. Little consideration given to impact of new development on local infrastructure. First consideration in any local plan for York should be the maintenance of what makes the city special and not to convert it into a copy of so many other poorly developed cities.	2798/7425	
	Objection – doubts about the general impact of such large scale development in York as a whole. Doubt that there will be enough jobs, and of the right type, created over the coming years to employ the people occupying the 22,000 extra homes. How many more cars will be on the roads? The ring road and A64 are a nightmare and businesses are put off from locating to York precisely because of poor transport issues. Would tourists still be as keen to flock to York if its reputation as a quaint little city is tainted? What about wildlife, drainage, hospital, schools, doctors? Agree that York does have to change and grow but the scale proposed is just too much too quickly to the detriment of the character and rural setting of the city.	2802/7434	
	Objection – assumed growth of 1000 jobs per annum appear optimistic given that York’s economy has shrunk over the last 10 years. Why going way beyond the housing figures suggested in the evidence – the Arup report states only 800 homes a year are needed in order to satisfy baseline economic forecasts? Proposals will dramatically increase congestion in and around the city, causing fewer people to want to live in York, not more. Want growth and prosperity for the city, but it has to be achieved in a measured and sustainable way.	2806/7447	
	Objection – to plans to build on the green belt. Brownfield sites should be used for both residential and business development.	2809/7454	
	Objection – see response 10C. Need to treasure and protect the green belt.	2814/7469	
	Objection – see response 10A	2816/7475	
	Objection – level of expansion which is unrealistic and without due regard to existing problems such as congested road network and school and hospital capacity. Significant additional infrastructure will be required.	2824/7485	
	Objection – York obviously has a need for more housing but it should be carried out at a much more measured pace, utilising all brownfield sites before encroaching on green belt land that is valuable for agriculture.	2826/7492	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see response 10A. Dunnington is a sought after village and the planning has to be thought out dearly and efficiently new homes need building but where? Also not to discriminate houses have already been developed.	2830/7500	
	Objection - York obviously has a need for more housing but it should be carried out at a much more measured pace, utilising all brownfield sites before encroaching on green belt land that is valuable for agriculture.	2837/7518	
	Objection – green belt must be maintained at all costs. Brownfield sites within the A64, A1237 must be developed before any green belt is considered for development. A1237 cannot cope with existing or anymore traffic, it needs to be dual carriageway. Housing figure should be 850 dwellings a year, incorporating a 5% buffer.	2846/7537	
	Objection – see response 10A	2847/7582	
	Comment – think that the plan is a good idea but damage to the area.	2852/7593	
	Comment – hospital will need expanding and main roads need improving for easy access for ambulances. Bootham Road is always full of traffic – avoid for housing. A train station near York college would make it a better place to go to learn, easier to access for people in Strensall and Haxby and it would ease congestion.	2854/7596	
	Objection – the proposed increase in housing in the area will simply increase the already overcrowded roads. Improve access routes.	2860/7598	
	Objection – see response 10I	2869/7601	
	Objection – don't want York to turn into an overpopulated sprawl, look to develop brownfield sites and keep the countryside as it is. Scale the plans down.	2878/7605	
	Comment – seriously question the projected housing needs for the city overall. If York is to remain an attractive location it needs to retain the village atmosphere of places like Poppleton.	2885/7608	
	Support – there is a need for large increases in housing to cut shortages and reduce prices as happened through the 60s and 70s.	2901/7615	
	Objection – whilst houses need building, the proposed building of approximately 22,000 houses will put immense pressure on the infrastructure of York. In particular sewerage, drainage, traffic and schools.	2914/7627	
	Objection – see response 10A. The 2012/2013 winter saw our field partially flooded for the first time since 1981. Extra building in and around the village will worsen the situation. Common road and the A1079 also have water that no longer drains away quickly. Building will cause more flooding problems and congestion. Also a safe means of crossing the A1079 to catch York bus would be great.	2915/7633	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – York is a small historic city in which infrastructure is already under great strain. There is no economic justification for the number of new homes proposed. The Arup report indicates that the population of York as shown by 2011 census results is at a lower level than previously forecast. These plans fail to protect the environment or conserve York’s heritage and green infrastructure.	2929/7654	
	Objection – see response 10A	2980/7760	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2988/4527	
	Objection – cannot deny the need for new housing in the city, especially in view of the very low rate of building in recent years. However unhappy about the scope and concentration of the proposed new developments and their likely impact on the city. Because of its configuration, York just cannot cope with the sort of vast expansion which is envisaged. York’s drainage system cannot cope with the present demand. Traffic means York is slowly grinding to a halt, the A1237 and other roads need dualling.	2994/7778	
	Objection – the scale of the plan is too large and ambitious and could be out of date by 2030. Building on green belt land is ludicrous. York cannot cope with the projected traffic increases which these new developments will generate.	2995/7783	
	Objection – plan is ill-conceived and excessive. Do not believe it is necessary to build on fields. Other sources say a maximum of 800 houses would meet city’s growing need. Plan will completely destroy wildlife habitat. Do not believe there is the demand for new housing. Huntington already suffers with saturated land. How can green belt land be used when not utilised all brownfield sites. No provision in the plan for the influx of people – what about roads, schools, drainage, sewage, doctors, dentists?	2999/7792	
	Objection – it is clear from research that the 1500+ houses are excessive and a smaller number would meet demand. There are a large number of empty properties in York and these should be renovated and used first. All land in the plan is flood zones. Land from Monks Cross to Old Earswick is teeming with wildlife, these habitats will be destroyed and green belt land lost. Failed to implement plans for brownfield sites. Roads are already very congested ad there is nothing in the plan that addresses this. No provisions in the plan to cope with the increase in population – schools, doctors, dentists.	3000/7793	
	Objection – opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	3001/7824	
	Objection – opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	3002/7828	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection– see response 10A	3008/7844	
	Objection – see response 10A. I say no to any housing development. We have a lovely village and it would be spoilt with any housing. The fields behind the croft are unsuitable because of drainage problems.	3027/7873	
	Objection – why the huge increase from current house building rates? Where are the jobs going to come from in the current circumstances? York will be lucky to maintain the jobs it has. Why use the green belt, there are plenty of brownfield sites in York? The ring road is already gridlocked.	3034/7881	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4011	
	Objection – hope Knapton and West York green belt will not be developed as planned. Object to loss of countryside, woodland and wildlife.	3036/7887	
	Objection – green belt once confirmed should stand for all time otherwise it is meaningless.	3043/7897	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	3047/7907	
	Objection – concerned that the scale of growth and that the identified housing need is exaggerated. Arup report suggests growth projection for the population are overstated in the 208 report. Emphasis has been placed on economic growth in arriving at the annual need for housing, when considering the new economic climate, growth levels have been set too high.	3056/7909	
	Objection – there is too much green belt taken. There are brownfield sites that could be developed is affordable was removed.	3066/7938	
	Objection – protect the west York green belt. Any further misuse of the land would be morally wrong. Look at the old Sugar Beet site or tear drop for development and leave green belt alone.	3073/7946	
	Objection – whilst believe there should be limited housing schemes in some parts of the city they need to be on brownfield sites, or close to the A64 as there is better access to the city and West Yorkshire. Further housing should not be considered without better transport links, considering where people will work and understanding the effect on schools, health and other services. Building the volume of houses will not help the prices as there is little employment in York people then have to travel which puts strain on other transport/services.	3111/8015	
	Objection – strongly object to so many new homes as there are not sufficient doctors, school places and roads to accommodate the extra number of people.	3114/8023	
Objection – strongly object to future development proposed in the local plan until such time as the infrastructure and facilities are in place to sustain it.	3115/8024		



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Comment – generally support the numbers of dwellings proposed and their locations provided that infrastructure, especially transport and road networks/junctions are in place/upgraded to support these developments. Support the dualling of the ring road in its entirety, not just the specific sections shown on the plan – upgrading these transport links is vital to York’s continued economic prosperity. Believe the plan’s proposals of modest and targeted expansions into the green belt form a reasonable balance between conserving the green belt for the purposes it was originally established and the need to provide affordable places for people to live which will in turn support York’s continued economic prosperity.	3116/8026	
	Objection – smaller developments spread around the city have many advantages and can cater for demand for additional housing on all geographical sides of the city and for residents that may not be able to afford a car. Congestion and potential ‘blot on the landscape’ will do nothing to encourage tourism – so vital for the city and end up damaging our largest industry with a very strong employment multiplier.	3117/8032	
	Objection – the target of 1250 homes per annum is considered excessive. The desire for economic growth has been presented as a reason behind this target – would prefer greater emphasis on sustainability than on growth. There should be greater emphasis on developing brownfield sites in the city centre; a more even distribution of any additional houses which are still necessary to meet the revised target around the outer York area; and more rigorous protection of the remaining green areas around Heslington.	3121/8036	
	Comment – not totally against development and growth if it’s required. The city of York and surrounding area has many brownfield sites that may not be as attractive to developers as green field sites, but must be considered as the better option, if not only to protect the historic character of the green belt but to regenerate brownfield sites that are in need of the investment.	3131/8061	
	Comment – not totally against development and growth if it’s required. The city of York and surrounding area has many brownfield sites that may not be as attractive to developers as green field sites, but must be considered as the better option, if not only to protect the historic character of the green belt but to regenerate brownfield sites that are in need of the investment.	3132/8063	
	Comment – not totally against development and growth if it’s required. The city of York and surrounding area has many brownfield sites that may not be as attractive to developers as green field sites, but must be considered as the better option, if not only to protect the historic character of the green belt but to regenerate brownfield sites	3133/8065	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	that are in need of the investment.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – if all new residents could find work in York would look on the plans to build 22,000 new homes with equanimity. But cannot compel new employers to open up in York, which is already enjoying reasonable levels of employment. Adding more people to the labour pool seems to me a good way of driving up unemployment and how that will help the local economy isn't clear. The list of major York companies which have closed in the last 20 years is lengthy; the new comers welcome as they are, are minnows in comparison. Is it sensible to build more commuter houses?	3134/8066	
	Objection – the huge increase of housing, people and motor vehicles would result in massive deterioration in the quality of life of people who live in the area already. Congestion has been a major issue into the city for many years. Because people are allowed to drive into the city without restriction, the approaches are chaotic. Do not believe that there would be any adequate planning, infrastructure and action to make such a massive new scheme workable.	3137/8079	
	Objection – there is no social or economic reason in York for such a large scale increase in housing. The proposed loss of hundreds of acres of farmland shows complete disregard for the countryside and its many varied inhabitants. Decimation of green belt. Cynical disregard for the villages surrounding York is detrimental to the historic city's stature as a world tourist site, and is making the approaches to our city tawdry and commonplace. A more creative development of the many unoccupied central York properties and brownfield sites should be maximised rather than this oversupply of inappropriate buildings.	3139/8081	
	Objection – do not think that building on green belt land ahead of brownfield sites is a good idea. No guarantee that the necessary infrastructure or road improvements will be provided. Should only develop all of the space inside the A64/A1237.	3142/8090	
	Objection – all available brownfield sites in the city should be developed before any other developments should be considered.	3145/8097	
	Objection – unclear as to why it is necessary to plan for so many houses to be built, when in the middle of austerity measures which are likely to continue for a long time, with the resultant loss of jobs. The result will be that York will become even more so a commuter town for the Leeds City Region. Proposals will mean a dramatic change to the city which will no longer be attractive to tourists and economy will suffer as a result.	3147/8106	
	Objection – unclear as to why it is necessary to plan for so many houses to be built, when in the middle of austerity measures which are likely to continue for a long time,	3148/8108	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	with the resultant loss of jobs. The result will be that York will become even more so a commuter town for the Leeds City Region. Proposals will mean a dramatic change to the city which will no longer be attractive to tourists and economy will suffer as a result.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see response 10A	3150/8112	
	Objection – question why York has to be expanded at the rate and to the extent envisaged in the plan. York already has problems with traffic congestion and lack of suitable infrastructure. Cannot be sustainable to continue to grow the population and employment base of the city. This policy will mean higher energy consumption and strain on local services. Question where the expansion in the local population is coming from.	3151/8113	
	Objection – there is no social or economic reason in York for such a large scale increase in housing. The proposed loss of hundreds of acres of farmland shows complete disregard for the countryside and its many varied inhabitants. Decimation of green belt. Cynical disregard for the villages surrounding York is detrimental to the historic city’s stature as a world tourist site, and is making the approaches to our city tawdry and commonplace. A more creative development of the many unoccupied central York properties and brownfield sites should be maximised rather than this oversupply of inappropriate buildings.	3168/8147	
	Objection – proposals show hugely unrealistic building targets for the historic city of York resulting in an uncontrolled suburban sprawl. Cannot see any social or economic reason in York for such a huge increase in housing. Unnecessary building on green belt land ahead of brownfield sites. Any limited development should be restricted to within the outer ring road, firstly on brownfield sites and then perhaps on green field sites. Destruction of the character and beauty of special city and its surrounding villages and countryside. The inability of the city’s roads to cope with the proposed increase in population, worsening the existing congestion problems. No guarantee to provide the necessary infrastructure and road improvements to cope with proposals. Impact on way of life of residents.	3173/8162	
Objection - York’s per capita economic growth depends on the city’s ability to attract and retain high value professions – including technology-led product and service businesses associated with the development of the University. Like other successful university towns such as Cambridge, the attraction of the city to the best students, academics and high value businesses depends on a large number of factors. Like Cambridge, York’s architecture, history and green environment in combination create a	3174/8165		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>compelling package. So significant is the role of the green belt in this package that of the 20 Russell Group universities which are located in England, every single one lies within a protected green belt town. The attempt to disaggregated York's green belt into a set of supposedly higher ecological/ amenity-value 'green wedges' and, by deduction, a set of remaining lower-ecological/amenity-value wedges where Haxby-sized developments like Whinthorpe can be built seems to be a purely artificial one, designed to post-rationalise a plan in which trend-based population growth assumptions are deemed sacrosanct, the implication being that this growth must be met with housing development at all costs. This plan to build houses anywhere and at all costs appears to favour absolute economic growth over per-capita economic growth – despite the fact that this type of 'bums on seats' growth is the least sustainable (The value of an individual's output can in theory increase without limit; the number of individuals supported by York's infrastructure cannot) and also the least desirable since it necessarily sacrifices individual quality of life for aggregate economic output. In addition to the loss of green belt amenity value, the increased congestion, increased pressure on other amenities and increase cost of services such as parking in response to demand pressures all represent the hidden costs imposed on York's existing population when the economy expands purely as a result of a housing-enabled population increase. This absurd plan will pave over greenbelt land that has been successfully protected for decades in return for the hope of a short-term economic gain, and will instead result in a stagnation of York's academic and technology service based economy. It will destroy green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna. It does nothing to safeguard the quality of York's greenbelt land and furthermore will take productive agricultural land out of farming use.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Comment – an economist advising the City Region of which York is a part said that the city growth over 10 years is predicted to be 3% and not the 10% within the plans – where is the evidence for this population growth?</p>	3176/8172	
	<p>Objection – need affordable housing but not on this scale of 22,000 new homes. Do not need to build homes to accommodate or even attract people to come and live in York from other areas of the country. Should have satisfactory skilled or perspective trainee employee who actually live in this area already. York should remain a small, historic city, that is its charm and it would lose a lot of its tourist industry if it grew any bigger.</p>	3180/8176	
	<p>Objection – oppose development on green belt land. Should look at various smaller pieces of undeveloped land within the present boundaries without encroaching on</p>	3182/8187	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	green belt.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection –opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	3185/8195	
	Objection – fewer than 850 homes should be built. Brownfield sites should all be used for housing before green field sites are used.	3189/8206	
	Objection – too many houses in one year. Based on 850 houses and 4 people per house, that would be 3,400 people a year moving in, this is too many – saturation point. Brownfield sites must be built on first.	3190/8207	
	Objection – 850 houses are too many for this area. All brownfield sites should be used as a priority and green field sites used only when they have been built on.	3191/8209	
	Objection – development of brownfield sites should be used fully before green belt land is used. Current plan releases green belt land too early and stops development of brownfield sites	3202/8237	
	Objection – development of brownfield sites should be prioritised and maximised. Impact on doctors, schools. Are there enough jobs in the York economy to support demand?	3204/8244	
	Objection – 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised. If these plans for such a number of houses go ahead there will be severe impact on congestion, sewerage and drainage.	3205/8246	
	Objection – the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum or less than 850 a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year, achieving 1090 can only be done through 36000 people moving to the area. Such an expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt. There is no need for anymore houses in York.	3207/8253	
	Objection – what provision is in place to protect and preserve the green belt? Surely the outer ring road provided a natural boundary. When the villages experienced major development in the late 60s and early 70s there was a great deal of employment within easy commute of 2-5 miles. When considering development it makes sense to build in reasonable proximity to the place of work. If it is deemed necessary to persist in developing green belt sites, then it would extremely important to greatly improve the infrastructure. Consider completion of existing development sites in York before extending beyond the outer ring road. Utilise all empty properties above the shops in the city to provide temporary affordable housing.	3210/8274	
	Comment – a local development plan is a very sensible and logical structure with which to protect the existing city landscape and focus attention on future needs and	3214/8279	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – protect the green belt.	3240/8299	
	Objection – the proposed wanton building on green belt land before using the many brownfield sites within the city is another weapon of destruction to the city’s economic and viable future.	3245/8325	
	Objection – see response 11	3246/8326	
	Objection – plan seems to be based on the possible creation of 1000 new jobs a year, this is wildly ambitious. In reality the creation of 300-500 new jobs a year is a more reasonable and achievable target. This would bring down the proposed housing target to approximately 10,000. The majority of employees for established businesses moving into York will commute in from outside the city. Understand that none of the larger employers in the city are looking to expand and take on more staff in the next 18 months.	3254/8350	
	Comment – plan is very impressive in the detail, depth and scope of its considerations. Strongly favour highest priority for development being brownfield sites, followed by new settlements in previously undeveloped areas, and least priority being for further significant development attached to existing settlements. Main concern is the ability to provide adequate infrastructure. This should be relatively easy to achieve for brownfield areas. It should be easiest for new settlements because requirements can be part of site selection and the infrastructure can be built in from or before the start of development but can be difficult for new development that extends existing settlements where the infrastructure may be adversely affected by the new development and may indeed be inadequate. Over-riding concern that the plan is aspirational. It gives no assurance that developers would be made to follow these requirements.	3256/8361	
	Objection – understand the need for some new housing in and around York but am deeply concerned by the numbers proposed. York and the surrounding villages do not have the infrastructure to support such large scale development. The ring road is already inadequate and the increase in traffic, which the proposed development could create, would most certainly deter many businesses from opening up in the area thus damaging the local economy.	3257/8366	
	Objection – see response 10A	3266/8386	
	Objection – 1090 houses per year is far too many. The amount should be no more than 800 using all the brownfield sites first and that number coming off the new build numbers. Such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	3267/8388	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – totally against the use of green belt land for housing development or any other type of building.	3268/8392	
	Objection – building on the green belt will be the modern equivalent to dismantling the city walls. Once gone they can never be replaced. It is argued there is a necessity for building to provide houses for a future workforce. Yet the figures in the Arup report appear to spell out that the large projected increase in York’s population is due to age group 65+ who do not require jobs, but do require housing. This group do not appear to be catered for, with no bungalows being built in the area at present. Projected figures may be optimistic and job losses may alter these. Hope the figures will be examined with care before development is given the green light.	3269/8393	
	Objection – extremely devastated at the proposal to build 22,000 houses. More green belt being used. Where are the inhabitants going to be employed?	3270/8398	
	Objection – want to see preservation of green belt throughout this area.	3271/8402	
	Objection – great concern about housing development planned for York. Building 22,000 houses with a possible two cars per household will add to traffic congestion. Infrastructure is already stretched to breaking point.	3272/8404	
	Objection – deep concerns about plan to build 22,000 houses, 16,000 of which will be on green belt land. Infrastructure is presently stretched to the limit and further building without guaranteed substantial supporting development will see city descend into an urban sprawl of ugly residential areas with limited facilities. Travel on the northern ring road is already very tedious and slow, especially at peak times during the day. Reckless building on the green belt as a priority is wrong. Should be developing brownfield sites as a first priority and concentrating on building affordable housing on them.	3273/8406	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4019	
		3283/4027	
	Objection – opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington. Strongly object to the amount of green belt land on which it is proposed to build when there are brownfield sites available.	3286/8430	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4043	
		3289/4051	
Objection– see response 10A	3290/8433		
Objection– see response 10A	3291/8441		



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis and Response 10A	3292/4035	
	Objection – the scale of proposed housing (22,000 new homes) for York is shocking. More robust evidence is required to determine whether this degree of development is truly warranted, before the character of York and surrounding areas is damaged. York’s green belt land should not be allowed to be used for development (or safeguarded for future development), where there are alternative suitable brownfield sites available.	3293/8449	
	Objection – the overall housing targets are vastly over ambitious and unsustainable.	3297/8466	
	Objection – against the development of York’s green belt. It would put an enormous strain on the local amenities. Hundreds more cars in the area is alarming with the congestion problems we already have.	3299/8468	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposed building of houses surrounding York on green belt land, especially Fulford, an historic site.	3303/8474	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 850 houses should be built. Population trends suggest that no more than 800 houses per year are required. 1090 homes a year can only be done through 36,000 people moving into the area, such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	3327/4066	
		3330/4074	
	Objection – strongly object to the building of new houses because no thought has been put into local infrastructure.	3345/8530	
	Comment – do not object to the building of new houses but do object to the growth in population without serious improvement to the infrastructure.	3348/8535	
	Objection – concerned about the lack of detail on infrastructure. Area is already congested at times, plan will generate increased vehicles. There is little or no study detail on how the sewerage system will cope. There is little detail on how drainage and flooding will be dealt with.	3349/8536	
	Objection – disagree strongly with the number of houses proposed, all on green belt land. Where are all the jobs coming from? Schools and doctors at capacity.	3350/8539	
	Comment – all of York’s green spaces must be safeguarded to maintain and continue to enhance the value and attractiveness of our city.	3354/8560	
	Objection – York will never have the industries or jobs that justify such extensive development. Opposed to the development proposed.	3358/8609	
Objection - the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum or less than 850 houses should be built. Population trends suggest that no more than 800 houses per year are required. 1090 homes a year can only be done through 36,000 people moving into the area, such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	3359/8614		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – the estimate for the number of houses required has no robust methodology, it is pure hypothesis.	3361/8620	
	Objection – scale of proposed development. Cannot understand the thinking behind the overall proposals.	3364/8631	
	Objection – not against development per se but feel the scale of the proposal is just too great. The infrastructure as it stands will not cope with the needs of the additional huge number of residents in particular transport, health services (hospital), employment and sewage and waste disposal.	3365/8632	
	Objection – against any more development in York. It will destroy what was once a lovely small city. Need more green places, not more pressure on the infrastructure.	3371/8651	
	Comment – how will it be ensured that the new houses will address the shortage of houses for York residents, rather than for people outside the area.	3377/8669	
	Objection – the building of new homes is certainly required but not at the rate forecast.	3383/8680	
	Objection – a maximum number of 850 homes a year should be considered across the city.	3394/8696	
	Objection – concerned that the scale of growth and thus the identified housing need is exaggerated. The Arup report suggests growth projection for the population are overstated in the 2008 report compared to later documents. Emphasis has been placed on economic growth in arriving at the annual need for housing. I believe when considering the new economic climate, growth levels have been set too high.	3402/8711	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3412/4082	
		3414/4097	
		3415/4105	
		3416/4113	
	Objection– see response 10A	3424/8745	
Objection – extremely concerned that the proposals as they stand will do considerable damage to the character and beauty of the city of York making it a much less attractive place for people to relocate to and to visit, perhaps damaging the tourist industry to the detriment of the local economy.	3427/8749		
Objection – York’s present and future housing needs can be fully met by the construction of 850 dwellings year, rather than the preferred 1250 (further evidence/analysis provided in response). Such employment growth would be far in excess of what York has achieved in previous years. It also assumes a fast overall UK	3428/8773		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	economic recovery, and a much faster economic growth rate in York compared with the UK as a whole, and also with Yorkshire and the Humber. These employment and economic growth targets are unrealistic and based on wishful thinking. The plan does not describe any strategy to create the 16,169 additional jobs. Plan's other proposals could have the unintended consequence of compromising quality of life which might be the answer to attracting more business. Many new employees may not wish to live in the city, adding to further traffic congestion and air pollution. Proposed housing development on and around the A1237 is unnecessary to meet the housing needs of York's population.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – Arup report contains no detailed analysis of the housing needs of international students who now make up a significant proportion of the York population. These numbers have increased substantially in recent decades but which may not increase so substantially in future. Their housing needs are much more for apartments and multiple occupancy so that failing to distinguish them from the general population is likely to lead to an over estimate of the number of additional houses required.	3431/8761	
	Comment – understand that extra housing is needed and this plan is required, but don't want York to be ruined.	3438/8799	
	Objection – see response 10A	3448/8832	
	Objection – plan does not justify the development of the magnitude proposed. No indications are given regarding areas for leisure, education and social pursuits. An approach which ignores the ecology, permanent loss of landscape, ecosystems, agriculture, and wildlife and causes light pollution is untenable.	3450/8835	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	3451/8870	
	Comment – cannot argue with the urgent need to provide for the poor young people inside or outside of the green belt with village type developments of simple cottages, small gardens, church, shops, post office, bus services, cottage industry and small workshops to be encouraged.	3463/8890	
	Objection – see response 10A. Opposed to the developments in the York draft plan on both planning and environmental grounds. Not convinced that justification for these developments the conservative/liberal Government's planning directives have to be interpreted not followed blindly. Further more planning blight is already evident.	3464/8891	
	Objection – don't think York needs all these new houses; there are plenty of buildings for buying and renting that are empty. There are not enough jobs to support all these extra people.	3470/8905	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – if all these houses are built York will be no different to the conurbation of Manchester and Leeds.	3483/9006	
	Objection – should keep the green belt green.	3493/9091	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	3498/8847	
		3499/8855	
		3500/8863	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6025	
	Objection – the greenbelt should be preserved. This is to the benefit of the local populace and should remain so.	3503/9128	
	Objection – York already struggles with congestion and plans to build 22,000 new homes will destroy the city's unique character, particularly as the majority would be build on the green belt.	3509/9426	
	Objection – there is no need for the propose amount of houses to be built. With 22,000 more houses people will just buy to let more houses and rent levels will be even higher.	3511/9438	
	Objection– see response 10A	3515/9447	
	Objection – 1,000 full time jobs a year believed to be totally unrealistic. Where is the detail on how this employment growth is to be achieved? Proposals fly in the face of the green belt ideal and will destroy the character of the city forever. The city does not have the infrastructure in place to sustain the proposed level of growth.	3522/9459	
	Objection – York's infrastructure will not be able to cope	3532/9478	
	Objection – see response 10A	3534/9484	
	Objection – See response 10B.	3546/9507	
	Objection – not in favour of any plans to reduce the green belt in the region of Nether Poppleton, Upper Poppleton and Hessay.	3556/9197	
	Objection – opposed to the use of green belt land which should be protected.	3567/9289	
	Objection – the draft plan ironically trumpets the securing and safeguarding of permanent green belt sites until 2014 and beyond whilst embodying in its measures the destruction and loss for all time of over 2000 acres of existing green belt land. Could the Council provide an accurate inventory of all the Brownfield sites available around the city, together with detailed of the projected uses for this land? Accepting that Brownfield sites are more expensive to develop, with this associated impact that has on housing costs, evidence that Brownfield sites are being fully utilised would enable one to consider the degree to which a raid on the existing swathes of green belt land that characterises York and its neighbouring village communities be justified.	3571/9527	
	Comment - recognise that York needs many new homes and that Huntington is one of the areas which is appropriate for such developments. Objection – question the scale of development proposed for Huntington.	3584/9544	Church Of England Parish Of Huntington, Earswick & New Earswick
	Objection – does not regard the proposals for 22,000 extra homes as desirable or necessary. With in increase of about 25% on the existing number of dwellings services	3588/9553	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	such as medical facilities (particularly the A1237) already under severe strain would make life intolerable with the extra pressures on them.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – too many authorities are trying ways to use the green belt areas which are getting smaller and will have an adverse impact on many issues over the years.	3590/9569	
	Objection – the development of 22,000 new homes will create a large conurbation in a protected area where residents do not want it. The developments are planned to take place whilst there are many empty homes in the city available to rent. The infrastructure is not sufficiently developed within the city to a good enough standard to satisfy the needs of an additional 45,000 residents occupying the extra homes.	3609/9597	
	Objection – see response 10A	3610/9608	
	Objection – if greenbelt to mean anything is has to be taken seriously. Encroachments into the green belt on spurious grounds needs to be opposed vigorously. Nowhere in the draft plan is there plausible justification for the population increases inferred and therefore the need for so much additional housing. York is a very special place and enjoys a rural setting of character beyond the ring road. This should be preserved.	3619/9627	
	Objection – should not build on green belt land. How can 1,000 jobs per year be forecast. What about jobs lost, how much would these new jobs? Services will not suffice. Wildlife will be affected.	3625/9641	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3626/9319	
	Support – York has not had a formal green belt for over 50 years, it is about time it has one formally laid down. Housing is needed, support for land allocations.	3628/9327	
	Objection – where are these proposed jobs to be? It already seems that CPP will lose jobs in York. Surely these people will be requiring new jobs and as they already work in York will not need new housing. Why are so many houses being envisaged at this time? Understand that empty offices and empty spaces above shops in York are potentially to be used for housing therefore reducing the number of properties required elsewhere.	3683/9712	
	Objection – convinced that the plan is not the result of a considered assessment of the needs and capacity of existing housing areas within the council's boundaries. The areas selected for housing might as well have been chosen by using a map and some darts.	3686/9716	
	Objection – see response 10A	3688/9722	
Objection – See response 10D	3714/10000		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the reason people to move to York and to Copmanthorpe is for the beautiful surrounding countryside and to enjoy walks and the nature. Green Belt land should be protected by the council. The local community should be able to make use of the wonderful opportunities that green belt land provides. The local countryside is an important irreplaceable environmental resource and its supports the local wildlife.	3720/10010	
	Objection – see response 10A	3723/10019	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3726/6003	
	Objection – unclear how building an additional 22,000 new homes in York would create thousands of new jobs. Surely more people will then move into the city from other areas, taking the jobs from current York residents.	3727/10025	
	Objection – See response 10C	3731/10066	
	Objection – must preserve green belt land as much as possible which provides the unique setting for York. Need open spaces for walking, cycling and running etc. The council should use the empty top floors of many of the city centre shops and businesses before considering building thousands of new homes.	3735/10077	
	Objection – see response 11	3737/10081	
	Comment - if migrants were reduced/stopped in this country would not need as many houses therefore countryside/green belt areas could be preserved and less traffic.	3738/10091	
	Objection – the housing plans are oversubscribed and overdeveloped, there are not enough school places in infant, junior or senior schools to support the number of houses.	3745/10136	
	Objection – the use of green belt or housing development is unacceptable. The number of houses suggested at 25,000 is far too many and in excess of the suggested 17,000 in a recent study. This amount of housing is unsustainable. York does not have the transport infrastructure to cope nor the necessary amount of local services. There will not be enough employment for the increase in household and traffic will increase as people seek work out of York. The ring road will become a pollution hotspot whilst established companies like Nestle and Portakabin may well be discouraged from staying in York as its roads become impassable to their lorries.	3752/10149	
	Objection – see response 10A	3764/10169	
	Objection – the city is protected from building by the greenbelt. To encroach on this green belt is to go against the stated definition of greenbelt in the council's own policy document and is unjustified. There are several sites that have already been passed for housing development which seem to be at standstill, such as Hungate and Germany Beck, are these sites taken into the equation when estimating the number of houses	3799/10239	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>'needed'? Where does the council expect the production of new employment to come from? Has the council any firm assurance that companies are wishing to relocate to York, or are the expected jobs going to be in the building industry, building the planned housing? Will many people be able to afford to purchase homes? Or if York becomes a city of sanctuary are the homes being built for incomers from the European Union and refugees from many other countries? There are many brownfield sites that should be developed before encroaching on the surrounding greenbelt. There is no statement that infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with all this building. No plans for dualling of the A1237 for example. This road is already reduced to an end to end traffic queue at peak times.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2                      Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Support – accept the need on strategic, economic and demographic grounds for the provision of additional high quality and affordable housing in York.</p>	<p>3811/10259</p>	
	<p>Objection – the green belt should be protected in the interests of future generations; once it is removed it cannot be replaced.</p>	<p>3818/10274</p>	
	<p>Objection – the council has chosen to ignore the figures on housing requirement and job numbers as predicted in the Arup report and based the plan on arbitrary inflated numbers which are unsupported. In order for York to remain a desirable place to live and work it is essential that the government's fundamental aim of green belt policy 'to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open' is adhered to. The plan lacks information about the infrastructure that would be required to sustain the developments the council desires. The plan cannot deliver because it lacks the inclusion of basic human needs other than swathes of houses for which most people need a mortgage and therefore be already in employment to buy. It is too much; too fast and clearly not sustainable.</p>	<p>3836/10308</p>	
	<p>Objection – considers that any forecast up to 1,000 jobs per year is exceedingly adventurous not to say reckless. The university have promoted growth but the current rate is very unlikely to continue. Business in York has declined in manufacturing terms. York is essentially a small fairly circular city dominated by the Minster and other historic buildings architecture. While progress and change is essentially a cycle, the nature and character. Have statistics on senior citizens been accounted for in housing growth forecasts? The life cycle itself will provide houses. The sort of houses required if/when skilled/professional jobs ever come to York. It is unlikely building contractors will provide all the many forms of infrastructure required to fulfil 50% of the growth proposed. Builders prefer green belt sites as it is cheaper.</p>	<p>3839/10315</p>	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – the current proposals would be detrimental to the city. The green belt around the city is to protect the city's heritage and views of the minster. To encroach on this green belt is to go against the stated definition of greenbelt in the council's own policy document and is unjustified. There are several sites that have already been passed for housing development which seem to be at standstill, such as Hungate and Germany Beck, are these sites taken into the equation when estimating the number of houses 'needed'? Where does the council expect the production of new employment to come from? Has the council any firm assurance that companies are wishing to relocate to York, or are the expected jobs going to be in the building industry, building the planned housing? Will many people be able to afford to purchase homes? Or if York becomes a city of sanctuary are the homes being built for incomers from the European Union and refugees from many other countries? There are many brownfield sites that should be developed before encroaching on the surrounding greenbelt. There is no statement that infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with all this building. No plans for dualling of the A1237 for example. This road is already reduced to an end to end traffic queue at peak times.	3842/10323	
	Objection – less than 850 houses per annum should be built, 850 is an absolute maximum. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes per year are needed. 1090 homes per year are only needed if York sees an unrealistic migration of 36,000 international workers. This would destroy the character of the city.	3852/10344	
	Objection – the council's target for providing 1,090 houses per year is ridiculous and has not been thought out.	3855/10357	
	Objection – should not build on green belt land.	3856/11761	
	Objection – 22,000 new homes around the beautiful city of York and its countryside is completely unsustainable and no greenbelt should be used to be built on.	3875/10407	
	Objection – the plan is too ambitious with regard to jobs and houses and resultant claim on green belt land for development. It is important that York retains its green and pleasant ambience and that this version of the local plan places insufficient emphasis on this.	3880/10419	
	Objection – see response 11	3884/10424	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are the minimum of 22,000 extra York residents going to work? 16,000 jobs identified in Local Plan – where and what about other 6,000.	3888/4563	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where is the justification for 22,000 new homes in York? Not sufficient jobs in York now. Disastrous to grow the City's	3889/4571	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	inhabitants without sufficient employment. Plan wholly deficient in this critical area. A64 and A1237 only just manage. Where is the road system that will cope with the amount of traffic 22,000 new homes will bring?		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 10A. Disturbed by the proposals in the local plan to build such a large number of houses on green belt sites and would question the efficacy of the schemes, particularly with regard to the actual need for such a large number.	3893/10436	
	Objection – do we need over 1,000 houses to be built each ear? Where are all the people to come from to fill these houses? Where are the jobs for them to do? Many flats have been built over the past few years, are these really occupied? What about school provision, has a secondary school not just been shut down? Do not think that many of the answers to these questions have been thoroughly thought through ad considered publically. The traffic on the A1237 is already horrendous, how can it cope with hundreds more cars. Dualling it is just a pipe dream. The infrastructure in and around York simply cannot cope with the proposed extra expansion. To say that improving public transport will help solve the problem simply does not ring true. The green belt within and without the ring road is what makes York an attractive place for residents and visitors.	3902/10440	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3903/4590	
	Objection – new housing is needed but not in the quantity projected. There seems no commitment to funding the improvements to schools, roads and other services required by such an increase in population, especially in the Huntington area. The loss of so much green belt land will be irretrievable and will also discourage developers form taking on brownfield sites.	3907/10445	
	Objection – see response 10A	3923/10460	
	Objection – See response 10C	3929/10465	
	Objection – see response 10A	3932/7812	
	Objection – the numbers are high, 22,000 hew houses equates to some 40,000 people and will transport York into a massive urban sprawl. Where will the jobs come from for the 40,000? There are few enough jobs already with even four significant employers.	3949/10505	
	Objection – has no one given any thought to the environmental issues regarding the destruction of the green belt on the wildlife and the increase in air pollution? If as suggested a 45% increase in population occurs where are the children going to go to primary school. Will there be additional roads put in and increased parking places, play areas etc. Is proud of the beautiful medieval city surrounded by green belt and countryside which attracts so many tourists. What a disappointment for the future to	3950/10512	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	see an urban sprawl surrounded by windmills and choked with traffic on the ring road. How was the figure of 22,000 reached? Where are the jobs for all the people? Even allowing for a spin off from the university major manufacturing businesses have been lost. Tourists to do not live in the area, are we to become merely a commuter city?		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. 1090 homes a year can only be done through 36,000 people moving into the area which will destroy the character of the city and have a detrimental effect on all resources. The use of green belt land means York will become a sprawling city and will lose its uniqueness. It is important that children can grow up with natural countryside to visit and learn about nature. Densely populated areas can only increase global warming and energy consumption.	3954/10520	
	Objection – See response 10B	3956/10530	
	Objection – whilst acknowledge there is a national requirement for new homes and places for employment for an ever increasing population, the draft plans for York are grossly over ambitious and likely to irreversibly damage the charm and character of our city. No consideration appears to be given to the effects on schools, colleges, surgeries, dentists or roads. 11,000 additional cars can be expected. The majority of this growth for new housing will be for economic migrants. This correlation should be rejected in favour of more realistic housing targets.	3958/10535	
	Objection – opposed to the quantity of homes planned to be built in the plan. York does not require the addition of this many houses. There is not an adequate transport network, particularly the A1237 to cope with the extra housing. Look at empty properties first. If land is green belt it should not be built on.	3966/10551	
	Objection – no social or economic reason in York for such a huge increase in housing. Local roads will be unable to cope with the associated increase in traffic. Loss of hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland surrounding historic York. York is a unique and historic cit and should not be turned into an urban sprawl. Unnecessary building on green belt land ahead of brownfield sites.	3969/10563	
	Objection – there are far too many houses proposed particularly without major road improvements such as the ring road which needs action now. There is not enough work in the area to support many more home owners. While the anticipated increased need for homes for the over 70s may be correct, they are more likely to need nursing homes or flats than houses.	3970/10564	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 10F. The roads are already overcrowded. The hospital and surgeries are stretched to the limit as are the schools. The use of green belt land and loss of farmland shows a complete disregard for the countryside, communities, animals and wildlife.	3971/10573	
	Objection – 1000 houses per year is far too ambitious as far as jobs and houses are concerned and question whether infrastructure can sustain that number.	3980/10581	
	Objection – the scale of new house building seems entirely inappropriate to the area and could have detrimental effects through traffic congestion, and the general overloading of facilities that are already over stretched. The number of annual new builds should not be more than 850 and if possible less to prevent the collapse of necessary infrastructure.	3983/10593	
	Objection - less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Further expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	4003/10618	
	Objection - less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Further expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	4012/10634	
	Objection – See response 10B. Proposed building of so many additional houses on green belt will overload even further the infrastructure of services to existing buildings – sewage and storm water drains particularly.	4028/10656	
	Objection – to building on green belt. Number of proposed homes will irrevocably change the nature and environment of Haxby. Infrastructure (schools and drainage) are not adequate to encompass build on the proposed scale. Traffic levels are already high. Why do we need the proposed number of homes?	4031/10665	
	Objection – agree that York has not built enough new homes in the last few years and that more new homes are required but challenge the numbers proposed. Arup believe that even 850 homes per year would be very difficult to achieve so it is puzzling that plan is proposing so many more.	4039/10679	
	Objection – even if the economy is expected to increase by 1000 jobs the Arup report indicates that only about 800 houses are needed. Growth must be at a controlled level that can be sustained. Not addressed the need to upgrade roads, drainage, and sanitation, provide schooling and hospital facilities.	4040/10682	
	Objection – See response 10B. Disagree with housing for the Haxby area.	4043/10691	
	Objection – the housing need laid out in the plan is far too much for this area. Object to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15	4044/10695	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	years, 2000 of them in Huntington.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection –opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington. Do not need any more homes to be built; the roads are already at saturation point.	4046/10707	
	Objection – see response 10D. Appreciate that York needs affordable housing, but this scheme is far too ambitious and not suitable for York. There is no indication that industry will expand in York to warrant 22,000 homes being built and taking away 2000 acres of green site. The areas chosen for development will put undue pressure on the current infrastructure.	4049/10715	
	Objection – the proposal for 22,000 over 15-20 years is ridiculous. Loss of green belt. The current transport system would not sustain much more development without major adjustment.	4051/10723	
	Objection – the number of houses to be built is far too many. It will completely change the nature of York.	4052/10726	
	Objection – unrealistic that the York population will grow by more than 10% in the next 10-15 years as it has since 2001. The local economy may also not be able to create an additional 15,000 jobs. Therefore support a more realistic target for house building in York which would have less impact on existing residents and infrastructure.	4054/10732	
	Objection – no details of how the main infrastructure will be dealt with i.e. A1237, A64, A59 and A19 are already at bursting point. Loss of established green belt. No mention is made of jobs in York. It is foremost a tourist city providing hotels, cafes and restaurants – how can these workers be able to purchase housing in the city? What sort of housing is proposed? York needs far more affordable old people’s housing and for young people – flood free with adequate parking.	4055/10738	
	Objection – see response 10A	4061/10739	
	Objection – why do so many new houses need to be built? The targets for housing and new jobs seem vastly ambitious.	4066/10749	
	Objection – appears to be little or no social or economic reason for such a large increase in housing.	4068/10753	
	Objection – against green belt land being used for houses. There is plenty of developed commercial land not being used. Number of houses not needed. Loss of productive farmland, animal habitats, hedgerows and wild flowers. Roads, sewers and hospitals need upgrading. Jobs in York are few and far between.	4076/10763	
	Objection – there appears to be little or no social or economic reason in York for such a large increase in housing.	4095/10786	



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection –to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	4101/10801	
	Objection – plan is inappropriate and proposals are unsustainable. Have not taken into account the added strain that the proposals will place on existing amenities. What plans and guarantees are proposed for the appropriate upgrading of local infrastructure?	4112/10817	
	Comment – plan so that in the future will still be able to grow food on open land.	4127/10822	
	Objection – opposed to 22,000 homes to be built over the next 17 years of which 16,000 will be in York’s green belt. Well over 2000 acres of land taken out of green belt for housing and businesses. Potentially 10,000 more cars contributing to congestion. No guarantees that any of the necessary infrastructure will follow these developments. Hugely ambitious building targets.	4128/10832	
	Objection – totally unacceptable amount of housing proposed. Green belt should stay green belt. Object to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	4130/10838	
	Objection - less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Achieving 1090 can only be done through 36000 people moving to the area. Such expansion would overwhelm local amenities such as schools, roads and health services and alter the character of the city.	4134/10843	
	Objection – the green belt that circles Knapton should be maintained and must be protected from development.	4143/10856	
	Objection – completely object to the plan and the effect it would have on local infrastructure – the huge increased amount of traffic, the increased congestion, and effect on school and health services. Whole plan would create chaos.	4145/10858	
	Objection – see response 10A	4152/10867	
	Objection – see response 10A	4154/10868	
Objection – the scale of development proposed is completely unsustainable ad entirely inappropriate. If proposals go ahead York will go from being a beautiful and popular city of great historical and cultural significance to being an overpopulated west Yorkshire suburb of Leeds. Inconceivable that such extensive development is proposed without providing any guarantees of having secured the necessary investment in infrastructure. Existing congestion problems will rapidly deteriorate. Green belts are absolutely necessary in protecting the countryside and the character and setting of historic the city and prevent suburban sprawl. Protection of green belt is essential. Development figures must be reduced to a more sustainable and manageable level.	4158/10873		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the scale of development proposed is completely unsustainable and entirely inappropriate. If proposals go ahead York will go from being a beautiful and popular city of great historical and cultural significance to being an overpopulated west Yorkshire suburb of Leeds. Inconceivable that such extensive development is proposed without providing any guarantees of having secured the necessary investment in infrastructure. Existing congestion problems will rapidly deteriorate. Green belts are absolutely necessary in protecting the countryside and the character and setting of historic the city and prevent suburban sprawl. Protection of green belt is essential. Development figures must be reduced to a more sustainable and manageable level.	4159/10879	
	Comment – whilst recognising that there is almost certainly a requirement for new housing in York, more transparency is needed on how the figure of 22,000 homes was reached. Do not understand the economic justifications for so many new houses. Concerned that plan has been proposed without due consideration for the impact on flooding and infrastructure. No consideration in the plans for increasing school capacity or local retail development.	4168/10889	
	Objection – disagree with the number of houses planned to be built and their location. The overall total is too large and assumes that far too many people will be moving into the area. Where are they planning to work? There is some housing needed for local young families but the number proposed is far greater than needed to meet this need. Building this number will change the character of York as a small city.	4174/10901	
	Objection – see response 10B. The infrastructure in Haxby cannot cope with a large housing development. Appreciate that homes are needed but this needs to be on a much smaller scale when they are planned in areas that are struggling with present facilities.	4200/10935	
	Comment – question the need for this large amount of housing. Understand the estimate of growth to be 1000 jobs per year – wonder where these jobs will come from and major industry in York must surely be declining.	4201/10941	
	Objection – see response 10F. Proposed housing growth of 22,000 homes over the 15 years is over ambitious and unrealistic due to the uncertain economic growth of the city. Is the city capable of providing jobs for so many in just two decades? The plans rather sketchy evidence for economic growth is 33% higher than the UK projections. This is a highly ambitious target in the current economic climate. If the city cannot provide the jobs, people will not migrate in which renders the housing targets defunct. There are 2400 planned more homes than actually necessary – why? The Arup report confirms that a more realistic number would be around 850 homes a year, although	4204/7801	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	current house building levels even this target could prove challenging to realise.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – York is an attractive area for tourist but is becoming increasingly overcrowded with too much building and too many houses; any further building/overcrowding will have a dramatic effect on the area. The current infrastructure cannot already cope with the volume; roads are congested and overcrowded as are all forms of public transport. Sewage disposal already appears to be struggling and refuse disposal will become a bigger problem. Some results of overcrowding will be an increase in violence, illness, suicide and accidents. Flooding would increase as there would be less land for rainfall to drain into. Air quality would suffer from increased road jams, decrease in green oxygen producing land. Tourism would ultimately suffer too.	4217/10967	
	Objection – will the proposed infrastructure improvements be enough? Hull Road and Fulford Road are already overloaded. The housing target is too high and unachievable within the city boundaries. The target figure of 1250 greatly exceeds the sub national population projection which when adjusted by the 2011 census forecast an average annual increase of 700 houses per annum. The targets also exceed the 850 houses per annum which Arup consider to be a challenging target. Target is unachievable without massive and currently unexplained alterations and improvements to infrastructure. The inclusion of the 15% buffer seems excessive, what is needed is flexibility between the timings for development of identified sites within the period. Suggest that 850 with a 10% buffer is more appropriate and might just be achievable. Wholeheartedly support the maintenance of the green belt south of York up to the A64.	4222/10973	
	Objection – see response 10A	4252/11030	
	Objection – number of dwellings appears very ambitious and unrealistic given the number of houses that have been built in the last 10 years, the low likelihood of creating sufficient new jobs within the city and the targets for affordable housing which will continue to create challenges for developers. A more realistic target would be the lower target (850) suggested by Arup with a 10% buffer – although even that is challenging. The aspiration for York to be a top 10 city based on economic development is misplaced. Carefully managed sustainable growth is required to improve the wellbeing of residents and allowing for some new immigration into the city whilst maintaining and enhancing the historic centre of York and avoiding urban sprawl and the loss of the historic villages which is a consequence of such ambitious plans. There should be the minimum of housing development in the current green belt. A lower housing target and increased development on brownfield land should result in a	4257/11036	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	need for less housing in the more rural areas and ensure that any development in the green belt is only done if absolutely necessary. Once agreed fully support defining the green belt for at least 25 years.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection –opposed to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	4268/11074	
	Objection – proposals for 22,000 new homes of which 16,000 are to be on green belt, resulting in the loss of 2000 acres of green belt land would appear to run contrary to the governments own declared intention of encouraging sustainable development whilst retaining controls over green belt land. have all brownfield sites been examined as part of the process? Plan is based on assumption that the city will be able to attract new employment to the area and in the main relies on forecasts prepared before the most recent recession. These were subsequently revised down by Arup to 960 jobs with the proviso that the lower level in itself is demanding. York is reliant on the public sector and given recent cuts, will place considerable demands on the private sector to meet these targets. Forecasts are unduly optimistic and make no mention of the type of jobs that need to be created.	4275/11089	
	Objection – against development on existing green belt – need to preserve the countryside.	4282/11102	
	Comment – what is the current unemployment rate in York? Building can only affect a limited range of unemployed people. If more housing is needed it would seem better to have an increased number of smaller schemes.	4283/11105	
	Objection – do not see the need for 22,000 new homes in York as there are large numbers currently empty. See no evidence that 1000 new jobs will be achieved over 16 years. In current economic climate that is not going to happen. Aviva reducing workforce and several other major employers are in potential trouble. Plan does not identify where these new jobs are going to be based in the city. York’s general infrastructure won’t cope with this many new houses – buses, doctors, schools, chemists and hospital. Unsustainable plan.	4286/11116	
	Objection – agree that there is a need for an increase in the number of houses required in York. However, population trends suggest that no more than 800 per year are required. The 1090 homes proposed will result in an over supply, fuelling migration of workers into York, which currently does not have the infrastructure to provide jobs for them, boosting the number of unemployed people requiring social housing. Such expansion is therefore unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Less than 850 houses a year should be built, and numbers should be based on demand. Building	4287/11118	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	should not be concentrated on the east side of York, but should be city wide.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – it would have been more relevant to see how the roads, drainage related following the developments at Monks Cross before considering extra housing. Traffic in this area is a major concern. Extra housing will block the A1237 completely.	4290/11125	
	Objection – see response 10B. York Road traffic is already awful. Pollution and Noise will get worse. Parking is difficult in the village and infrastructure is dodgy. This will devastate rural character.	4294/11136	
	Objection – see response 10B. York Road traffic is already awful. Pollution and Noise will get worse. Parking is difficult in the village and infrastructure is dodgy. This will devastate rural character. Plan for 22,000 homes to be built mostly in green belt areas is totally unsustainable. There is no need for these houses as the population is getting older and requiring care homes and assisted living thus releasing properties. There are plenty of vacant plots in the city. York is not expanding in terms of jobs and should not be allowed to expand as it has neither the transport infrastructure nor educational or recreational facilities to cope. York is totally reliant on tourism and expansion of the city would ruin its attraction. Any building on green belt would just attract commuters from outside York. Developers holding sites with planning permission.	4295/11138	
	Objection – see response 10B. York Road traffic is already awful. Pollution and Noise will get worse. Parking is difficult in the village and infrastructure is dodgy. This will devastate rural character.	4296/11141	
	Objection – services will not cope with more developments in and around York. There are not enough jobs in the area and large developments will cause more unemployment and put unsustainable pressure on social care and services.	4297/11144	
	Objection – opposed to proposal to build 22,000 houses in York’s green belt. The option of 850 houses per year should be the maximum. Development of brownfield sites should be undertaken before encroaching on the green belt. Where are the jobs for these extra households? Schools for the children? Are the houses for incomers who will be commuting this aggravating traffic congestion? York is a lovely city surrounded by wonderful countryside and do not wish to see it ruined by loss of green belt.	4300/11151	
	Objection – massive increase in population would change York out of all recognition. The planned inward migration is not compatible with the reduction in jobs seen in recent years and this is destined to continue. York people will struggle to afford houses built to conform to eco standards and other current ideas which increase building costs.	4301/11155	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – York is a picturesque cathedral city. The plans would completely destroy the city. It is completely unnecessary and unwarranted.	4302/11162	
	Objection – opposed to such a huge number of new homes, with many on the green belt. Roads already at breaking point and the ring roads (inner and outer) cannot cope with such scale of building. Sewers and all other infrastructure just aren't adequate and flooding continues to be a problem. Transport systems are inadequate. A more sensitive approach to quality of life issues such as green spaces, stress free travel and keeping control of the population are important.	4307/11182	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed is far in excess to the requirement of the York area. The constant reference to the shortage of new houses is political and not a statement of fact. There are many empty houses and most houses for sale are on the market too long a time for the supposed housing shortage to be a fact.	4310/11189	
	Objection – disagree with the estimates for future population growth and housing need. Plan has little to say about the effects of the proposals on infrastructure. Arup concludes that an average of 850 dwellings per annum would represent an appropriate trend based position for York. This is in line with most recent evidence on demographic trends and is a much more realistically achievable figure bearing in mind recent building rates. Target much too ambitious and question its achievability and sustainability.	4327/11230	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	Objection – there is no economic justification for the number of new homes proposed.	4343/11618	
	Objection – the green belt as it stands now must be protected completely and no development on it should even be considered.	4344/11260	
	Objection – serious concerns over the amount of houses that are to be built, far exceeds anything realistic to a historical city such as York. Plan should adopt a lower figure of far less than 800 new homes per year. This would be achievable and would support good but realistic economic growth.	4345/11261	
	Objection – the significant loss of already designated green belt land would be a major cause for concern and would set a dangerous precedent for the future where protected or designated land could no longer be safe from future development.	4348/11269	
	Comment – until there are definite plans to upgrade and make the ring road dual carriageway should not be looking at putting thousands more cars onto this road everyday.	4351/11274	
	Objection - Policy SS2 does not provide any guidance on the weighting that the Council intends to apply to the four main spatial principles listed when determining planning applications or indeed in its decision on which sites to allocate for development in the	4355/11597	Henry Boot Development Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Local Plan. From a review of the draft allocations it would appear however that greatest weight is being attached to the first principle i.e. conserving York’s natural and historic environment. Whilst clearly an important spatial principle this has led to the plan allocating a range of sites in peripheral and unsustainable locations out with the ‘ring road’ (e.g. Sites ST14 and ST15) where development will be isolated from services / employment opportunities etc., difficult to access because of traffic congestion and car dependant due to lack of public transport facilities. Would seek a review of this approach with greater emphasis being given to identifying sites for development on the edge of the main urban area that have the capacity to accommodate sustainable development without any unacceptable impact on the historic and natural environment. The City Councils approach to this issue had been too broad brush. A much more forensic site specific examination is required and this will identify such sites e.g. our client’s land at the former Terry’s Chocolate Factory car park and the land to the south.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Comment – the plan is based on the assumption of an increase in employment of 1000+ jobs a year but believe there has been a decrease in the number of jobs for the past three years.</p>	4358/11295	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the large number of houses proposed around the city of York. City lacks the infrastructure to support such overwhelming numbers of housing. The unique character of York will be significantly impacted by the infrastructure required to permit developments to be built in a sustainable way. The current road network has reached its capacity for practicable vehicle movements. It is not adequate for the current level of development. Adding to the existing network by incorporating a series of additional junctions, traffic lights and roundabouts will lead to increased congestion.</p>	4361/11305	
	<p>Objection – it is not considered the approach provides a robust method to address the existing and forecast housing requirement in the city. The preferred option suggests a higher than baseline requirement of 1090 dwellings per annum which would support the achievement of economic growth forecast. However the figure is only expected to make a moderate boost to affordable housing supply. Not supportive of this option as it does not meet the full needs and affordable housing in York as identified in the Arup report. Considered that a higher growth option which would deliver 1500 dwellings per annum is required to be compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	4363/11742	<p>Gregory Property Developments (Haxby) Ltd &amp; Biorad</p>
	<p>Objection – by building on the green belt would lose hundreds of acres of prime farmland that has not been adequately taken into account. Any loss of prime farmland comes at an enormous cost to future sustainability and security.</p>	4366/11316	



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – to only preserve the parts of the green belt where the Minster is visible is extremely short sighted and misses out the fact that the sum is so much more than the collection of individual parts. York’s special setting is much more than just a glimpse of the minster as you drive round the ring road. Green belt needs to be seen holistically as opposed to ‘green wedges’ which can be chipped away at or have chunks removed from them.	4370/11321	
	Objection – the plan lack any mechanism to adjust to future York population growth not meeting the assumptions that have been made.	4379/11337	
	Objection – doubt whether so many houses is needed for the population and suspect that city is going to be used as a dormitory town for Leeds.	4380/11342	
	Objection – opposed to development in the green belt, especially when brownfield sites are still available in or near the city centre. Part of York’s attraction is its rural setting and this will be spoilt by the inappropriate and unsustainable developments proposed.	4385/11352	
	Objection – scale of development is excessive and has not been proved to be necessary. More convincing evidence must be provided. Evidence says that York will not return to pre-recession level of employment until 2020. Building more houses will make very little difference to affordability. Concerns about traffic, congestion, drainage and schooling. Rather than being a relatively small historic city with a surrounding ring of villages and farmland, the whole landscape seems to be moving towards a vision of urban sprawl up to and over the outer ring road, containing a historic centre and surrounded not be farmland but by wind farms, large villages/small towns and industrial development. This is not in keeping with the character of either the city, the villages or nearby countryside.	4389/11370	
	Objection – question the figures of immigrant population growth required to work out the amount of extra housing required. Is York really expecting a job explosion that requires so many people relocating to York? Since the plan was prepared a number of businesses have announced redundancies or closed. More evidence should be provided that the figures of projected growth and the level of proposed new housing required are realistic and achievable.	4393/11382	
	Comment – where are all the people going to come from to live in these proposed new homes? It is not as if York is expanding as a centre for commerce or industry. In fact manufacturing and industry has been systematically leaving York for many years so there is no need for so many new homes.	4396/11394	
	Comment – where are all the people going to come from to live in these proposed new homes? It is not as if York is expanding as a centre for commerce or industry. In fact	4398/11396	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	manufacturing and industry has been systematically leaving York for many years so there is no need for so many new homes.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the main urban area and the extension to the urban area could provide 12,000 new homes, equating to 10 years using the plan's preferred target per year. Would then not need to use green field sites in the feeder villages.	4400/11403	
	Objection – dubious need for such a large number of houses, many of them on green belt land. Plan says York will need 22,000 homes to house people for jobs in York but no hard evidence that such employment will or can ever happen. Object strongly to York's greenbelt being taken up for accommodating the commuters of Leeds which is where he jobs are more likely to be found. Building on the proposed greenbelt would ruin the environment of York as a historic and self contained city, spoiling views and approaches to the city. The increase in traffic with little apparent regard for improvements in road infrastructure will only add to the difficulty residents currently experience.	4404/11406	
	Objection – concerned that the education of future generations will suffer unless any increase in the number of pupils comes with sufficient funding to allow for the employment of sufficient full time and permanent staff and additional resources.	4407/11416	RA&QS Committee Of The Governing Body Of Woodthorpe Community Primary School
	Objection – no social or economic reason for this huge increase in housing in the countryside around York, and it would be wrong to destroy hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland.	4408/11418	
	Objection – whole plan and scale of it is ridiculous and stands to ruin the character and fabric of this city. Does it take into account the people who will move out of York?	4411/11420	
	Objection – where are these jobs coming from? Who will buy these properties?	4412/11428	
	Objection – where are these jobs coming from? Who will buy these properties?	4414/11440	
	Objection – reference to the green belt as 'draft' is being used to excuse the loss of significant areas of it. Planning to establish large new developments without taking account of the need for significant extra travel requirements is very short sighted. That York is approached largely along green corridors is a significant and unique aspect of York and this will be lost. York will just be another large urban sprawl in the countryside, the villages will be overtaken by large new developments and their green centres will slowly be lost.	4422/11446	
	Objection – during the last decade York has actually lost jobs overall. York has higher than average dependency on public sector employment which makes it especially	4423/11619	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	vulnerable to continuing and permanent reductions in public spending. Expert opinion says UK economy will show only modest growth over next decade. No evidence how such an unprecedented number of jobs will be created even in a city as attractive as York against such an adverse economic backdrop. Housing figures assume population growth of some 50,000 compared to expert forecast of 20,000 and the actual growth which took place from 2001 to 2011 of 17,000.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – See response 10C	4431/11457	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4436/5211	
	Objection – See response 10C	4437/11458	
	Objection – there are innumerable sites within York’s boundaries where any of these projects will not harm rural life or the environment.	4444/11459	
	Objection- so many more houses being built around York and yet no improvement to York roads.	4448/11462	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All the major routes into York and the ring road will become even more gridlocked.	4451/5219	
	Objection – the whole infrastructure of York will not withstand more extensive building. There is a great swathe of land at the present time which floods every year due to the building works which have already taken place. Traffic in and out of York and its surrounding areas is already very bad, particularly at peak times. Building more homes on green belt would definitely make it worse. Green belt is provided for very good reason and its boundaries should not be tampered with. Brownfield sites should definitely always be built on and not left. The character of a beautiful small city such as York will be lost forever and tourism will suffer greatly as a result. As tourism gives a great boost to the economy it would disastrous if this were to happen.	4455/11465	
	Objection – plans will destroy a very attractive area with wonderful wildlife and rural habitat. There are already new housing estates around York which cannot sell all the houses. There is so much land available where developments will improve the local area. On course to wreak the essence of York as a beautiful city set in rural north Yorkshire.	4463/11466	
Objection – York is a jewel of a city set amid some of the prettiest villages in England. Residents must expect some steady outward expansion and it should be possible to achieve this without losing the character of the city or the intimacy of its small surrounding communities. Not persuaded the plan will achieve this. Had hoped to find more strategically planned green spaces and improvements to the transport infrastructure – both are essential.	4466/11470		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – totally unsustainable to allow such a huge development (22000 homes) to be built on green belt land. The loss of 2000 acres of green belt is totally unacceptable. York is small compact city and its unique character and rural setting need to be protected. Infrastructure is already under great pressure with roads congested and schools over subscribed.	4468/11478	
	Objection – if housing expansion in York is necessary on anything like the scale envisaged, all available brownfield sites in the city should be utilised as the first priority.	4481/11498	
	Objection – 22,000 houses would irreversibly damage fine cathedral city and render it a deeply unattractive place to either work or live; it would literally be swamped with cars and people. The outer ring road and A64 cannot cope with the current volume of traffic.	4489/11503	
	Objection – building 22,000 houses will completely alter the character of York to the detriment of the city. Do not have the infrastructure – roads will not be able to take the increase in traffic, and schools will be overwhelmed, as will other services.	4490/11505	
	Objection– see response 10A	4520/11540	
	Objection– see response 10A	4591/11568	
	Objection – See response 10C	4649/11776	
	Objection – see response 11	4651/11778	
		4652/11784	
		4653/11790	
	Objection – see response 11. Proposals for 22,000 homes fail to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of York’s countryside and surroundings and disregard their merit. Importance of green belt is well secured in the National Planning Policy Framework. Permanence of York’s green belt is being dramatically tested by these proposals which would destroy irreplaceable countryside. Policy is unstable, unworkable and unlikely to ever encourage developers to start building again. If recent trends continue then jobs target is simply unrealistic.	4654/11796	
		4655/11802	
		4656/11808	
		4657/11814	
Objection – see response 11	4658/11820		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 11	4659/11826	
		4660/11832	
		4661/11838	
		4662/11844	
		4663/11850	
		4664/11862	
		4665/11856	
		4666/11867	
		4667/11873	
		4668/11879	
		4669/11885	
		4670/11890	
		4671/11896	
		4672/11899	
		4673/11905	
		4674/11911	
		4675/11916	
		4676/11922	
		4677/11928	
		4678/11934	
4679/11940			
4680/11946			
	Objection – good that at last a defined and sacrosanct green belt will be created and that the green corridors leading into the city on all the arterial roads are to be kept. Impossible to understand the need for so much new housing and industry. New housing on the scale planned will need local retail outlets, local bus services, doctors, schools, sewerage disposal. Why can't new houses be built on brownfield sites? Why isn't more being planned to encourage retail activities into the city centre – castle Piccadilly could become a much needed green area?	4681/11952	
	Objection – see response 11	4682/11959	
		4683/11965	
		4684/11971	
	Objection – concern over the scale of the proposed development around the city. The impacts of high density housing in the central areas of York has altered the character	4685/11977	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of areas and contributed towards road congestion, loss of amenity space and places of employment. It is not large numbers of houses that are required to revive York, but more business opportunities. Lack of infrastructure – existing road network is at or beyond capacity. Expansions of universities have taken large numbers of houses for student accommodation.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – more houses, but where are the jobs coming from?	4691/14249	
	Objection –to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	4713/12003	
	Objection – see response 10B. There will be additional loading on the foul and top water drainage system. The permanent removal of this large area from food production is short sighted.	4714/12006	
	Objection - less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Achieving 1090 can only be done through 36000 people moving to the area. Such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Further investment in infrastructure will be needed to cope with additional homes – roads, schools, drains and other services. Independent report says that city requires only 17,000 homes not 22,000. This loss of green belt is not justified.	4721/14224	
	Objection – how can plan claim to preserve green belt when it proposes building large estates in green belt.	4731/14266	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4737/5284	
	Objection – how will building 22,000 extra houses preserve the unique, historic character of York? It will just become a suburb of Leeds. Independent report suggested building 16-17,000 houses, why the extra 5-6,000? York's roads can scarcely cope with traffic at present. What affect will extra houses have on flood likelihood – will extra drainage be put in? How will schools and health services cope with these extra houses? From where are all these extra people coming – not enough jobs for people now? Eco-houses need to fit into existing environment. What provision will be made to protect Sites of Special Scientific Interest where housing is proposed nearby?	4738/12028	
	Objection – loss of 2000 acres of green belt land is an attack on the local environment. Number of new homes seems very excessive in relation to the past level of building and the likely requirements of the city.	4750/12038	
Objection – in principle new housing development should be met inside the ring road.	4752/12043		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – plan talks of sustainability and protecting the green belt but seeks to build on large tracks of prime agricultural land.	4754/12056	
	Objection – see response 9. Green belt should be preserved at all cost.	4755/12057	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4761/5340	
		4762/5348	
		4763/5356	
		4764/5364	
		4765/5372	
		4766/5380	
		4770/5388	
	Objection – no more than 850 houses per year should be built. Object to plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years, 2000 of them in Huntington.	4777/14274	
	Objection – the open countryside around York and the green belt are essential to protect the character of the historic cathedral city. New homes needed but the number proposed seems excessive. York’s infrastructure is already under great strain and there is not enough in the plan to explain how the infrastructure is going to be developed to accommodate this number of households.	4780/12072	
	Objection –opposed to development on green belt areas. National Planning Policy Framework states that green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	4795/12089	
	Objection – there is no justification for the scale of housing proposed as it is extremely unlikely that the job creation figures are likely to be realised. Given the current state of the local economy, there is no justification for developing within the green belt.	4797/12095	
Objection – preserve York’s green belt as it seems to define the size of this ancient and not very big city, from the centre of which it is still so easy to reach real unspoilt countryside.	4802/14284		
Objection – the plans will be absolutely disastrous for York’s long term future and character. Infrastructure is overloaded already. Turn empty houses into occupied before building new ones.	4812/12126		
Objection – no social or economic reason for a huge increase in housing. Local roads will not be able to cope with the associated increase in traffic. Loss of hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland. Unique and historic city which should not be turned into an urban sprawl.	4816/14286		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – reservations about the quantity of allocations to be developed on green belt character areas, conservation areas, green corridors, open spaces and causing loss of trees which could benefit flood zones. Concerned that it isn't possible to grow the economy to the extent planned. Can the infrastructure cope? Need to protect the environment.	4819/14289	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection – the estimates of creating 1000 jobs a year is dubious.	4822/14213	
	Objection – the plan for 22,000 homes is completely unsustainable for the local infrastructure. The A1237 cannot take anymore traffic; an upgrade to dual carriageway needs to happen before anymore plans to build. Impact on hospital and schools. 1000 new jobs a year is wishful thinking, there isn't enough employment in York for the current population.	4832/12156	
	Objection – see response 10A	4880/12166	
	Objection – see response 10A	4881/12167	
	Objection – no social or economic reason for the huge increase in housing, it is not evidence based. Targets are over ambitious and completely unsustainable. Local roads and the ring road are very congested already and will be unable to cope with the associated increase in traffic. Object to loss of hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland surrounding York. Unique and historic city attracting visitors from around the world, creating jobs and sustaining the local economy, these plans jeopardise the livelihood of many businesses by spoiling the city and turning it into urban sprawl. Building on green field sites compounds York's notorious susceptibility to flooding. Building on land that has always been part of green belt is entirely inappropriate and should be avoided and priority given to building new homes on existing brownfield sites. Existing infrastructure will not cope with plans, there is no guarantee funding will be available to invest in the necessary infrastructure required to accompany the housing developments proposed.	5111/12217	
	Comment – has consideration been given to the historical city of York which not only has to cater for residents but accommodate and welcome visitors who bring valuable income to the city. Bringing in more and more local residents may mean the city could not cope with such an influx of visitors.	5112/12225	
	Objection – accept the need for new housing but some of the proposed developments are out of all proportion to the local area. Consider setting a maximum for increase in population of no more than 10% of the current residential population – based on number of residents not number of dwellings.	5113/12226	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – protect green belt.	5129/12242	
	Objection – the need for new housing is apparent, but the plan does appear to go over and above the percentage that York is required to provide.	5130/12246	
	Objection – keep the green area that surrounds York. Need fresh air, not fumes from traffic and land for producing food and recreation activities.	5135/12252	
	Objection – fail to understand the idea that so much new housing and industry is needed and all within the current green belt area. Is 22,000 new homes really sustainable and achievable? Concerned about how current infrastructure would cope – hospital, policing, fire service and schools.	5145/12264	
	Objection – projections that York needs to increase the number of homes is questionable. There is no evidence that the number of jobs is going to increase at this pace. Large employers have made redundancies and any growth will offset these losses. National predictions of a return to economic recovery are more modest. Rate of building 1000 homes a year is too much and will destroy the character of York.	5146/12271	
	Objection – projections that York needs to increase the number of homes is questionable. There is no evidence that the number of jobs is going to increase at this pace. Large employers have made redundancies and any growth will offset these losses. National predictions of a return to economic recovery are more modest. Rate of building 1000 homes a year is too much and will destroy the character of York.	5147/12276	
	Objection – any development on green field sites would be an act of rural vandalism. Currently various brownfield sites within the city which could be developed imaginatively to provide housing. Heart of the city is dying, whilst surrounding land is being given over to huge buildings for shops and offices. Must preserve the beautiful unrivalled countryside which makes York so attractive. Who are these proposed houses for – not affordable to those in York who require housing? As it stands would attract those earning large salaries in other cities that would simply commute adding further to travel issues. Sheer volume of suggested expansion is extraordinary – is York about to have an enormous influx of businesses setting up in the city? How can such large scale development be sustainable?	5151/12281	
	Objection – the growth target being set and the subsequent calculation of the number of new homes required to service the growth are severely flawed and unrealistic in terms of achievability and deliverability. By targeting growth in line with the Arup report, the targets could be met without resorting to large scale greenfield developments. In order to meet proposed targets housing completion rates will have to far outreach what has been historically possible. The figure appears to have been	5152/12284	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	selected solely in order to meet the aspirational level of affordable housing at a ratio of 25% this in turn makes the overall delivery of the plan less achievable. Revise down growth targets to a realistically achievable level and concentrate on converting brownfield sites into quality housing in order to provide for the majority of the required homes. Protect the green belt by reducing the size of all new settlement or removing them altogether.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Comment – the transport infrastructure for the two new towns outside the ring road has not been sufficiently addressed. The northern part of the ring road already often has long queues. It will need to be made into a dual carriageway all around York as these two new towns are built.	5165/12296	
	Objection – assumptions that 16,000 jobs will be created does not acknowledge the loss of thousands of jobs that has occurred in York since 2008. Significant numbers of new jobs are needed in York just to reemploy current residents who have lost their jobs. Assumptions on new jobs and homes are particularly invalid when used to justify expansion on the western boundary of York which would largely be taken up by people who work in Leeds. Loss of high quality agricultural land.	5166/12298	
	Objection – see response 10L. Plan sets out to destroy quaintness of York by trying to commercialise a tourist city into a business city. City does not need to expand as it has an identity that is unique. There is no infrastructure in place to support these grand ideas.	5172/12309	
	Objection – green belt must be preserved at all costs. Major roads approaching the city show the openness and the beauty of what to expect. Do not violate this by installation of housing and leisure industry.	5177/12321	
	Comment – supporter of maintaining a green belt, but accept that there should be appropriate development in the green belt to allow others a decent future. Support the principle of delivering sustainable growth but find the policy as expressed to be too vague to allow meaningful comment. Plan should accept the employment growth baseline scenario otherwise the plan is unrealistic and over ambitious in the current economic climate. There is a danger that over ambition for economic growth would change the special characteristics of York. Accept that there is a need for additional sustainable housing in York but believe that the needs should be revised to be realistic and sustainable for the city's infrastructure. Concerned that the growth figures might be overstated.	5178/12325	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 100. Infrastructure such as the outer ring road needs upgrading and a more in depth study into facts of 15,000 extra jobs to 22,000 homes undertaken before proposals can be accepted.	5183/12383	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – there is little evidence that a large number of high pay jobs can be attracted to York at a time when most large organisations are reducing staff, reducing the number of sites that they operate from and collocating with similar organisations. Plan disregards consultant’s evidence on the number of jobs it can create or attract to York and the number of additional houses that will be required. No justification provided for the need to build on prime agricultural land. What legally enforceable requirement will be placed on developers to ensure that the housing will not be sold commuters who will continue to work away from York? Why intent on importing new residents for jobs created instead of creating jobs for current unemployed /underemployed residents of the city?	5186/12394	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – plan is welcome in its intention but lacks a clear vision for the rural villages which surround York which have very different needs. There should be no development in any green belt areas. Should not build houses but look to build communities with appropriate infrastructure and communal facilities.	5189/12399	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – sceptical of the forecast need for additional housing. Not really clear where all new houses can be located without drastically altering the character of the city and creating a serious overload on associated facilities. All growth comes at a cost to the environment and enhances existing problems as well as offering the apparent benefits of being better off economically. Growth can be self defeating, bringing more traffic, more congestion, and more demand for housing and all other public services.	5192/12462	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 10A	5208/12434	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – whilst there may be a case for 1090 new homes per year over the next 5 years, or 10 years at most, do not believe that new housing at that rate should continue there after as it would start to destroy the character of the city by growing too quickly. There is no evidence as yet that additional housing at that rate beyond 10 years is likely to be supported by new employment opportunities.	5210/12444	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 10C	5211/12470	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – concerned about the protection of the green belt and the preservation of wildlife habitats. It is counter productive to build on prime farmland. The plan places far too much emphasis on growing the economy and creating new communities and not enough on protecting the environment and the features for which York is famous. Proposal to build so many new houses seems unrealistic and unsustainable and seems	5228/12523	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to be based on flawed assumptions and extrapolation. Housing growth should be less than 850 per annum. There is no guarantee that there will be any jobs for the occupants of all these new houses. Building on green belt and farming land should be resisted at all costs. Flooding has always been an issue in York; additional building developments can only exacerbate the problem.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – disagree with the employment growth projections in the plan, these seem rather ambitious. Requirements should be based on realistic growth projections rather than aspiration. Building more than 20,000 additional houses would be unsustainable for York. This increase in size of population would damage York’s rural setting and the road infrastructure would become gridlocked.	5230/12527	
	Objection – there is little evidence that York requires the volume of housing the report suggests is needed. Nothing to say why this extra housing is needed, where the extra jobs will be coming from, why the majority of houses need to be built on green belt land, and how the infrastructure will work.	5232/12544	
	Objection – plans will destroy York’s environment and completely destroy the one thing that is so important in making York unique. York is a small city which makes it a desirable place to live and visit. These plans will change York forever into just another sprawling mass of concrete.	5233/12545	
	Objection – there is a total imbalance between preserving the special character of York and the economic ambitions of the plan. Too much emphasis on economic and housing growth would be at the expense of York’s natural assets as a small, special and unique historic city. Dispute the huge numbers of houses which we are told are necessary, recent studies reduce the projected numbers that are needed. In this small city there are not many employment opportunities – some people will move here and then commute to cities like Leeds. Congestion, overcrowding and increased risk of flooding. York will not be able to absorb such high levels of growth without causing extensive environmental damage. Congestion around the city is already far too high, with the suggested developments there will be gridlock – the A19 cannot take anymore traffic. Air quality in Fulford is already very poor and the developments will worsen it. So much of the open countryside being built on will adversely affect wildlife.	5234/12546	
	Objection – the housing and employment figures quoted are unrealistic and unobtainable.	5238/12569	
	Objection – plan is based on strongly disputed figures on the growth or the economy, of the number of jobs that will be created as a result and on the number of houses that might be required. The housing target is clearly out of line with expert forecasts which	5239/12571	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	place that number nearly 25% lower. Object to the development of green belt land. The city maintains its unique attraction in part through the character of the wider environment which surrounds and supports it – in economic as well as social terms and the proposed development alongside one of the primary approaches to the city fails to take that into account.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Support – welcomes SS2 which seeks to build strong, sustainable communities through address the housing and community needs of York’s current and future population. Objection – not considered that the annual housing target proposed satisfies the objectively assessed needs test. On the basis of the evidence the higher housing growth option would mean the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing should be selected.	5245/14330	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Objection – York needs a local plan, established green belt, green corridors into the city and some new housing development. It does not need to urgently transform into an ugly conurbation with even more traffic congestion than at present. The scale of development envisaged is inappropriate to a city of the size and character of York. The infrastructure is inadequate for current levels of traffic. Improving this, even if desirable does not look remotely viable.	5264/14360	
	Support – supportive of the strategy to build almost 1100 new homes in York each year. There is an appalling housing shortage in York, where the average house costs around 10 times the average income. York is a fast growing city and it is essential that proper housing is provided for the people who work here. A shortage of housing can also choke economic growth.	5265/14363	
	Objection – no one can deny there is an urgent need for substantial new house building in the York area and that existing brownfield sites many not meet this demand in full in the long term. Given increased ties with West Yorkshire and the majority of commuting to and from York outside the city is to Leeds and West Yorkshire, it would seem sensible solution if any green field sites need to be safeguarded for future development, they should be to the west of the city, not mainly to north and east as proposed. This would minimise commuting round and through the city and minimise impact on the already massive traffic problems to the east of the Ouse.	5274/14378	
	Objection – at a loss as to why future residential development is concentrated outside the ring road when there is land inside the ring road (some of which is brownfield) which could be developed first. Building on these sites first would reduce commuting and be closer to the services York already has. There are also countless properties inside the city walls at first, second and third floor levels in buildings which could be	5292/14421	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developed for residents.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – need major work on infrastructure, both traffic based and flooding/sewerage problems before any development should be allowed.	5294/14429	
	Comment – on what evidence is such a large increase deemed necessary? Brownfield sites should be used; there is capacity for this to satisfy all identified building numbers. No infrastructure improvements - A1237 and drainage - have been identified to cope with this build (ST09).	5295/14432	
	Comment – highlights ministerial statement that green belt protection overrides considerations of unmet demand.	5300/14452	
	Objection – where will the extra employment come from? Where are the new businesses to provide this? If at Clifton Moor or Monks Cross then that will be even more demand on a single carriageway ring road that should have been dual carriageway from the start. The infrastructure cannot cope with this overdevelopment.	5302/14458	
	Objection – number of proposed new houses is far in excess of York’s ability to have infrastructure to provide services. It will cause more traffic problems than those already existing. The area marked near the A64 will simply be a commuter town for Leeds. Lack of thought about brownfield sites within York which could still be used.	5313/14474	
	Objection – plan does not properly address the infrastructure issues, in particular roads; Clifton bypass is currently in a state of gridlock at peak periods.	5314/14481	
	Objection – see response 10I	5316/14482	
	Objection – the addition of 22,000 new homes will produce major problems in the provision of secondary health care. York Trust Hospital is already stressed in relation to space facilities and staffing.	5335/14516	
	Objection – Kexby is not even shown on the map.	5337/14518	
	Objection – there needs to be an effective green belt around York, in line with the previous proposed plan. There is very little green space within York. There is no need for such a large quantity of new housing, there are a lot of current sites that are awaiting development and have been so for many years. There are no jobs that would require housing provision, in the last 30 years a huge amount of industry has closed, leaving mostly a legacy of low paid employment.	5338/14521	
Objection – not convinced that the amount of homes suggested across the York area is practical and have concerns that the local roads and current infrastructure cannot cope with the huge increase in cars. The whole essence of York being a unique historic city will change. The green belt should be protected and York should not become a mass of housing estates. No real evidence of plans to develop the city’s roads, hospitals and	5342/14532		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	schools to cope with increased demand. Want York to prosper and develop but this has to be on a long term plan that the city can cope with. Is the suggestion of 1000 new jobs a year really accurate? The creation of new jobs has fallen over the last 10 years. Worry about housing affordability in the future but this has to be balanced against the very reason that York is the very special place to live. Development of brownfield sites needs to be fully exhausted before starting on surrounding areas.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – York has very little or no industry and is losing jobs – why attract people here if there are no jobs? York’s roads are practically gridlocked and there are no plans to dual the ring road so York cannot accommodate more people especially if they have to commute. There seems to be no consideration for schools, play parks or other amenities in this house growth. Building on flood plains will just offset floods elsewhere. Yes people want to live in York but first need the jobs, amenities and infrastructure to support such growth if it really is required.	5344/14535	
	Objection – lacking in any broad impact assessment and without any housing needs based assessment.	5351/14544	
	Objection – Arup report accepts that housing requirements should be treated with caution as the relationship between employment and housing growth is complex and non-linear. Data on commuting levels is from the 2001 census and therefore should not be included in this report. Employment has decreased by 11% between 2003 and 2011. Future increases in employment opportunities may well increase commuting levels by a way of lifestyle choice not dwelling availability. Additional housing requirements cannot be linked to forecast jobs growth per se. An increase in the delivery of housing should not be undertaken by using green field sites prior to brownfield. Any use of green belt land should only be carried out in exceptional circumstances. Analysis and requirement for additional homes in excess of the 850 baseline is based entirely on the fact that cannot get developers to build more than 25% of dwellings as affordable homes. A baseline position of 850 annual average would seem reasonable. The increased forecasts of 1090 are not supported by facts but assumptions on population migration based on economic growth providing jobs. Should lobby the government to provide more money to increase the build of affordable homes without it being linked to overall building volumes. The A1237 and A64 struggle to accept current traffic flows. Existing businesses are already being adversely affected by this problem. Bottlenecks at Grimston Bar, Hopgrove, Rawcliffe and Clifton Moor will be unable to cope if plan for up to 22,500 homes goes ahead. Current infrastructure – education, health practices and hospital – is already	5353/14541	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	inadequate and struggling to cope with existing demand. No detail as to how plan will make it all work.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – proposals to build high volume of houses are not supported by robust references to investment in infrastructure. For example new green field development north of Haxby will force more travel to work traffic through the bottleneck of Haxby High Street and York Road. Problems with surface water drainage and schools and health services, need for greater green and open space provision. New villages on the ring road without transport investment flies in the face of ‘city recognised as leader in sustainable transport’.	5357/14551	
	Objection – concerned about the scale of proposed house building across York and the justification and risk assessment undertaken. There must be an underlying principle that the green belt is there to protect the character and uniqueness of York that has enabled it to be a world class tourist attraction. There are still many brown field sites to be developed. The advice in the economic assessment is to try and keep the feel and uniqueness of York whilst developing businesses that complement the university and existing science park. Not anything in the plan that would support the huge development in house building across York. What is the transport/roads plan, the queues on the ring road at certain times are unacceptable? Plan is flawed – no economic argument, no funding, and no cohesion to hi tech professional business growth, no infrastructure (schools or healthcare) and no credible link to the great strengths that York has as a world class tourist centre.	5367/14572	
	Objection – disapproval of the large scale housing development on Greenfield land and lack of a sustainable transport plan. City centre traffic will always be constrained by the historic centre and adding more properties to suburban areas will only exasperate the situation. Do not agree that proposed developments will be highly accessible by means ‘other than the private car’. Those proposals are not on a flood plain the impact will be more wide ranging unless significant sustainable drainage is employed. Recent developments have tended to be of poor quality with an inappropriate mix of housing, industrial and retail space which has had a detrimental affect on the City. The main employment for York is through tourism and the plan does not address increasing employment in other sectors sufficient for the additional housing. Proposals are not a sustainable solution, certain key developments particularly on brownfield sites could be beneficial however plan should focus on improving public transport, improving local amenities in key areas and improving the overall environment within the city.	5370/14578	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – expansion of current housing stock will increase traffic delays (journey time to A1 has increased by 30% in 5 years) which will increase CO2 and other pollutants. The link between Monks Cross and Clifton Moor will become impassable.	5378/14597	
	Objection – green belt needs to be protected.	5380/14601	
	Objection – concerns about lack of any plan to improve the north ring road, this must happen if sustainable increase in housing and business is to take place. Lack of plan for business development – if York is to thrive, it needs more employment.	5385/14616	
	Objection – support progressive development in order to kick start the local economy however brownfield sites should be utilised before encroach on green belt land though understand there may be a need to look at some of these areas in the future. Little thought seems to have been given to support facilities such as retail areas, schools and service areas. Little thought given to the areas of outstanding natural beauty in the area. Northern ring road should have been built as dual carriageway, the city road system is at times completely overwhelmed – what will happen when hundreds more houses and thousands more cars are added to the system.	5389/14626	York Navigator Ltd
	Objection – there is not the infrastructure to cope with the amount of new homes and cars proposed. The roads around York are full now.	5391/14631	
	Objection – the option of 850 houses a year should be the absolute maximum, preferably 800 houses a year should be built as current population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Achieving 1090 can only be done through 36000 people moving to the area. Such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	5392/14634	
	Objection – plan contains a level of expansion and development which is excessive and unsustainable. Existing infrastructure would need large scale and immediate investment to cope with the population boom that this scale of development would create. York has existing problems with such things are traffic, hospital capacity and school capacity and there is not enough evidence that the infrastructure will be delivered. York is a highly desirable place to live and do not want to see the city become solely a commuter base as good location means many are prepared to commute to work. Wish to see development levels reviewed and reduced to a more sustainable scale.	5395/14643	
	Objection – see response 10A	5401/14659	
		5403/14662	
	Objection – the amount of traffic that will surely follow more homes. How can York cope with more? How is more housing needed when everywhere in York, especially	5406/14667	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	near the centre there are no end of flats? Wildlife is very important to people. The beauty of York is that you can just go for a short walk and be in the countryside – this would be jeopardised by the plan.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – to increase house and population numbers without dramatic improvements to local infrastructure appears unsustainable and to propose the building of 16000 new homes on green belt is a terrible idea that would totally ruin York.	5407/14669	
	Objection – concerns relate to the size and scale of the expansion plan for York. It is hard to see how the infrastructure will cope and how the very special nature of York will be preserved.	5408/14680	
	Objection – how can York accommodate more cars which is bound to arise with further house building on already overcrowded roads? Where are the jobs being created to justify the huge increase in house building? If new homeowners were to commute because of lack of jobs in York then the further pressure on the roads would be untenable.	5409/14681	
	Objection – one of York’s strengths is its small size and friendly feel. Significant growth and urban sprawl will change this character. Seems extremely naive to believe that the aim to drive down property values by building more houses will be achieved – house builders will not build houses at a rate that results in properties they are building being worth less over the years they are developing.	5413/14695	
	Objection – to using green belt to build 16000 houses and businesses. Understand that new housing will be needed but not to the numbers, nor to the places proposed. York is recognised throughout the world for its compact size and historic features. This will be lost if it is extended into the green field surrounding it. There are a great number of old brownfield sites that are still available and more should be done to use these areas first.	5416/14706	
	Objection – plan is underpinned by forecasts of a vastly increased population. Development should be based on addressing the issues and preferences of the existing population first. York’s biggest asset is its historic buildings and environment – a historic city in a beautiful rural setting. These two aspects underpin York’s principle industry – tourism. Over development of the city will spoil it and pose a significant threat to the tourist industry.	5417/14708	
	Support – the preferred approach to the spatial strategy. York is bucking the trend in terms of the effect of the recession in the north and Yorkshire. It is important that York uses its strength as an economic driver in the region and develops the infrastructure and housing provision to support this.	5427/14741	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – opposition to plans to grow York out of all proportion and take some of the existing green belt. York’s main income is from tourism and tourism would be adversely affected by loss of character as a small and attractive city and by increased traffic. More concrete means more potential flooding, loss of wildlife, damage to the environment, more traffic and poorer quality of life.	5435/14763	
	Objection – do not support building of homes on the green belt, do not want York to become sprawling suburbia.	5437/14769	
	Objection – any significant increase in population will destroy the individuality of the city. What the city needs to improve is what already exists and not expand. Little in the proposed and unnecessary expansion takes into account any improvement in the infrastructure.	5438/14771	
	Comment – what constitutes green belt and how is it protected against exploitation? Why are new housing developments being built on green belt land? The density of proposed development is too high. What consideration has been given to the effect on public transport and traffic flow resulting from these developments? What consideration has been given to existing infrastructure to cope with the hugely increased demand (schools, surgeries and local shops etc)?	5440/14774	
	Objection – York roads are already jammed solid for hours each day. Green belt has been subtly eroded and degraded at an alarming rate. The city is on the verge of losing the very things which make people want to live here.	5442/14775	
	Objection – instead of picking off different parts of the green belt, development should take place further out so that a ring of green land is preserved close to the centre.	5443/14777	
	Objection – not convinced that York needs or can warrant such large scale expansion. Where are all these people coming from, where will they work, how will they travel? Is no development beyond a small scale an option?	5450/14786	
	Objection – dispute that York needs the amount of houses stated. Loss of prime agricultural land. Outer ring road provides a natural boundary; there are plenty of disused areas in and around the city of York. Road network cannot support the additional proposed traffic. Many new inhabitants will move in from Leeds because York is a better place to live and commute back to their place of employment.	5456/14794	
	Objection – do not believe that York needs an additional 22,000 homes. The city’s infrastructure, especially roads, buses and sewers cannot cope with so much extra pressure. Will developers be required to provide improvements in infrastructure to meet the additional pressures? Most of these houses are to be built on green belt which is inappropriate. The city cannot be losing so much green space and many	5457/14796	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	picturesque villages will be ruined.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – the current infrastructure is inefficient (roads and parking) and is a major objection that working people have to cope with daily. Plan doesn't work primarily due to traffic congestion. Need joined up plan which guarantees additional road infrastructure to cope with even more demand.	5459/14800	
	Objection – plan is a misuse of green belt land. Proposed housing represents gross over development. Do not believe that projections of demand are realistic. Plan gives no assurances regarding improvements to the infrastructure and in particular traffic management.	5463/14808	
	Objection – plan fails to provide an appropriate vision for York. The approach is non sustainable and will destroy the essence of York. There should be no major housing development in the green belt.	5466/14812	
	Objection – like the size and character of York and object to it being made significantly bigger. Do not wish York to become a large sprawling city but accept that some local development is necessary.	5472/14822	
	Objection – how does York plan to tackle the transport challenge from increasing development on its outskirts? Does plan accept the destruction of the city character in favour of turning the surrounding fields into car parks and chain stores?	5476/14829	
	Objection – if green field sites have to be used they should all be within the confines of the outer ring road.	5484/14837	
	Objection – too much traffic and too many houses already. Should protect the green belt.	5486/14846	
	Objection – See response 10D. Strongly object to plan to build 22,000 extra homes. The road infrastructure cannot cope with the present level of traffic, this many more cars would ensure gridlock and chaos. There has not been an increase in the employment requirements of York so presume the additional homes would be for people commuting.	5489/14852	
	Objection – plan takes no account of the extra burden thousands of cars and people will have on the infrastructure and social elements of small villages and towns like Haxby and Wigginton. It also makes a mockery of the green belt which was put in place to protect valuable agriculture and wildlife.	5491/14853	
	Support – the approach to housing growth and distribution is appropriate given the housing shortage in York. City is one of the north's economic success stories and as such many people are taking up jobs here. However, up until now the housing policy has not kept pace with demand and this housing shortage has in turn pushed up	5493/14861	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	prices. This policy will make owning a high quality and affordable home near to workplace a reality.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – against the plan overall, the planned number of houses is above and beyond the independent report stating that only 17,000 are required. Environmental duty of care to protect and preserve the land and reduce the risk of flooding in the area.	5496/14868	
	Objection – is there a need for this many new houses? Is York going to become a dormitory city for Leeds? Certainly don't have the employment here for all the people that will reside in these homes.	5502/14878	
	Objection – is more housing really needed in the area? Where will all these extra people work?	5506/14886	
	Objection – York's infrastructure cannot cope with 22,000 more cars. Traffic is so heavy in the city and increasing the population further will create severe problems. Where are all the jobs going to come from for all the extra people?	5511/14898	
	Objection – preserve Knapton. There are lots of other more suitable areas in and around York to develop.	5512/14899	
	Support – like the plan for the proposed green belt.	5521/14935	
	Support – green belt – excellent idea.	5523/14936	
	Objection – agree that some additional low cost housing is needed for first time buyers. Existing land banks should be used and a smaller number of houses (approx 100) could be built provided that the infrastructure is upgraded specifically sewage, drainage and roads.	5539/14958	
	Objection – it is unacceptable to build on any green belt land. the recent wildlife report stated that 60% of wildlife is in decline. This land should be protected. York does not need more housing developments.	5540/14960	
	Objection – the number of homes required is overstated and as per independent report is probably some 5000 less than stated.	5542/14963	
Objection – the current infrastructure is struggling to cope at the moment. Improve local infrastructure first (dualling A1237). Reckless expansion plans which build on green field sites instead of tackling all the existing brownfield sites first. The wide geographical spread of proposed development sites will not encourage sustainable transport due to their distance from the city centre. The car will be the primary transport increasing pollution, congestion and making cycling even more hazardous. No indication of new schools and other essential amenities.	5547/14978		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>Policy SS2                      Delivering Sustainable Growth For York                      Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – it proposes housing of a level that would lead to a chronic overdevelopment and demand on the already struggling infrastructure of the city. Over the last 10 years the city has suffered from overdevelopment and poor planning that has been unsympathetic to both the heritage of the city and the areas in which the developments have taken place. Recent times have seen many blocks of flats or town houses being built which only provide dense population and overcrowding in certain areas which will become the ghettos of the future. Many of the properties built over the last 15 years remain empty and been for many years. How can the Council approve the building of 22,000 more homes when the ones we have are empty? The infrastructure is not able to cope with the traffic it currently has due to the Council’s policy for traffic management. Building 22,000 more homes will bring a city already at gridlock to its knees. The plan is approved sounds the death knoll for York as a city for business and jobs. Plan makes no provision for attracting high end business and therefore reinforces the glass ceiling of wages that already exists. Anyone with a degree who has aspirations for a better life is already condemned to having to travel to Leeds, Manchester or Nottingham, to find a job with prospects. Building new homes is a short sighted way to provide medial work in a city that is dying economically. How are we attracting high end professionals? York will become a residential suburb with properties that no one can afford, a road system that cannot cope and job prospects that are dire. Plan needs urgent reconsideration to turn this city back into the prosperous place it once was so that professionals and talented young people can stay in the area.</p>	<p>5554/13018</p>	
	<p>Objection – whilst appreciated that this is a long term plan considered that the number of proposed new houses is too great. Proposals to build on what is effectively green belt will have an adverse effect on the entire area. Without a huge investment in infrastructure there will be too much pressure on already stretched resources.                      Comment - the problems of congestion on the ring road and A64 need to be addressed before any large scale housing developments are begun.</p>	<p>5555/13023</p>	
	<p>Objection – do not see a convincing case for the number of homes proposed or the anticipated business development. Such extensive and undesirable development will change the character of the city forever. A plan needs to be made but the ambitions of the current one are excessive and need to be reviewed and certainly scaled back. Object to the excessive amount of green belt being proposed for development when so much brownfield and is available. Object to the absence of specific infrastructure developments to support the proposed expansion.</p>	<p>5557/13031</p>	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – completely oppose the decision to build the amount of houses proposed and in so many areas of current green belt open land. People like to live in York because it has a small town feel, if they want to live in a sprawling municipal city there are plenty close by to move to. York’s tradition of thriving local communities and what’s left of open countryside should be maintained for future generations, not destroyed by an elective committee that will not be around to suffer the consequences.	5567/13045	
	Objection – disappointed at the plan which seems to have totally ignored the needs and wishes of the people currently living in and paying taxes in York. The creation of high numbers of new houses across the city with its 19 <sup>th</sup> century road infrastructure (apart from the A1237 and dualled part of the A64) will dramatically affect those living in the development areas. Congestion will be worse is more houses are built in areas where roads are already stressed and crumbling.	5568/13046	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – object to the approach the council has taken in identity where developments should taken place. The outcomes have been determined not by any planning as to how and where the city should grow but simply on the basis on which landowners have said they will make land available. Opportunistic, not strategic.	5570/13051	
	Objection – growth of this scale will exacerbate traffic problems in York. These plans have been instigated due to a view that there will be upwards of 1000 jobs per year “created”, yet jobs have been declining in numbers. The very position of Elvington and its proximity of the A64 and the short cut to the M62 means that the increased housing is more likely to create homes for commuters rather than support York.	5571/13057	
	Objection – growth of this scale will exacerbate traffic problems in York. These plans have been instigated due to a view that there will be upwards of 1000 jobs per year “created”, yet jobs have been declining in numbers. The very position of Elvington and its proximity of the A64 and the short cut to the M62 means that the increased housing is more likely to create homes for commuters rather than support York.	5572/13060	
	Objection – serious concerns about the sheer scale of the proposed development and the impact that this will have on York’s infrastructure and the quality of life for its residents. York’s roads cannot cope and more houses lead to more cars. York hospital seems to lack funds to deal with the current population – increasing the population significantly over the next few years will surely only make this problem worse.	5575/13065	
	Comment – once planning has been approved for housing/retail/leisure/employment sites, the road infrastructure should be up-graded or established before development begins.	5578/13072	
	Objection – the strain on the City of York, the villages of Heslington and Fulford would be too much. Why spoil something we can be proud of for excessive expansion when other options are available. Does York need to continually expand? When is enough, enough?	5579/13074	
	Objection – even if the council maintains the level of housing suggested is necessary; the proposed use of protected greenbelt is quite frankly a travesty. Do not believe the Council has demonstrated that sufficient consideration has been given to the redevelopment of brownfield sites.	5585/13087	
	Objection – the whole idea of this massive expansion of this ancient city is too ludicrous for words and does not reflect well on the council	5588/13099	
	Objection - it would appear the plan does not apply an even handed distribution of housing with the great majority located in the eastern section – why could this not be evenly distributed?	5592/13112	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – houses do need to be built for the future, however the scale and need is not as great as indicated. York will have an increased population without the prospect of employment. York is not like Leeds and unlikely to be able to assimilate such a population growth. Roads are congested and environment is likely to suffer, York would not be such an attractive place to live. Although the plan claims to preserve the greenbelt building will take place on the greenbelt.	5593/13120	
	Objection – it is difficult to access the ring road, extra housing will make this even harder, Businesses and people will not want to be in York as access will be so difficult.	5597/13130	
	Objection – the preferred options put forward on housing and the economy are potentially highly damaging to the special character of York and its diverse and lively communities. They simply do not convince as a deliverable set of objectives and the Council should reconsider these options, aiming for a more balanced and realistic approach.	5599/13139	
	Objection – object in the strongest terms to the proposal in the draft local plan to build 22,000 new homes over the next 15 years together with over forty wind farm sites.	5604/13152	
	Objection – implementation of the plan would mean a significant erosion of the Greenbelt and have a deleterious effect on a beautiful city and surroundings.	5606/13159	
	Objection – far too much land has been earmarked here for predicted needs and sustainable growth. Particularly object to the large proposals with the greenbelt, ST14 and ST15 which are completely incompatible with the idea of a greenbelt.	5609/13171	
	Objection – concerned regarding the plans to develop York’s greenbelt, York roads are very congested, the by pass cannot cope with present level of traffic, what is affordable housing and who is it for?	5618/13208	
	Objection – concerned regarding the plans to develop York’s greenbelt, York roads are very congested, the by pass cannot cope with present level of traffic, what is affordable housing and who is it for?	5619/13210	
	Objection – underlying plan assumptions are seriously flawed, the proposals are not justified by the evidence and much essential detail is unclear or omitted. Flooding the greenbelt and existing communities with new housing and business developments will not help those in most need to access homes or jobs, nor will it provide the infrastructure need to support such massive growth. No local Council, regardless of political persuasion could or can deliver such a proportionately huge increase or ensure the local infrastructure needed to support this scale of residential and commercial development. There is no regard long term sustainability of the commercial or domestic property sectors or the huge negative impacts on the environment and	5622/13221	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	support infrastructure. The ideas which is claimed to underpin the Local Plan are merely a set of untested hypotheses which assume that what is desired can be achieved simply by wanting it to happen and are only tenuously linked to the objectives and strategic ambitions.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – Concerns regarding the proposed plans to build an additional 22,000 houses in York. The ring road already struggles to cope, could damage businesses, question how an influx of people will be dealt with in terms of schooling. The greenbelt land under proposal to be developed is part of what makes York a special and attractive lace to live and work.	5631/13251	
	Objection – the plan to build on the floodplain is irresponsible, to plan for a huge number of house without any increase in the access road to York is nonsense. To plan for significant increases in the York population with plans for increased schools, shops, doctors, dentists, hospital places seem shorted sighted.	5633/13257	
	Objection – no enough evidence has been provided to make an informed comment. York does not need 22,000 houses; this will destroy York’s unique character. Add upwards of 50,000 cars to the roads which are already near gridlock in places. Too many people, not enough jobs or facilities and not properly thought out. The idea that this will bring house prices down is unrealistic and not achievable.	5634/13260	
	Objection - York is extremely congested, with insufficient jobs for future residents. It has more accessible brownfield and peripheral sites.	5639/13270	
	Objection – there should be a respect for the basic shape and size of York – York should not aspire to become much bigger, either in terms of population or hectares, rather be gradual development focussing on brownfield and infill sites. It is essential that ‘people floes’ whether by car, public transport, or cycle are put in place first. Any significant increase in population must depend on a sensible travel policy and one which recognises the importance of keeping cars outside the ring road.	5645/13277	
	Comment – difficult to understand the reasoning for the extensive building proposed. The roads in the area struggle to cope at present with the volume of traffic and with no sign of the A1237 being made into a duel carriage way it will only get worse.	5646/13282	
	Objection – no thought has been given to such items as the affect on infrastructure which in many cases is already overloaded, Principle items likely to be affected are roads, public transport and drainage. Without details of how these will be tackled makes the plan a paper exercise and of no value.	5648/13285	
	Objection – there is a lack of information on details, there is a need for detail. If the plan were to go ahead, the rural setting of York, a historic and unique city could be	5671/13349	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	destroyed. It seems hugely ambitious fifteen year plan to provide houses and jobs at a time when we are a slow recovering economy and could see York grind to a halt amidst a never ending building site.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – See response 10B	5672/13353	
	Objection – the scale of development proposed is completely unsustainable and entirely inappropriate for a historic cathedral city. York will go from being a beautiful and popular city of great historical and cultural significance to being an over populated suburb of Leeds. Finds it inconceivable that the Council have proposed such extensive development without providing any guarantees of having secured the necessary investment in infrastructure. Inevitable that the whole area will become a building site with existing congestion problems rapidly deteriorating and potentially grinding the city to a halt. Greenbelts are necessary in protecting the rural countryside for which this country is renowned, they also serve to protect the character and setting of cities and prevent urban sprawl. The Council must reduce the figures to a more sustainable and manageable level. The protection of the greenbelt is essential.	5673/13358	
	Objection –there should be no building on the greenbelt. Comment – new schools/extensions to be in place before new development so that existing residents are not disadvantaged. Current school catchments should not altered, residents of new developments should not take precedence.	5674/13366	
	Objection – contains a level of expansion and development which is excessive and unsustainable. The existing infrastructure would need large scale and immediate investment in order to cope with the population boom that development of this scale would create. York has existing problems with traffic, hospital capacity and school capacity. There is not enough evidence to suggest that the infrastructure will be delivered and therefore he existing problems will be exacerbated. The excessive development may have an adverse effect on York remaining a desirable place to live, would like to see the development levels reviewed and reduced to a more sustainable scale.	5683/13387	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed number f houses that are suggested be built. 22,000 is too many for York’s economy to support. There is no shortage of houses in York for purchase or rental; there are hundreds available in estate agents. Building 22,000 new homes will not benefit the local population and simply go some way to provide housing from those outside the city (or those not paying for them). York should not aim to increase its population and this would encourage it. Do not see York’s future as an extension of west Yorkshire. York needs to keep its own historic	5684/13390	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	identity and not become a faceless city.		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Comment – given the historical status of York the interior area of the walled city should be altered only with extreme caution. We are custodians of this ancient city and should leave it for future generations to enjoy and admire. The council needs to be mindful that the reason York is such a pleasant city is because it still has lungs created by open spaces, trees and low density housing.	5686/13397	
	Comment – consideration should be given to allocating separate zones for housing and night-time uses in the city centre to guide investors and safeguard residents.	5689/13410	
	Comment – concerned about the impact of the local plan on schools and health care provision given that it is already accepted that the city does not have the number of school places available in the short term let alone in the medium to long term. It makes no sense to build more housing without first having a good foundation of schools and health care provision for the current York population in the short term.	5696/13418	
	Objection – the developments proposed are inappropriate on green belt and could spoil the character and setting of the city for generations to come. While York’s greenbelt is still only draft it does currently inform planning policy in York. York’s infrastructure is already under strain, particularly the outer ring road and Manor School is oversubscribed. How will further massive housing development affect these?	5704/13439	
	Objection – the plan seems very precise in terms of the number of houses to be built but is very vague in terms of bigger needs that accompany this such as schools and parks to be provided. The data doesn’t seem to back the need for all the housing. There seems to be a lot of contradiction such as needing open space but that open spaces will be built on. The data on population growth has been consistently wrong in the past but yet the demand for housing seems to be based on these incorrect figures. Ensuring that York’s historical emphasis is maintained needs to be prioritised and the style of new developments need to factor this at all times. Difficult to see how York can maintain its character because this character is based on it being a small city. The proposed developments seem to do little to enhance the city and rather than attracting more people will perhaps kill they city off as people will choose other towns such as Harrogate or Ripon to live rather than York if the balance isn’t maintained.	5717/13470	
	Objection – no compelling case has been presented that an extra 22,000 homes are required. Does not see sufficient growth to offset loss of jobs let alone alleged increase in demand. Disgusting that 16,000 of the 22,000 homes are proposed to built on York’s remarkable and precious greenbelt. There are so many areas around the city that are clearly derelict and in need of demolition.	5720/13481	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – do not think that expansion of housing should happen in any rural areas outside the current area but that the brownfield sites within the city should be priority development.	5721/13484	
	Objection – the extent of the proposals seems excessive and involves developing too many Greenfield sites.	5729/13497	
	Objection – the proposed number of houses is far too large. Will radically distort and downgrade the character of the city. Do not believe that there is a demand expansion of the city of this scale. Building on the green belt will inevitably constitute degradation in the quality of life for the existing residents, degrading air quality and removing residents further from the natural environment. The green belt is a priceless resource which should not be needlessly reduced or abandoned. Houses require access roads, provision of services, schools etc. This will add to the amount of traffic on the city's roads and increase competition for services to the disadvantage of York's residents. Builders are currently unwilling to build house because of the requirement for affordable housing what guarantee is there that they would be prepared to build houses on this scale? Building houses and ancillary roads and providing services will cost a lot of money at a time when this is in short supply. Where is the money to come from?	5730/13503	
	Objection – development on the west side of the city will not be appropriate for people working in these areas. There is often serious congestion on the outer link road and bypass at peak times which will be substantially aggravated by development on the west side of the city unless substantial improvements to the infrastructure are made.	5734/13506	
	Objection – if there is no prospect of any new industry coming to York why the need for extra housing?	5741/13542	
	Objection – concerned that 22,000 new homes are not needed or wanted. The proposed level of development is totally unsustainable. The additional pressure that will be put on local infrastructure, much of which is already at capacity, is beyond comprehension.	5744/13547	
	Objection – reject the assertion that York needs the scale of growth that is promulgated here and question the underlying assumptions encapsulated in statistics. The stress on the city's infrastructure and culture by the types of growth proposed will be too great.	5747/13558	
	Objection – increasing development will accelerate growth causing increased congestion and strain on current social and medical services. Will also drive up the need for future development and urban sprawl. Development with the idea to provide	5748/13559	



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cheaper housing is self defeating. Increasing housing will increase the strain on congested roads. The solution to this will be to increase the transport network which will require further development and expansion of the city. Current NHS services are in financial difficulties, an increasing population will not aid the financial situation, and this situation will be made worse. Has the local clinical commissioning group been consulted?		
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Objection – concerned that 22,000 new homes are not needed or wanted. The proposed level of development is totally unsustainable. The additional pressure that will be put on local infrastructure, much of which is already at capacity, is beyond comprehension.	5749/13561	
	Objection – much appreciated that we need to ensure that the city can cope with an ever growing population but to do this at the expense of ruining the charm and scale of the city is totally wrong. See nothing but words about the improvements in the infrastructure that should be the first consideration before any house plans are agreed. City transport system is a disgrace. What about the increase in school capacity, doctor's surgeries, dentist?	5750/13564	
	Objection – plan is too ambitious, will clearly be unachievable. Very little of the plan is deliverable due to cost constraints. Plan needs to be slimmed down and requires focus on the part of the framework that are likely to be achieved. This is likely to be small scale infrastructure projects and developments on brownfield sites.	5751/13572	
	Objection – the proposed housing target is over ambitious. Given the number of current sites with permission where no building has taken place not convinced that there need to be quite so much expansion into the green belt. It is key that services specially schools, roads and cycle paths and amenity space are planned and high quality. The green belt should be maintained. Any proposals to develop the greenbelt should be in exceptional circumstances.	5754/13587	
	Objection – do not see convincing case or the number of homes proposed or the anticipated business development. Such extensive and undesirable development will change the character of the city forever. Objects to the excessive amount of green belt being proposed for development in the overall plan especially when so much brownfield sites are available.	5755/13601	
	Objection – object to the city wide plans put forward.	5764/13625	
	Objection – the plan is based on York's economy growing and generating 16,000 jobs up to 2030. No evidence has been put forward on this unprecedented job creation in the city. The figures of population and housing growth with the economic growth are	5766/13634	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unrealistic.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – believes that the green belt should be maintained, totally opposed to loosing green belt land.	5768/13645	
	Objection – object to all of the Greenfield site ear marked for future development. With the present record of homes getting flooded it makes sense to stop adding to all the pollution and extra run off causes by building on more of the countryside. The recent appearance of food banks will surely only get worse if more food producing land is taken out of production.	5771/13648	
	Objection – object to the council building on the green belt anywhere across the city. The unique nature f the city could easily be spoiled by further residential developments on the green belt.	5772/13651	
	Objection – concerned that the council has not looked hard enough for alternative development land so that compromise to the greenbelt is spread and a single landowner is not advantaged over others who may wish to offer land. Understand hat North Yorkshire Strategic Housing projections for the housing marker indicated a need for 850 houses per annum and York’s own employment prospects (Arup) confirmed this need. The plan indicates an over provision.	5779/13671	
	Objection – feels excessively weighted in certain areas of the city.	5780/13675	
	Objection – the employment growth baseline scenario is much more realistic and is itself a bit optimistic. The preferred number of houses per annum is grossly unrealistic.	5783/13690	
	Objection – the plan would make the city even busier than it already is, making travelling in the York area horrendous, it will also have a high negative impact on the environment.	5785/13695	
	Objection – don’t want more green fields gobbled up or villages becoming suburbs.	5787/13706	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not in place to support any new housing, closing schools and then building new houses doesn’t make any sense. Would put extra pressure on already overburdened facilities. The roads are already very busy.	5790/13713	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not in place to support any new housing, closing schools and then building new houses doesn’t make any sense. Would put extra pressure on already overburdened facilities. The roads are already very busy.	5791/13716	
	Objection – See response 10D	5794/13721	
	Objection – the plan appears to be driven by an assumption that we need to build more houses. Unable to find any reference to justification for the proposed levels of house building.	5796/9540	
	Objection – too many houses proposed.	5799/15013	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – concerned that the plan suggests the need for so large a building programme. Green belt must be a treasured resource that is not considered for development unless an extreme case can be made.	5800/13733	
	Objection – the council has chosen housing targets higher than its advisors proposed. The targets should be modified downwards and attempts made to align them with land availability without taking large areas out of the current green belt.	5801/13736	
	Comment – plan seems to have little consideration for the impact of the people who will inhabit the properties on the local infrastructure. Any housing development needs to go hand in hand with infrastructure improvements such as a dual carriageway.	5805/13741	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6232	
		5807/6240	
	Objection – what type of housing are we expecting? Where do all these new residents work?	5808/13744	
	Objection – object to the proposal for so many new houses; don't believe that the infrastructure of the city can cope. York is a beautiful city and part of its charm is that it is small; a bigger number of residents will spoil that.	5812/13752	
	Objection – York is beautiful and unique and any plans to build unnecessarily should be viewed with concern. By building the planned number of homes would just attract investors who do not have the interest of York a heart and are only looking for a business opportunity.	5815/13758	
	Objection – have eco towns been considered? The plans should be reviewed to make the development in all areas of York more proportionate. Infrastructure should be in place before any housing works take place.	5828/13796	
	Objection – object to the loss of 2,000 acres of green belt that could be used for agriculture and generate up to 6,000 tons of grain per year. 33,000 extra cars would be put onto an already dilapidated and badly maintain road system. This equates to 7,478 miles of cars in and around York. If Nestle cannot transport effectively then they will leave and with that goes York's complete chocolate heritage. Does not say what kind of jobs, part time, minimum wage, skilled etc. New houses should be reduced by 11% i.e. 2,200 immediately. Infrastructure is the most important proposals, hospitals, schools and a bus station have been given no consideration.	5834/15002	
Objection – refute the information from Office for National Statistics that indicates 1,000 new jobs per year, these figures are not taking into account the large unemployment issues in the city.	5837/13813		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the scale of the plan is completely inappropriate in relation to a city the size of York especially when it impacts on the green belt so significantly. Highly concerned about the impact overall on local infrastructure due to the increase in more traffic on the roads which will struggle to cope.	5838/15000	
	Objection – concern is the high number of proposed new houses for York, how on earth will the infrastructure cope?	5840/13816	
	Objection – strongly object to the green belt being used for development.	5841/13818	
	Objection – the infrastructure is no in place to cope with the amount of housing proposed.	5847/13839	
	Comment – houses are needed instead of building thousands of flats for university students, use that land for housing and brown field sites, not greenbelt land. That is why it is called green belt.	5858/15121	
	Comment – both the figures adopted fro employment growth and population growth and the consequent housing growth are not endorsed by the recent historic growth figures for York or the Oxford Economic Forecast and Arup studies. Given this, the projected house building requirements seem significantly overestimated. Main concern is how this required expansion of supporting infrastructure will be achieved if the population of York increases as envisaged. Most of the required infrastructure expansion is outside the direct control of the council and the prospect of much of it being put in place seems somewhat unlikely due to financial and other constraints. The extra traffic on the A1237 is of particular concern.	5860/15125	
	Objection – object to the huge new housing sites around York, who wants to live in such an overcrowded city?	5867/15141	
	Objection – using council figures there are 1,500 empty houses so why do we need so many more? There is no new infrastructure. Why build on green belt land? Will increase the chance of flooding. More cars and more pollution.	5868/15142	
	Objection – York is surrounded by beautiful green belt, this makes it unique and worth preserving. What will happen to the abundance of flora and fauna and the multitude of wild life that is living in and around the proposed areas earmarked for development? The existing infrastructure and transport systems are at capacity and will be unable to cope with the volume of people and high increase in the number of cars. York promotes a cycling city how can this be when increased people equal increased pollution increasing congestion. Look at the problem existing businesses already have with premises in and around the York outer ring road, clients and customers all struggle to provide an efficient service.	5871/15150	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – not convinced by the assertion that York needs to develop in such a dramatic way. Some homes will be needed but the numbers proposed are unrealistic and will cause problems throughout the city.	5884/15178	
	Objection – see response 10M	5886/15186	
	Objection – opposed to the use of the green belt	5887/15188	
	Objection – should protect York’s greenbelt.	5888/15191	
	Objection – no to 22,000 new homes in the next 15 to 20 years, no to anything that would develop the greenbelt.	5893/15197	
	Comment – with an increasing population there needs to be a little give and take, but always with much more careful planning. The present scheme of the Labour City Council on the face of it seems to be a land grab, especially the proposal to take seventy acres for some indefinite project in the distant future.	5895/15201	
	Comment – There is no mention of how the NHS in York will cope. York hospital opened in 197 and was already oversubscribed as the population had grown in the 25 years planning stage. 37 years on and it is no wonder there are criticisms at delays etc, the staff are under so much pressure to provide a service to growing demands with no extra resources. What will an influx of 40,000 new residents do?	5897/15206	
	Comment – in agreement with Julian Sturdy’s campaign against the Local Plan.	5899/15208	
	Comment – more houses are needed and land is at a premium but the labour council seems hell bent on using huge areas of our green belt in York and this must not happen. Cannot see how affordable housing will ever be built that young people will be able to afford. Building super green houses is all very well but there should a relaxation in the regulations in order to bring the costs down.	5900/15211	
	Comment – the building of many houses on the west side of York would be a big attraction to commuters from Leeds, this would provide more income to York Council.	5902/15216	
	Objection – the proposed encroachment on to the greenbelt must be vigorously resisted.	5903/15218	
	Objection – there are no nearly enough jobs for people here already so where are all these people going to work?	5904/15220	
Comment – a consequence is virtually certain to be that infrastructure will be swamped, particularly roads, which are often overcrowded presently. Employment prospects in York are generally poor. The need for such a large number of new homes is not apparent. If it were to transpire, then considerable improvements to infrastructure would be required, particularly roads, and a dual carriageway ring road all the way around York would be an absolute necessity.	5906/15224		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – opposed to any encroachment of York’s green belt.	5911/15235	
	Objection – See response 10C. Good agricultural land.	5914/15238	
	Objection – see response 10N	5915/15240	
		5916/15242	
	Objection – see response 10I	5917/15243	
		5918/15247	
		5919/15248	
	Objection – see response 10I	5920/15249	
	Objection – see response 10J	5921/15252	
		5922/15253	
	Objection – see response 10F	5923/15256	
		5924/15257	
	Objection – see response 10M	5925/15258	
	Objection – see response 10M. Totally against due to congestion on roads and impact on drainage, environment and hospitals.	5926/15259	
	Objection – see response 10F Comment – one of Britain’s beauties is the existence of attractive villages, where the communities are sufficiently small to engender a “family atmosphere”. The plan to being our villages into the urban sprawl will destroy local interest.	5927/15261	
	Objection – see response 10I	5928/15264	
	Objection – see response 10M	5929/15265	
	Objection – see response 10F	5930/15266	
	Objection – see response 10M	5932/15268	
		5933/15269	
5934/15270			
5935/15271			
Objection – see response 10J and 10M. Against development on the greenbelt.	5936/15272		
Objection – see response 10J	5937/15274		
	5938/15275		
Objection – see response 10F Comment – reduction in green belt – why when we have a girth of brown field sites available such as the British Sugar site and the teardrop site. What will be the effect on the infrastructure as the Northern ring road system is often grid locked currently with no definite plans for improvement? Education, recreation, social and leisure	5939/15281		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
 Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)	
	facilities, all need a plan and defined actions, provision of social housing needs to defined, where will all new purchasers of houses be working, as employment around York is not scheduled to grow to the extent of all the proposed new housing village at Cliftongate, plus other Outer York village locations.			
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – See response 10C	5940/15283		
	Objection – See response 10C	5941/15285		
		5942/15286		
		5943/15287		
		5944/15288		
	Objection – see response 10L	Objection – See response 10C	5945/15289	
			5946/15292	
			5947/15297	
			5948/15299	
			5949/15300	
			5950/15301	
			5951/15302	
			5952/15303	
			5953/15305	
			5954/15306	
			5955/15308	
			5956/15309	
	Objection – see response 10H		5957/15310	
			5958/15312	
			5959/15314	
5960/15315				
5961/15316				
5962/15320				
5963/15325				
5964/15327				
Objection – See response 10B		5965/15328		
		5966/15329		
		5967/15330		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – See response 10B. Adding more people to Haxby and Wigginton with housing proposals to build on the greenbelt will cause havoc with extra traffic.	5968/15331	
	Objection – See response 10B	5969/15334	
		5970/15335	
	Objection – See response 10B. We have more than enough empty areas to use before Green Belt.	5971/15336	
	Objection – See response 10B. Over population must be stopped.	5972/15337	
	Objection – See response 10B. The roads need to be properly repaired and maintained.	5973/15338	
	Objection – See response 10B. This is destroying the greenbelt and improvements need to be made to infrastructure.	5974/15339	
	Objection – See response 10B. No School, No access, no need	5975/15340	
	Objection – See response 10B	5976/15343	
	Objection – See response 10B. All necessary support infrastructure needs to be considered for Greenfield sites.	5977/15344	
	Objection – See response 10B	5978/15348	
		5980/15350	
		5981/15353	
	Objection – see response 10A	5982/15354	
	Objection – see response 10A. Extra housing is needed, smaller homes should be considered. Also flats and apartments. This enables those who wish to downsize to do so, releasing more family sized homes.	5983/15356	
	Objection – see response 10A	5984/15358	
		5985/15360	
		5986/15361	
		5987/15363	
		5988/15365	
5989/15367			
	5990/15369		
Objection – See response 10D	5991/15373		
Objection – See response 10C	5992/15374		
Objection – See response 10D	5993/15375		
	5994/15377		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – See response 10D	5995/15378	
		5996/15380	
		5997/15382	
	Objection – See response 10D. The greenbelt should not be used for building.	5998/15386	
	Objection – See response 10D	5999/15388	
		6000/15389	
	Objection – see response 10I	6001/15390	
	Objection – See response 10D	6002/15391	
		6003/15393	
		6004/15394	
	Objection – See response 10D	6005/15396	
		6006/15397	
		6007/15398	
		6008/15400	
		6009/15401	
		6010/15403	
		6011/15404	
		6012/15405	
		6013/15407	
		6014/15408	
		6015/15409	
		6016/15410	
		6017/15411	
		6018/15414	
	6019/15415		
	6020/15416		
	6021/15418		
	6022/15419		
	6023/15420		
	6024/15422		
Objection – see response 10G Comment – Before any further development for housing, shopping centres, the outer ring road needs priority for a dual carriage way and also the A4 to Scarborough. There is congestion at peak times all ready, also at Monks Cross roundabout at weekends.	6025/15424		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The roads won't cope with all this extra traffic. York needs new businesses and factories for employment before anymore housing.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – see response 10G	6026/15432	
	Objection – see response 10G. Most people in York are on low wages and so cannot afford new houses or raise a deposit.	6027/15434	
	Objection – see response 10G	6028/15435	
	Objection – See response 10C	6029/15436	
	Objection – see response 10G	6030/15437	
		6031/15438	
		6032/15439	
		6033/15440	
	Objection – see response 10L Comment – the greenbelt should be protected, houses can be built elsewhere.	6034/15442	
	Objection – see response 10E	6035/15445	
	Objection – see response 10K. Greenbelt must be left alone.	6036/15448	
	Comment –do not understand the social or economic reasons for this increase in housing, Exactly why does York need to grow? Surely, our beautiful small city should be preserved as just that. Expansion would just mean that the city becomes a sprawling mass of urbanisation. The pressure on the local infrastructure will be immense. Roads, hospitals, schools, dental and health surgeries will all feel e strain and is there really cash to invest in these to keep up with the demand created?	6043/15472	
	Comment – welcome the Council's intentions to increase the housing target beyond that set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Question whether 1090 is sufficient to meet the identified housing need; it is not sufficient to address the identified affordable housing need. Either the council need to increase the housing target to address the affordable housing nee, or else, set out the means by which the affordable housing requirement will be met beyond developer contributions so as to deliver closer to the annual target of 790 affordable units.	6046/15476	
	Comment – the amount of housing proposed is very large and as little green belt land should be used as possible, his is because farmers need to increase food production as much as possible while protecting the environment.	6047/15480	
Comment – concerned about the scale of the proposals and their potentially devastating effect upon wildlife, and the potential detriment of York.	6050/15490		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b>	Comment – concerns about increasing the housing stock by 20,000.	6052/15492	
	Comment – Previous reports undertaken by the council have stated that approximately 800 houses are needed each year. Do we really suddenly need 50 more than this original figure per year? Believe the most recent report does not state that we need more than 1200 homes per year and is more in keeping with the original 800. Where is the justification for this sudden increase? With the recent news that the college of law is to close and move to Leeds, demand for property at this side of York will decrease. Students from the University of York or York St John University will not travel from this site of York and as such property that was used as student accommodation will become available. As a country we are showing signs of recover from a recession yet we are not aware that there was this much investment in jobs in the years before the recession, as such, can it really be concluded that we will now get this high number of new jobs. York is a city whose workforce is predominantly tourist/service based and many workers are on low/minimum wage. It will take more than an increase in the number of properties available for the vast majority of York residents to be able to afford their own home. If the plan is to increase the number of houses built to reduce the overall value of each individual property already built, many York residents will find themselves in negative equity, and unless they sell at a loss, it will remove current properties from the available market. A large proportion of the green belt around York is prime agricultural land. During recent years there has been increased pressure on agricultural land. Ever acre of agricultural land removed from agriculture will mean an increase in the requirements of food imports. Agricultural land must be protected.	6055/15500	
	Comment – due to the lack of consultation time it has not been possible to test the efficacy of the extremely inspirational employment growth figures (forge quality jobs) and how they have been manipulated to the purpose. Confidence is slim that the economic forecasting is robust, or even accurate with obvious knock on effects on the pushing numbers.	6056/15505	
	Objection – the amount of housing development proposed in the Plan is too great for a City the size of York. The evidence does not support the proposed building of 22,000 homes. This scale of expansion far exceeds the levels of house building achieved in recent years and appears to be at odds with the council's own report from Arup, which says that even 850 is ambitious. It seems to take no account of slower rate of growth identified in the last census or the reduced projections from the Office of National Statistics.	6057/15506	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Support – however it is considered appropriate for part ii of policy SS2 to acknowledge there is a need to release land from the greenbelt adjacent to existing settlements to ensure the Council can deliver its identified housing requirement.	6062/15510	ID Planning
	Objection – see response 11	6064/15519	
	Objection – the proposal that there is a need or, in fact, a desire to build in excess of 1,100 houses per annum is unrealistic. Looking at any trend forecast for the growth of York in the foreseeable future, it is in conceivable that York will achieve growth to merit this sort of number. The development lacks sustainability and will increase the pressures on a road network which is already creaking in numerous places. There is an argument which believes that if housing is provided in large numbers then the price of housing in York will fall. With respect, this is purely fallacious. Unless you hugely downgrade the attractiveness of York, it can be anticipated that York will remain a relatively expensive place to live. If there is an over supply of land, it will encourage developers to cherry pick and not necessarily carry out development in a sequential manner which is both undesirable to the City and sustainability. The draft Local Plan provides numerous developments outside the ring road as suburban “add ons”. Generally speaking, such development has a domino effect in terms of pressure. In each locality such development will put significant pressure on local services such as roads, schools, recreational space and the like. The northern ring road is totally inadequate for the load put upon it present. York is one of the rare few gems, both nationally and internationally. There are very few cities with such unspoilt features from roman, Viking and medieval times. It is, though a frail environment and one which needs significant protection. The ultimate conclusion of the domino approach is that significant pressures land upon the City centre and pressures move inwardly radially. The current draft local plan seeks to create a suburban sprawl of mediocrity, detrimental to the significant and historical character of York, upon which the local economy depends so heavily. It would rely on a creaking infrastructure and it would weaken it further. The draft plan should be amended to annual numbers should be reduced to circa 800. In so far as any greenbelt is needed the same should be minimised to preserve the historic setting of the City and prevent coalescence. It should be provided at one location with good highway connectivity.	6065/15525	
	Comment – concerned at the lack of forward planning of infrastructure to cope with an expansion of York’s housing. There should be consideration given to the schools requirement. Water treatment and supply should also be addressed.	6135/15581	
		6143/17227	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – these unrealistic building targets for the city of York will result in an out of control; urban sprawl, destroying the character of our very special city and the historic villages which surround it. The inability of the road system to cope with increased congestion.	6145/15619	
	Support – this policy appears to be based on a comprehensive and robust assessment of factors that will influence growth in and around York and highlights the constraints and opportunities for new development.	6160/15662	
	Objection – staggered by the total disregard the Council has for upholding the development for 22,000 homes (16,000 on the greenbelt) and the added congestion that would bring.	6167/15684	
	Comment- proposed housing sites are too big, York does need to grow but maintain its current pleasant small city feeling.	6168/15689	
	Comment – the housing figures are too many to be sustainable given the road capacity, jobs available and infrastructure.	6169/15690	
	Objection – statistically it is impossible that York should need over 22,000 new houses. The jobs created by building new homes should not be counted in the Council's prediction of 1,000 new jobs a year for the next 15 years as these jobs would not be permanent	6177/15711	
	Comment – many sites in the city centre are derelict, many properties over shops unoccupied so there is much scope for providing residences here. Why does some of the green belt need to be safeguarded, it should all be so. How is the Council planning to protect the green belt in the face of central government plans to allow development?	6179/15715	
	Objection – opposed to the use of green belt for housing development and for the number of houses in excess of those that studies suggest is needed, that is 25,000 instead of 17,000. Suspect this is not affordable. What are the brownfield options?	6180/15717	
	Objection – totally against the use of building on the green belt. There are laws to control development in the green belt which should be adhered to. Brownfield sites should be used first. York's road structure is under stress already. Proposed population increase of 20% will put extra stress on essential infrastructure	6200/15731	
	Objection – considered that villages should remain villages as that is the reason people live there. Continued urban sprawl is turning a very special city into another Leeds.	6203/15739	
Comment – it seems that every available green space is to be built on when there are brownfield sites available.	6206/15740		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – national policy clearly states that preference should be given to brownfield sites, do not believe genuine consideration has been given to these. Specifically the York Central and Sugar Beet Factory sites are still largely vacant yet do not appear to have been considered for new housing development.	6212/15746	
	Objection – disagree with house building on the greenbelt. The suburbs and villages should not bear the brunt of any housing boom. Focus on brownfield and urban sites to start with.	6213/15752	
	Objection – protest again the 22,000 houses proposes, 16,000 of which will be in the greenbelt. Such a vast number is incomprehensible and 1,000 news jobs is unrealistic. The roads are clogged by the increase of cars. York will quickly lose its special appeal. It is impossible to build thousands of homes and have no new roads, schools, doctors etc. More importantly York District Hospital cannot take on any more patients.	6217/15755	
	Objection – destruction of the greenbelt, the council wishes to build more areas like Clifton Moor and Monks Cross without placing access roads around these areas, thus creating even more traffic problems.	6223/15771	
	Objection – against the proposed release of greenbelt land for housing and business development, lack of consideration to the needs of local infrastructure which is already hugely congested, there has been no social or economic reason proposed or offered to justify he massive expansion of housing land, object to the expansion of this beautiful historic city. Object due to the extremely stained nature of the local road infrastructure.	6224/15773	
	Objection – there is no social or economic reason in York for a huge increase in housing, the local roads would be unable to cope with associated increase in traffic. York is unique and historic city no o be turned into an urban sprawl. These are hugely unrealistic building targets.	6225/15780	
	Objection – any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it and after all brownfield sites in the city have been utilised. The creation of jobs is one thing, but only really good if those jobs pay people a reasonable living wage, which is not the case with the majority of jobs in York. I have not come across anything that links expected value of housing with expected income from created jobs.	6227/15783	
	Objection – it is complete lunacy to build any more houses on green belt land, especially in the beautiful city of York. Thee are a shortage of jobs already, where are these extra people going to work?	6235/15805	
	Objection – there has been no case made for the requirement of so many additional houses. The idea that many additional jobs will be created is not based on any firm	6243/15815	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	plans. Will destroy hundreds of acres of farmland in the greenbelt. There are no plans for infrastructure improvements or the provision of schools.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – a very basic question that needs to be answered is if 22,000 houses are to be built over the next 15-20 years, where are the jobs for the occupants of these houses. If one assumes that 50% of wives/partners work that would require over 30,000 new jobs. Where are these coming from, how can you justify building this vast number of houses.	6248/15819	
	Objection – the basis of which the number of new houses have been decided. The significant increases proposed in the Local Plan under consultation far exceed the numbers required. Some developments are likely to become satellite commuter areas for Leeds.	6249/15820	
	Objection - far too many houses with no proposals for where their jobs would be or how you would create them.	6251/15823	
	Objection – the proposal to build 22,000 new homes is nothing short of ludicrous.	6261/15835	
	Objection – 22,000 houses is far too many for York. Would alter the whole feel of the city. The infrastructure is already struggling; York will not provide sufficient jobs for those who are encouraged to live here, people will have to travel elsewhere to work and many more car journeys would necessarily ensue. The greenbelt must be maintained.	6269/15842	
	Objection –the local plan will be remembered by meeting targets set by doing what they were asked to do by building lots of straightforward houses across a draft greenbelt this encouraging urban sprawl and yet another near identical soulless city. Option two: seized the opportunity to invigorate the historic and beautiful City of York by creating a bold ad visionary plan that protected the Greenbelt forever, brought new life to the heart of the city and used the plan to catalyse positive growth, once again, to make York become England's Second City.	6275/15860	
	Comment – driving in York appears to be difficult and stressful already. The promotions of walking, cycling and public transport is good but fails to acknowledge that some have to drive and that this will always be the case, Building large new residential areas on the ring road will presumably lead to gridlock.	6279/15871	Yorkstories.co.uk
	Objection – it is important that any site that is proposed for removal from the greenbelt should be subject to an analysis of its greenbelt character value prior to any further stages of the Local Plan. Housing numbers and economic growth are no realistic and should be lowered to ensure that York remains a compact historic city, lower than 850 per annum.	6284/15881	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – believe the proposals based on an additional 1000 jobs per annum are fundamentally flawed; it is unacceptable to build on Greenfield sites within the green belt whilst so much brownfield land within the city remains undeveloped.	6285/15886	
	Objection – proposals for 22,000 new houses is inappropriate, especially so many on greenbelt. This would alter the character of York. There are not enough schools, roads or medical services. Thousands of jobs have been lost in the last decade and t is no guaranteed these will be replaced.	6290/15897	
	Objection – there is no point in having a greenbelt if it is so readily disregarded,	6291/15899	
	Objection – York is almost unique in the UK for its heritage which the plan threatens to undermine by the proposed expansion of the city on greenbelt land, already planning has allowed out of town shopping centres that are harming the commercial life of the city centre, there are long term consequences of destroying the city resident’s love.	6294/15916	
	Objection – over optimistic growth forecasts that in turn lead to multiple options for housing development, a proliferation of potential search sites for wind turbines, uncertain infrastructure requirements and total disregard of the historically established greenbelt.	6296/15919	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6297/15927	
	Comment – sites for development should be strategically selected, not picked from sites offered. What plans are there for complementary schools, hospitals, local service and how will the increase in transport be accommodated? Where will the extra jobs be accommodated, sustainable development should require a balance between population growth and employment.	6299/15931	
	Objection – it is essential that initiatives are undertaken reasonably and with full awareness of the issues of deliverability, sustainability and the long term effects in the quality of life for existing citizens. Building on land prone to flooding is not a sensible long term solution. Are 22,000 houses over 15 years deliverable? What are the implications for the increase in traffic on the approach roads and in the centre of the city? Need to widen roads and develop public transport.	6303/15939	
	Objection – to the local plan proposals to allocate so much green belt land for potential future housing. All available brownfield sits should be used before resorting to building on the greenbelt. Identify existing housing that has been empty for a number of years.	6305/15942	
	Comment – reassured to hear that brownfield sites will be built on before any greenbelt land is used. The greenbelt needs protecting and we need space for nature and for recreation.	6307/15946	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – taken together, the need to maintain the compactness/urban form of the city of York and the role and function of the outer ring road in achieving this important aim does question whether any sites immediately adjoining the outer ring road ought to be considered to accommodate housing or employment growth. The council has a well established record of viewing the outer ring road as the key feature in containing and directing most growth within its boundaries. This approach is supported.	6319/15971	
	Objection – what sort of a community can exist in a clump of housing plonked next to the ring road and not adjacent to anywhere? What will be done to improve the ring road?	6322/17234	
	Objection – the council have no respect for the preservation of the greenbelt. The whole of the character of the city will be destroyed. The number of houses proposed is alarming, will make travel difficult and increasing air pollution.	6323/15981	
	Objection – York is a small medieval city, not a sprawling metropolis. More housing is needed but not at the expense of the greenbelt. Industry and jobs should come first, to ensure employment. Most important is infrastructure and duelling of ring road.	6325/15986	
	Comment – employment provision will be required to match requirements across the plan period. The existing playing fields to the east of the college could e developed with the playing fields being relocated to some of the land to provide a logical campus type arrangement.	6327/17648	Blacker Brothers
	Comment – there is no move to redevelop current existing brownfield sites. The plan suggests using hundreds of acres of arable land. The main growth is from the University expansion and the current high standing of York as a tourist location. There is a daily export of workers to other area, as not all skills can be catered for within York.	6338/16017	
	Comment – quantum of land proposed supported, it will, however, be necessary for the next version of the emerging plan to justify this target following a reduction in one component of the requirement. The range of build out rates translates to continuous construction throughout the plan period.	6339/16006	The Merchant Taylors Of York & R & M Gorwood
	Comment – quantum of land proposed supported, it will, however, be necessary for the next version of the emerging plan to justify this target following a reduction in one component of the requirement. The range of build out rates translates to continuous construction throughout the plan period.	6341/16012	
	Comment – quantum of land proposed supported, it will, however, be necessary for the next version of the emerging plan to justify this target following a reduction in one component of the requirement. The range of build out rates translates to continuous	6344/16022	Escrick Park Estate

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	construction throughout the plan period.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Support – last paragraph of policy SS2 particularly. Based on a proportionate evidence base and justified.	6349/16031	Linden Homes North
	Comment – the plan should take a longer term view with regards the Green Belt boundary than the 25 years currently proposed. The Arup study identifies the 1,090 figure would not deal with the backlog of need for affordable housing in York. The council should plan more positively and aspires to 1,500 dwellings per annum.	6351/17170	Gladedale Estates
	Objection – the Local Plan does not provide for Greenbelt boundaries which take into account the current period. The green belt boundaries should be based on objective criteria and not mitigate against development in the longer term.	6355/17716	Askham Bryan College
	Objection – the Local Plan does not provide for Greenbelt boundaries which take into account the current period. The green belt boundaries should be based on objective criteria and not mitigate against development in the longer term.	6356/17697	
	Support – considered appropriate for part ii to acknowledge there is a need to release land from the greenbelt adjacent to existing settlements to ensure the council can deliver its identified housing requirement.	6357/16055	Ainscough Strategic Land
	Objection – there is a lack of infrastructure to support these new developments. Schooling is a significant concern; the local school is already under pressure. The current road network already experiences severe traffic delays which will worsen as a result of significant additional road users. There has been a lack of consideration for the wider implications of the plans and object to the scale of development.	6358/16064	
	Comment - York City Council is pursuing a development strategy of around 1,150 dwelling units a year based upon an economic growth model. Would suggest that this target should be progressed as a minimum. It is important that the strategy (as far as possible) integrates the provision of jobs and homes along with the consideration of accessibility and movement. For employment it is also important to have regard to the operational needs of businesses and employers.	6362/16078	
	Comment – the settled community expansions should be permitted in accordance with their neighbourhood plans.	6363/17700	
	Comment – housing numbers but approach to employment lacks vision and imagination. Job targets should be at least 20,000. Not all jobs come from high technology, science, tourism and office work. Doubts that Edinburgh, Cambridge, bath or Guildford are useful comparators.	6364/17709	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – there is too much new housing shown for the east side of York, compared to the west. Infrastructure to the east is struggling already.	6365/16080	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the local plan seems to include a number of housing sites with no thought to infrastructure or sustainability in these areas. Both the A1237 and A64 are a challenge at the moment without more housing schemes to add to the mix.	6370/16088	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – York is a small, historic city with limited infrastructure. The addition of so many homes will mean more cars on the roads and dangerous levels of congestion. New schools will have to be built but where? And where will the money come from for these developments? The local social services are struggling to meet the needs of the population in all age groups and the health service will not be able to cope. Why do we need an influx of 44,000 economic migrants?	6374/16099	
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Support – York needs plenty more housing. As the owner of an IT business in the science park, struggle to attract people due to the high costs of property and rent. York should push even further to increase the level of housing on offer.	6378/16109	Rapita Systems
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Support – support 1,090 completions a year. It will be necessary for the next version of the emerging plan to justify the retention following a reduction in the requirement (census). The number of small and medium size residential sites should be significantly increased, where possible, Housing allocations should be extended in a sustainable manner.	6383/16113	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Support – support 1,090 completions a year. It will be necessary for the next version of the emerging plan to justify the retention following a reduction in the requirement (census). The number of small and medium size residential sites should be significantly increased, where possible, Housing allocations should be extended in a sustainable manner.	6384/16119	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Linden Homes
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – would wish to see further analysis of sites and their cumulative impact on cross boundary links to North Yorkshire to destinations including Harrogate (A59/A168 junctions), Selby, Malton and Thirsk/Northallerton. To date the county council haven't seen any evidence to demonstrate that the additional development at York will not have a detrimental impact on North Yorkshire's highway network. In particular the impact of the urban extensions at Clifton Moor and south east at Whinthorpe.	6385/16125	North Yorkshire County Council Highways
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – the overall strategy is fundamentally flawed as the infrastructure to accommodate an increased population of nearly 100,000 has not been addressed and there is a lack of employment opportunities. Infrastructure apparently ignored includes the hospital, existing roads and parking facilities, extra or expanded schools, basic other facilities such as refuse and fire stations. The development of this infrastructure would necessitate considerable capital expenditure. Removal of swathes of the green belt areas is to be deprecated as outlined in various Village Design Statements.	6423/16142	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Objection – why is north/east York being over developed when areas in the south and west appear to be left in peace?	6428/16152	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6328	
		6433/6336	
		6434/6344	
		6435/6352	
	Objection – an infrastructure delivery plan is required setting out what new infrastructure, roads, utilities etc may be required to deliver new housing and other development. There should also be a community infrastructure proposal enable the preferred options to be assessed in terms of deliverability and viability. It is not clear whether the local plan has been prepared in association with adjoining authorities and or other bodies. Has the Council explored delivering part of its housing needs beyond the green belt boundary? Core Strategy reviews of neighbouring authorities may allow the accommodation of some of York’s housing growth in new settlements beyond York’s green belt boundary.	6439/16157	
	Objection – York is a small historic city and has been over developed already. Would love to work in York but have to travel to Leeds, Bradford, Hull, Harrogate, Thirsk and Scarborough. York is not a suburb of Leeds. There should be no new housing built apart from on disused sites. Traffic is stop start fro most of the day and any more building will only make this worse.	6456/16182	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6457/6373 6467/6393	
	Objection – York’s road system is inadequate for the existing amount of traffic. The proposed plans for more housing will compound the problem. Amenities would not be able to cope	6470/16191	
Objection – the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum or less than 850 should be built. 1,090 houses a year is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used.	6477/16198		
Objection – the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum or less than 850 should be built. 1,090 houses a year is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used.	6484/16222		
Objection – the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum or less than 850 should be built. 1,090 houses a year is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the	6485/16213		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	city. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used.		
Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued	Comment – development outside the A64 and ring road should only be permitted if contiguous with existing development e.g. Haxby and Copmanthorpe.	6493/16226	
	Objection- opposed to the use of green belt to enlarge York when there is so much brownfield land available that has been left empty for so long.	6495/16229	
	Support – fully support the move to designate the ings as green belt land.	6497/16233	
	Objection – see response 10H	6501/16243	
	Objection – green belt should always be protected. Brownfield should always be used rather than green belt. Why the great need for such a high building project and growth in such a short space of time? York is such a special city and has a charm which will be irrevocably spoilt. There would be a lot of continued disruption for such large scale sites which would increase traffic congestion, stress, accident potential etc. Taking away green belt land that is used in agriculture is foolish because it mean less food grown.	6502/16245	
	Objection – green belt should always be protected. Brownfield should always be used rather than green belt. Why the great need for such a high building project and growth in such a short space of time? York is such a special city and has a charm which will be irrevocably spoilt. There would be a lot of continued disruption for such large scale sites which would increase traffic congestion, stress, accident potential etc. Taking away green belt land that is used in agriculture is foolish because it mean less food grown.	6503/16249	
	Objection – see response 11	6505/16254	
	Objection – see response 11	6506/16260	
	Objection – the exceptional level of proposed growth will place a strain on the city’s infrastructure with no plans in place to upgrade these facilities. The plan denigrates rather than preserves York’ setting and special character. Concept of a policy on scenario based on faster growth for employment is overly ambitious. York’s employment has actually declined from the peak ears from 2003 to 2011 by 13,000 or 11%. 20,000 dwellings with an average build of 1,090 per year is unsupported by any reliable statistical evidence regarding current or future population, housing and employment trends. Housing numbers should be guided by the Office of National Statistics with much lower population predictions.	6508/17652	City Of York Council Conservative Group
Objection – economic growth proposed exceeds that which is realistic or desirable for this ‘special’ city. A pursuit of economic growth far in excess of that traditionally	6510/16283	Cllr Joseph D Watt	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>achieved would require a substantial migrating workforce and greater use of the available brownfield sites for industry than there had been in previous draft plans. This in turn would reduce the number of houses that could be build on brownfield sites and so has increased the allocation of housing on the city's agricultural land. Considered that the plan should adopt lower housing growth figures of less than 800 dwellings per year. Adopting a more traditional economic growth target would mean more brownfield sites for housing.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Comment – absolutely necessary for Heslington that York adopts a local plan in order to formally define a greenbelt and protect the character and setting of the current settlement of Heslington. Welcomes the classification of Heslington as washed over greenbelt and the exclusion of land for development this will ensure its character and setting will be protected. The commitment to developing existing brownfield sites and to housing a greater proportion of student residents on campus – for the benefit of the whole community – are also a positive</p>	<p>6511/16292</p>	<p>Cllr David Levene</p>
	<p>Objection – concerned that York's infrastructure can neither cope with 22,000 extra homes or in fact needs such a quantity in the life of the plan. Particularly object to the vast majority (around 16,000) which would be taken from precious green belt. There appears to be no realistic evidence to support this level of development. The council must ensure it is proactive in building on brownfield land ahead of any other. Major housing development of the scale proposed without significant infrastructure improvements will only lead to further gridlock and ultimately a deterrent to inward employment investment.</p>	<p>6514/16303</p>	<p>Cllr Paul Doughty</p>
	<p>Objection – residents are concerned about the impact of the proposed scale of development on the historic city and on the greenbelt. Object to the levels of growth in the plan, they are over ambitious. Housing targets should be lower and reflect more closely the demand from new employment. There should be more not less housing on brownfield sites. There should be a windfall allowance. This approach would remove the need to develop green belt sites. There are a number of sites that affect the setting of the city and do not comply with the purpose of the green belt (ST7, H9 and H6). In other places the sites fill the space between the current boundary of the built up area and outer ring road which sets a precedent for the future. The contention of the Labour administration that in-commuting is a major cause of congestion and that people live outside the city solely because of high house prices, meaning that young people wishing to get on the housing ladder have to move out of York to cheaper areas. There is no evidence to support this assumption. There is no evidence to</p>	<p>6516/16318</p>	<p>City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>support the assumption that most commuters would find suitable local employment. In and out commuting is likely to remain a significant factor in the future. Para 47 refers to 1250 dwellings and says it relates to the capacity arising from identified housing sites excluding any windfalls. This appears to be saying that the sites have been identified before the housing requirements have been established. The draft plan does not include any modelling work in order to link jobs growth to housing need nor does it try to analyse how each of the drivers of housing demand – jobs growth, creation of new family units, commuting, overcrowding – contribute to the housing growth figures. International migration has been overestimated in the Arup report. Difficult to support any of the housing growth options. Disagree with the removal of any windfall allowance which is short sighted. Need a plan that sees the historic city grow to meet the needs of the current and future population whilst reflecting the heritage and history that is the very essence of York? Do not believe that the plan can meet those objectives and needs considerable amendments before it can be adopted. Comment - the development of small business is seen as desirable. More attention needs to be paid to placing such sites near to housing developments to decrease the necessity for car use.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – no convincing modelling figures linking jobs growth to housing need. No attempt to hypothecate how a housing growth figure of 1090 per annum would be apportioned between the drivers of housing demand. Despite the forecast growth being nearly double the level suggested in the 2011 local plan the proposed transport investment profiles are virtually identical. This is a major flaw in the argument advanced for high growth rates. York has a green belt protected by government order. The council has failed at a macro level to demonstrate the need to use this land for housing and at a site level has failed to respect the reasons – included in previous draft plans - for their including in the green belt. The effect on the general environment could be disastrous. It will potentially destroy the very reasons that are prompting investors to come to the city.</p>	<p>6517/16350</p>	<p>York Central Liberal Democrats</p>
	<p>Objection – criterion i) needs to be amended. The plan should provide sufficient land to meet the needs of York residents for housing, food, energy and recreation over the plan period and for future residents based on innate population projections. Acting as an economic driver for the Leeds city region should not be its primary objective. The excessively high levels of growth will not only have a direct negative effect on York's environment in terms of traffic impact, air pollution, water supplies and sewerage systems, biodiversity, open space, the setting and character of the city and the loss of</p>	<p>6518/16364</p>	<p>York Green Party</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>a significant amount of high quality agricultural land (grade 2-3) but the impact on York's de facto green belt could also jeopardise the potential for the city to develop in an environmentally sustainable and self sufficient way in the future.</p> <p>Support – support the aspirations of criterion ii) and iii)</p> <p>Comment – cannot see how the plan as presented will enable the aspirations of criterion ii) to be achieved. Given the approval of the leisure and retail development at Monks Cross it is difficult to see how criterion iii) can be sustainable as it is likely that both centres will develop characteristics of alternative city centre.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS2 Delivering Sustainable Growth For York Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – protection of the historic and natural environment and quality of life for existing York residents is incompatible with the proposals in the plan. The starting point for the plan should have been a thorough and independent environmental capacity study to ascertain just how much future growth York can accommodate without compromising the very qualities that the local plan refers to.</p>	6521/16494	Cllr Mark Warters
	<p>Comment – whilst it is accepted that there is a need for new housing in the city, considered that all such additional housing should be built first where exiting planning approval exists, second on brownfield sites, third on windfall sites and lastly on green belt land only where there is no alternative. A clear indication of prioritisation should be given in the plan; its present approach seems to favour development on green belt land as a lower cost option as opposed to brownfield and other sites.</p>	6522/16501	Cllrs P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
	<p>Objection – the road network is already over burdened and at peak times grid locked. There seems to be no plans to ease the situation by road widening or expansion.</p>	6523/16511	
	<p>Objection – the claim that the aim is to deliver affordable housing for York residents and their families is not borne out by evidence. Arup report states that need for homes will be fuelled by migration of 228,000 from outside the city and 50,000 from outside UK. It has the potential to flood the city with houses without the population growth to occupy. Housing numbers are neither realistic nor deliverable. Policy requires a 40% increase on the 10 year completion rate and 58% increase on the five year average. It seeks annual delivery that has only been achieved twice in recent times and even then only through the type of high density apartment building that this plan does not seek. NPPF states that figures should be drawn from SHMAs, but this plan attempts to use employment projections to fit a desire for higher housing targets. Evidence states that basing housing needs on economic growth is at best risky and such approaches have been rejected by planning inspector. The environmental impacts of such an approach have not been carefully considered as highlighted in the Arup report. Pressure has been increased by the failure to include windfall sites,</p>	7313/17760	Cllr N Ayre

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	despite changes to legislation that now allows such inclusion.		
	Objection – oppose plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years.	Petition 1	
	Objection – oppose plans to use green belt land across York to build 22,000 houses over the next 15 years.	Petition 4	
	Objection – acknowledge the need for more housing in York, but believe the figure of 22,000 homes to be too high and the loss of over 1000 acres of green belt land to be unsustainable.	Petition 15	
	Comment – the housing target may be aspirational but is likely to be unachievable.	Petition 20	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution</b>	Comment – concerned about the impact of growth on cross boundary strategic infrastructure, most notably the A64. Keen to work with the Council, other adjoining authorities and the Highways Agency to ensure that the cumulative impact of growth can be addressed and a coordinated approach to developer contributions/Community Infrastructure Levy to secure improvements can be considered and agreed.	6/11642	Ryedale District Council
	Support – pleased to see that the Council expect to meet the city’s assessed growth needs within the plan area, without putting development pressure on neighbouring local authorities.	7/11646	Hambleton District Council
	Support – satisfied that York can realise growth aspirations within its own territory.	9/11652	Selby District Council
	Objection – should one of the urban extensions or the Whinthorpe proposal fall there appears to be no contingency or flexibility within the Preferred Options to make up the difference. No evidence that the potential for new settlements beyond the city (or green belt) boundary has been considered or explored therefore not all reasonable alternatives have been examined.	46/12591	Heslington Village Trust
	Objection – the removal of the priority for development on brownfield sites and the allocation of Greenfield sites for new settlements is clearly designed to get developers to finance the provision of affordable homes. Past performance does not support such an assumption.	47/12582	CPRE (York and Selby District)
	Objection – no evidence that the potential for new settlements beyond the city boundary has been considered or explored. Should one of the urban extensions or the Whinthorpe proposal fall there appears to be no contingency or flexibility within the Preferred Options to make up the difference.	48/12600	Heslington Parish Council
	Objection – if housing numbers are not reduce to a more realistic level, the plan will allocate more land than is actually required which will result in developers picking off those sites which are the easiest to develop; brownfield sites will be left undeveloped and irreparable harm will be done to the countryside around York. Object to building on prime farmland when extensive brownfield sites are available in the urban area of York.	57/12615	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – there should be a hierarchy of development; needs should be met as far as possible by brownfield sites, then the two new large villages/towns and then extensions to existing settlements. The latter in the site order deemed least damaging in accordance with their individual neighbourhood plans. Support the commitment to development on brownfield sites as a priority but the densities should be higher (as in 2011 Local Development Framework) to relieve some of the pressure on Greenfield sites.	59/12643	Dunnington Parish Council

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – Naburn Designer Outlet should be deleted as a priority area for economic development (see comments on ST21). Germany Beck should not be identified as a Strategic Site as this consent is currently subject of high court challenge. Whinthorpe new settlement should be deleted (see comments on ST15). The proposed urban extensions and village sites should be reconsidered in the context of the primary purpose of the green belt which is to preserve the setting and special character of the historic city. The development of all peripheral Greenfield sites should be phased so that they are only released when necessary to maintain a 5 year requirement, otherwise there is a real danger that their release will prejudice the development of important regeneration sites such as York Central and British Sugar.	62/12692	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – the hasty creation of extensive new suburban area in the green belt, based on option 2 housing target assumptions is an irresponsible and improvident policy and the more gradual approach embodied in option 1 which should include adjustments to the ration of brownfield to green belt allocation will meet York's foreseeable needs.	65/12731	Heworth Without Parish Council
	Objection – with more effort much of the new housing could be located on brownfield sites.	74/12749	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – it is important to build on brownfield sites before encroaching on areas recognised as green belt.	80/12788	Wigginton Parish Council
	Comment – if there really must be more development in the green belt, how can it be assured that this is quality building, and not more of the same? Want distinctive, aspirational high quality architecture that York can be proud of.	88/12796	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Objection – whilst recognise the importance of re-developing land, the aim to have 60% of new development on previously developed land is simplistic and does not take into account biodiversity: some previously developed land is now a wildlife haven.	90/12832	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Support – support the spatial distribution set out in the policy including the provision of 10% for housing in villages.	144/12880	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Support- such reliance upon these large complex sites early in the plan period may compromise the delivery of the overall housing requirement and York's 5 year housing land supply. Recommends the Council provides a mixed portfolio of sites throughout the plan period and does not rely too heavily upon these complex brown field sites to maintain its supply.	145/13858	Home Builders Federation
	Objection- it needs the area for greenbelt persecutory has. Brown field sites must always come first.	164/13883	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment-no organisational comment except to encourage planners to fully consider any genuine evidence submitted by voluntary, community or social enterprise (VCSE) organisations as to suitability of specific sites. Less likely to present insight as to the economic visibility of specific sites they are perhaps the most likely valuable insight into the social and environmental impacts and benefits of sites.	178/13890	York Council for Voluntary Service
	Comment- support the identification of strategic housing and employment sizes as these are necessary to meet the considerable development needs of the city in the next 15-20 years. The capacity of brown field sites in the main urban area to deliver the necessary housing an employment land is increasingly limited. The plan is overly optimistic about the capacity of some of these sites to deliver what is required in the plan period.	187/13910	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Objection- that so much green belt land is being removed for employment and housing and especially as these areas has been considered important for the purposes of green belt up to now. The impact of green belt land setting of York will be considerable. Need to be confident that the economic ambitions for York are not at the expense of the setting and special character of York.	192/13992	
	Comment- following assessment either delete those sites detailed in the table below whose development would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the historic city. Amend the size and extent of these areas or their location. Plan will need to clearly justify why it is necessary to develop areas which seem likely to which harm elements which contribute to the special character or setting to the historic city.	238/14043	English Heritage
	Comment – show all brownfield sites that should get priority for building on before “Green” areas.	274/439	
	Objection – plan places significant reliance on new settlements to bring forward a large proportion of the housing requirement in a non sustainable location. Reservations about whether a new settlement could be brought forward quick enough to start delivering units in the early part of the plan. Question therefore whether the strategy is justified as being the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives. Object to the relatively small apportionment of new housing that is directed to the villages. By restricting more development in the villages it will become increasingly harder to sustain existing facilities and shops that may be present thus leading to additional car borne trips to larger centres. The proportion of new housing developed in the rural areas should be increased and relatively modest increases in the size of the smaller settlements could have significant benefits to those communities in terms of maintaining local services and shops and delivering	432/16543	Church Commissioners for England



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	affordable housing.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Support/objection- support the inclusion of the British sugar/Manor school site as Strategic site ST1. Object to this precise definition of percentages within each category on the basis that is overly prescriptive and not appropriate for inclusion within the local Plan. Percentage figures should therefore be removed from the policy SS3 and rather the councils strategy should be make provision for the maximum number of new homes on the most sustainable sites. i.e. recycled, urban land and the first instance.	434/16569	Associated British Foods plc
	Comment- whilst support the plan aims and efforts to boost significantly the supply of housing it as some of the requested average annual build rates from these sites of sales outlet are challenging. A wider range of smaller to medium sized sites will support delivery. Equally the potential for early release of phases of the larger urban extension sites would support delivery, where they can be delivered with appropriate commensurate supporting infrastructure.	452/16604	Miller Homes Ltd
	Objection- would be better to concentrate on brown field sites. York has numerous undeveloped brown field sites which if we go down the route of releasing the proposed amount of green field land for development.	458/16617	
	Objection- targeting out of town green field sites which builders of course prefer but not good for York residents the plan will create two car families due to the lack of facilities schools, doctors shop sand regular public transport within walking distance. The plan is environment unfriendly which will lead to more road congestion and car pollution. Public transport is inadequate. There is large amount of brown field sites within the city such as the tear drop but no consideration is given to those sites. There is a need to look again at the local plan and develop brown field sites within the city.	459/16620	
	Objection- strongly feels that the current expansion plans are far too excessive for the Haxby area. Feel that the brown field sites should be used before the Greenfield sites. Feel that York should be looking more sustainable developments.	497/16629	
	Objection – need to ensure that all sites identified are deliverable. Question the sustainability of making provision of 29% of the housing needs within a new settlement (eco settlement) on a site currently within the green belt. There is insufficient evidenced based research to back up the delivery of such a scheme. Therefore consider that this 29% should be allocated elsewhere which is already in close proximity to the existing local services and facilities and where it would also have less impact on the green belt. Therefore consider that option 2 – prioritising	528/16660	York Diocesan Board of Finance

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through the provision in the villages – is more suitable for this plan period.		
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection- concerns that too much of the city's housing requirement has been directed to ST15 and that this level of development cannot be achieved in the plan period. It would be more realistic if this percentage was reduced and the other percentages increased to compensate.	534/16699	DPP One Ltd
	Objection- do not agree with the proposed distribution. Reliance on three large sites (Holmes hill, north of Clifton moor and east of Metcalfe Lane) to meet the majority of the requirement will mean that the plan under delivers.	540/16729	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection – Policy SS3 is not justified. Failure to recognise the Regiona Spatial Strategy (RSS) creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16744	
	Objection – disagree with building on green land till all brownfield sites are built on such as Hungate, tear drop site, British sugar factory, Terry's, old manor school and old civil service playing fields.	548/16780	
	Objection – the plan is unsustainable and unsuitable. Strongly opposed – should instead focus on developing brownfield sites.	551/16790	
	Comment – concern over delivery of York Central (ST5) and Former British Sugar (ST1) sites, which could impact on overall 5yr housing supply. Recommend that policy refer to phasing timescale for complex brownfield sites, including those above and Nestle South (ST17).	659/15070	Persimmon Homes
	Objection – the allocation of an excessive amount of greenbelt land should be avoided. Emphasis should be placed on bringing forward existing allocated and consented land, by the necessary de-risking through reduced or complete removal of affordable housing requirements.	668/16810	
	Objection – if more homes are required it would make more sense to locate them on brownfield sites near already improved infrastructure and existing services. Further increase in transport links to Heslington Village or University from Whinthorpe would take it beyond saturation point.	670/16812	
	Support – general support for aspirations within York's spatial strategy.	673/16838	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Comment – major developments must enhance the city and be designed carefully.	679/16858	
	Comment – new housing to be explored on brownfield/empty sites.	698/16866	
	Objection – the plan is predicated on a number of non-factual assumptions, including that huge amounts of brownfield land has not yet been developed/released.	801/4546	
	Comment – why not concentrate on existing brownfield sites (Terry's, Rowntrees, and Land to rear of York Station) and land already consented. The quality of semi-rural	837/16921	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village of Huntington is at risk.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Objection – the first draft local plan, which was withdrawn, suggested several brownfield sites. These have not been included in the new plan, with the result that 22,000 houses are proposed on greenbelt land. This would have significant environmental impacts, including on the use of energy and water, traffic and emissions, strained infrastructure and services and general quality of life.	940/16946	
	Objection – it was formerly the intention of the Council to avoid development outside the ring road- this has now been blatantly overturned, creating the potential for steadily expanding urban sprawl. Questions whether neighbouring authorities have been consulted to determine alternative development options.	994/17009	
	Objection – plans for thousands of homes on the edge of York will threaten the green belt. Potential sites for over 1100 new homes are currently available, and have not been included in the Local Plan housing site list, including reusing empty commercial properties, the former Grain Store site, potential reuse of York's Law College as well as garages on Newbury Ave and Chaloners Road.	995/17022	
	Comment- brownfield sites should be developed before valuable farm land and Greenfield sites.	1054/17050	
	Objection – building on greenbelt is nothing less than criminal given the numerous brownfield alternatives.	1079/17061	
	Comment – a new settlement would be fine, but doesn't need to be within York's local authority area.	1109/17175	
	Objection – brownfield sites should and must be developed first. The greenbelt must not be eroded to the detriment of its setting in North Yorkshire.	1124/17065	
	Objection – the planned building of 22,000 homes is madness, and would negatively impact on services – new homes are required and can be accommodated on brownfield sites.	1134/17073	
	Objection – questions deliverability of large strategic sites, including 5,580 homes on new settlement at Whinthorpe. Sites of this nature tend to require significant lead-in and will take several years to build out.	1140/17077	
	Objection – Whinthorpe site (ST15) and Land North of Clifton Moor (ST14) are too large, unnecessary and would result in loss of countryside, trees, wildlife. Use brownfield sites instead.	1144/17087	
Objection – scale and impact of Whinthorpe would be horrendous. Instead, expand out to the Ring Road (near Osbaldwick, Monks Cross and Acomb).	1210/17115		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – unable to analyse spatial distribution policy since adequate impact analysis has not yet been provided. Commitment to work alongside the Council to determine where mitigation measures may be needed or where the provision of additional capacity is not possible.	1264/17147	Highways Agency
	Comment - large potential population should be accommodated in a self-contained new town or eco city well away from any existing town so that it has room to grow. Should be on a railway line with its own station, employment, cultural provision, shops and public transport system. Cannot tack on 22,000 new homes on periphery of traffic choked city like York.	1272/209	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used first for housing developments. Greenfield sites should only be used as a last resort	1317/17249	
	Support – fully supportive of the identification of the new settlement of Whinthorpe (ST15) at Policy SS3 (iv) to accommodate 29% of the housing needs of the Local Plan.	1337/17275	Halifax Estates
	Objection – concerns that an over-reliance is made on a few strategic sites to deliver both employment and housing growth. Large scale sites are notorious for their long lead-in time before development commences due to issues affected by scale, such as infrastructure and land assembly. Large sites are comparatively slower to deliver because developers generally develop sites out at a rate of one house every week, fortnight or month depending on the strength of sales. In buoyant economic times a developer may only build 50 units in a year out of one particular outlet-even with 2 sales outlets (through a Joint Venture arrangement) on a large scheme 100 units would be theoretically possible but realistically improbable to deliver, whilst when sales are slow the build out rates and subsequent sales rates can fall to 30-40 per year. Instead of relying solely on a number of large strategic sites to deliver development requirements, the Council should adopt a variety of approaches with the allocation of an increased number of small and medium sites offering a variety of outlets against which deliveries and fluctuations in the marketplace can be addressed/responded to – rather than ‘too many eggs in one basket’.	1346/17301	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
	Objection – 22,000 new homes within the Authority, of which 16,000 have been proposed on York’s greenbelt. The Council have failed to acknowledge the importance of productive agricultural land when drafting the Local Plan and this should be reviewed	1355/17316	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – need housing but not this much. Brownfield sites should be used first.	1392/17347	
	Objection – there are plenty of sites within York that could be redeveloped instead of	1394/17352	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	building on precious greenbelt. The Stonebow and the derelict hotel just off Parliament Square are eyesores that sorely need to be redeveloped		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Support – support Policy SS3 as it identifies a significant proportion of the development within York will come from large strategic sites to be brought forward through the plan period	1514/17470	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Support – Fully support the identification of Clifton Gate as a Strategic site. Appropriate and important site to meet the City’s housing needs which should be expedited and brought forward early.	1523/17494	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Objection – greenbelt allocations are far in excess of those necessary. It is noted that housing numbers on Brownfield Sites have been slashed to ridiculous low levels to try to justify this enormous land take	1526/17517	Laverack Associates Architects
	Objection – surprised that most of the proposed development is to be taken out of the Greenbelt. The implication is that the Greenbelt has never been defined. Are you not contradicting a policy a previous Council had established? In the future, land around will be essential for food security.	1582/17543	
	Comment - no evidence of how brown field sites are to be developed.	1605/129	
	Objection – sites with planning permission have experienced problems in progressing to a stage where housing can be delivered. With the strategic sites without permission there is a considerable degree of uncertainty in terms of costs and timescale for development and it is not clear whether these sites may be viably brought forward for development. Given the significant infrastructure costs and wider facilities that will be required to provide sustainable development at Whinthorpe there is a good degree of uncertainty over the deliverability and viability of this element of the plan. Preparing Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) for all strategic sites which will identify infrastructure, facilities and services which will be required. This process will not be simple or speedy and in leaving the potential infrastructure requirements and other costs to be determined as part of SPDs there is a lack of certainty for developers and a failure to undertake full consideration of viability. In the light of the uncertainty in respect of a number of the consented and proposed strategic sites, there is a clear need for additional sites which can be implemented early in the plan period.	1661/9947	Linden Homes
	Objection – too much of the City’s housing requirement has been directed to ST15 and that this level of development cannot be achieved in the plan period.	1663/9958	DPP

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Support – The fact that development has been directed to a range of urban areas and villages. Assist in sustaining these urban areas and villages and help to provide strong and sustainable community's in the future. Support the distribution of 10% of the City housing requirement to villages and Copmanthorpe in particular.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Support – broadly supports the locations identified for development for economic growth. Objection – no natural link with economic development with many of the sites identified. What level of facilities and services will be required for the larger settlements? How will developers minimise and mitigate the impact of vehicle trips? Ditto sustainable travel modes. Mismatch between the sustainability talk and the figures. Reference to 'exemplar sustainable developments' (paragraph 5.6) is excellent – in theory. Similarly, the concept of an eco-settlement (paragraph 5.7) with high standards of sustainability. Unless a developer of the calibre of Joseph Rowntree was involved, it is believed that the inspirational eco-rhetoric would be just that and the 'standards' would be left to legislative measures i.e. carbon reduction through the building regulations.	1665/12929	York Environment Forum
	Support – no objections to the proposed policy and considers this to be the most appropriate option compared to the alternatives proposed in the Local Plan.	1668/15027	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection – the village should be excluded from the Greenbelt. The village of Hopgrove is unique in the Borough, being the only identified village to be located inside of the Outer Ring Road around the City's main urban area. The village can be considered to be more closely located to the main urban area of York than all other villages. In many cases the village is more closely related to the main urban area than many of the proposed site allocations, including some of those also within the Outer Ring Road immediately adjacent the urban area. The proximity of the village to Monks Cross shopping park and the proposed substantial increase in commercial development at this location provides excellent access to a high number of existing and new jobs and services. The Hopgrove is a sustainable location on the basis of a number of criteria including good access to the road network, direct public transport facilities and proximity to jobs and services, and therefore consideration should be given to make best use of the land in and around the village within the Local Plan.	1672/15054	Mitchells & Butlers PLC
	Objection – plan places an over reliance on the delivery of urban extensions and the proposed new settlement. Failure to deliver as planned on any of these sites would significantly jeopardise the implementation of the plan as a whole. Delivery of these complex sites may require significant lead in times; as such need to ensure that	1705/9772	Gladman Developments



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	through the proposals of the plan there are a range of sites to ensure a rolling supply of housing land and delivery of housing throughout the plan period. Not undertaken a comprehensive review of the green belt in order to make amendments to the boundaries or undertaken a thorough assessment of all the potential development opportunities in the green belt to determine the most appropriate green belt release sites.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Objection – pointless to leave any of the land at the rear of Avon Drive, Huntington in the green belt, it should be included in the development of much needed housing in the area.	1791/9875	
	Objection – too much of the City’s housing requirement has been directed to ST15 and that this level of development cannot be achieved in the plan period. Support – the fact that development has been directed to a range of urban areas and villages. Assist in sustaining these urban areas and villages and help to provide strong and sustainable community’s in the future. Support the distribution of 10% of the City housing requirement to villages and Copmanthorpe in particular.	1801/9888	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Objection – more houses on the North side of York will overload the local roads.	1900/66	
	Comment – brownfield sites should always be developed in the first instance before greenbelt land is even considered. New sprawling suburban developments built on our wonderful greenbelt land would have a detrimental and adverse impact on local communities and would destroy the very appearance, nature and character of our historical city. Not to mention the massive destruction of habitats, the subsequent loss of animals and the felling of thousands of mature trees. The Council must remember that the villages of York are just that, villages. Although the villages may belong to the City of York, they are not the City and should be treated accordingly. They have their own personalities and histories and the people who live there choose to do so, and pay a premium for their houses, for a reason. Why should the city of York spoil the quality and way-of-life of the people of the historic villages of York with its overblown development targets? Future development must be on all brownfield sites and windfall sites first. Greenbelt land should not be an option until all other sites are exhausted.	1901/7803	
	Objection – protest about Greenbelt land being used for housing. Incursion of Greenbelt land should be avoided at all costs. Increased traffic, most onto minor roads (initially) which are unable to cope with the present weight of traffic. Comment – Cheaper housing could be made available by approaching someone like Portakabin to produce pre-fabricated housing, much the same as was produced at the	1908/9908	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	end of World War Two, providing cheap first homes and much needed employment.		
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – if development is to take place this must be on all brownfield sites until those are exhausted	1914/101	
	Comment - should be concentrating on brown field sites.	1928/140	
	Objection – have all brownfield sites been fully investigated? When is the eyesore that is Piccadilly going to be taken seriously? Where will all of the wildlife go when the land is all carved up?	1946/203	
	Comment – develop strong communities. This aim is going to be hard if not impossible to achieve with the number of new residents over such a short period of time. Do not destroy the community through excessive and overwhelming housing development built in a very short time period.	1954/240	
	Objection – opposed to the talk of a permanent Green Belt for future generations, whilst planning to encroach on the existing Green Belt.	1956/244	
	Objection – better use should be made of the many brownfield sites in the City.	1959/201	
	Objection – oppose the housing plans for the villages in general and for Copmanthorpe. Proposals for new housing in Copmanthorpe should be significantly scaled back to fewer than 100 new units. New housing is excessive and will have a seriously detrimental impact on existing residents because it would increase the village by about 33%. Would like to see the character maintained. Burden on existing infrastructure – water, sewerage, roads, medical facilities, dentistry, school, playgroups. The plan lacks balance. The 10% increase in housing allocated to ‘villages’ falls on just 3 villages (Haxby, Wigginton and Copmanthorpe) whereas many other villages in the area are untouched. Ample space to distribute the proposed 10% housing increase for villages more equitably across other villages in the York area, minimising the pressure on infrastructure in any one area. The land proposed for development on existing green belt land should not be built on.	1970/216	
	Objection – all brownfield sites and unused commercial sites should be used for new houses – not our precious British countryside	1984/243	
	Objection – additional housing does not appear to have been distributed fairly between all villages, some villages have no proposed housing developments. Consideration should be given to sharing out housing fairly between all existing villages on a formula basis which takes into account the current size of the village	2003/587	
	Comment – building on brownfield sites would help to preserve the green belt but could still lead to problems with services and infrastructure, could still result in less land for drainage unless it is carefully managed.	2004/592	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – there are a number of industrial and commercial sites around York and derelict sites, why is it seen as necessary to site so much of the proposed development on, in or near to beautiful village locations or open countryside?	2009/601	
	Objection – need to develop brownfield sites, repair and modernise existing properties and not build on more green belt land which will change the surrounding environment of York irreversibly	2010/603	
	Objection – there is no mention of using brownfield sites before eroding the green belt. Why is the Council proposing to build on prime agricultural land before developing brownfield sites and non agricultural land within the city?	2012/6499	
	Objection – shocked by the vast housing estates proposed on greenbelt land	2052/6506	
	Objection - should not be proposing to build thousands of houses on greenbelt land and agricultural land when crops can be produced. This land is protected by law.	2054/6508	
	Objection – wrong to take away fields on Manor Heath when Acaster Malbis Airfield is not being used. Empty houses should be used first then brown field land.	2079/3572	
	Objection - priority should always be to develop brown field sites before green field sites. Proposed development at Clifton Gate is on prime arable land. No justification in taking over 2000 acres out of existing green belt.	2127/1432	
	Objection - if a significant number of houses need to be built need to consider whether should be a new settlement or add on to existing areas. New settlement requires new infrastructure to be put in place. Existing areas will need infrastructure improvements. Argument is not against expansion and development but the scale of it.	2191/4544	
	Objection – object to using up green belt land when there are ample brown field sites.	2278/3261	
	Alternative – recommend that the area of the old carriage works and North plus the site of the gas works at Malton Road would be suitable inner York Sites. Solve your requirement in one stroke for 22,000 homes, A, 10-12,000 houses at Elvington airfield, B, 5-8,000 houses at Acaster airfield, C, 4-6,000 houses at Rufforth airfield. Planned with facilities and environmental planting and landscaping, therefore protecting the green belt infrastructure and road system of York	2287/6517	
	Objection – In relation to Site H9 - Plenty of alternative previously developed sites which would be best used for housing development.	2313/3275	
	Objection – believe that brownfield sites in York Centre should be used first, namely Hungate, British Sugar, York central and civil service ground site. There is no need for a new village on the A64 if you use these sites first.	2322/6525	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – the policy of brownfield first should be given priority.	2358/6544	
	Alternative – former industrial sites and other airfield/defence sites would seem preferable to agricultural land and less environmentally damaging. Objection – the existing and proposed policies for green belt and environmental protection are no adequate for environmental security. Comment – criterion i) and ii) are reasonable.	2416/6592	
	Objection – to ‘nibble away’ at the boundary of the Green Belt or perhaps still worse form holes within would set a precedent for the future leading to more encroachment over the coming years.	2469/1901	
	Objection – houses should not be built on green belt land	2470/6749	
	Objection – in none of the material is there any reference to prioritising use of brownfield sites the exclusive emphasis being on use of what should be green belt.	2477/6763	
	Objection- why build on green areas when you still have all the brownfield sites in York which you are struggling to development e.g. sugar beet factory, teardrop, nestle, terry's, Vickers etc.	2484/6771	
	Objection – greenbelt land is just that for amenity, leisure and agriculture. Buildings appear the flavour of the month, being pushed as our saviour for jobs and the economy, the being only short term. Manufacturing and export are the only ways to revive our fortunes; this is a definite no to any development of any greenbelt land.	2512/6791	
	Objection – population trends suggest no more than 800 houses per year are required.	2546/6835	
	Objection – where is the justification for building on greenfields when there are so many brownfield sites readily available? York has always wanted to conserve its heritage and green space, this quality will be lost if these proposals go ahead.	2559/6885	
	Objection – new developments should be latched onto existing conurbations.	2578/6907	
	Objection – no to greenbelt use for housing.	2584/6929	
	Objection – build on all York brownfield before destroying the greenbelt.	2585/6932	
	Objection – the greenbelt should be left alone.	2619/6960	
	Objection – excessive use of Greenfield/belt land. Where are the brownfield sites?	2638/6997	
	Objection – immense over-development in terms of housing and retail and the loss of almost all greenbelt land in Huntington.	2652/7024	
	Objection – all the greenbelt should not be lost.	2660/7042	
Objection – how many brownfield sites are there in York and why are they not being used up first?	2668/7064		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – too many houses are being built on greenbelt land, brownfield sites should be utilised first.	2669/7068	
	Objection – brownfield sites must be maximised in preference to greenbelt.	2670/7069	
	Objection – any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it and after all brown field sites in the city have been utilised.	2684/7132	
	Objection – any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it and after all brown field sites in the city have been utilised.	2685/7136	
	Objection – the greenbelt should not be used for housing development and for the number of houses in excess of these required.	2686/7138	
	Objection – the greenbelt should not be considered for development until all brownfield land has been fully utilised for housing in the City of York Council area.	2711/7193	
	Objection – how can the city and surrounding areas have run out of brownfield sites? These should be made use of before encroaching on greenbelt.	2714/7207	
	Objection – development should not happen on greenbelt land when there are more than enough brownfield sites in the York area to choose from.	2737/7253	
	Objection – totally against the extra housing in Haxby as it would put undue pressure on the areas infrastructure.	2759/7290	
	Objection – need to ensure that all sites identified are deliverable. Question the sustainability of making provision of 29% of the housing needs within a new settlement (eco settlement) on a site currently within the green belt. There is insufficient evidenced based research to back up the delivery of such a scheme. Therefore consider that this 29% should be allocated elsewhere which is already in close proximity to the existing local services and facilities and where it would also have less impact on the green belt. Therefore consider that option 2 – prioritising development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through the provision in the villages – is more suitable for this plan period. To ensure that the housing targets are achievable, it is important for a greater number of less constrained sites to be allocated for delivery in the short term. Greenfield sites on the edge of the built up area are considered the most appropriate for delivery in the short term, based on the understanding that brownfield sites will take longer to complete with a slower development rate. There are very few housing sites proposed in the smaller settlements and therefore the plan is risking the vitality and viability of these settlements and their communities.	2769/7318	
	Objection – no to building on the greenbelt and agricultural land.	2784/7377	
	Objection – the pressure to build houses on Greenfield sites is increase by the	2789/7394	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	reduced housing availability on brownfield sites that would be required to accommodate more industrial development. The Arup report confirmed that the proposed housing growth figures are not realistic for York and that a reduced annual growth closer to 800 houses would be appropriate, but still challenging to achieve, The reduced housing target, combined with increased use of brownfield sites for housing, would make the Clifton Gate and Whintorpe developments unnecessary.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Objection – greenbelt land should be protected and brownfield sites should be utilised first.	2796/7417	
	Objection – the use of greenbelt land will affect the character and beauty of York.	2798/7426	
	Objection – greenbelt land for development should not be used before full use of brownfield sites.	2801/7432	
	Objection – doubts about the general impact of such large scale developments in York as a whole.	2802/7435	
	Objection – the council has not given sufficient consideration to brownfield sites within the city.	2806/7448	
	Objection – both Poppletons are surrounded by fields please do not ruin it with more and more houses.	2858/7597	
	Objection – any developments which would turn the villages into suburban sprawl would be a blight to the wider area and utterly detrimental to York.	2862/7599	
	Objection – look to develop brownfield sites and keep the countryside as it is.	2878/7606	
	Objection – to the principle of using green land for development purposes.	2884/7607	
	Objection – there should be a firm policy to maintain the physical separation between the city within the ring road and the villages outside. Future development should take place within the ring road.	2889/4548	
	Objection – why not use the brownfield sites and leave the green belt alone? Why can't the empty properties in the city be used for living accommodation, instead of building hotels like St Leonard's?	2897/7610	
	Objection – land to be used in Copmanthorpe is green belt, would prefer to see development contained within the ring road, spreading the development on several communities instead of building houses in large numbers in certain areas. Why is there no proposed development in Bishopthorpe, Askham Bryan and Acaster Malbis?	2988/4529	
	Objection – would it not be more sensible to build on land inside the inner ring road – spreading the development on several communities instead of building houses in large numbers in certain areas.	3060/7917	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – there is little attempt to boost the possibilities of living space within the city walls, large estates on the outskirts of York will overload the road systems.	3064/7931	
	Objection – building on greenbelt land ahead on brownfield sites is not a good idea.	3142/8091	
	Objection – all available brownfield sites in the city should be developed before any other developments should be considered.	3145/8098	
	Objection – completely against the building on greenbelt land until all brown belt land has been developed or existing building renovated and re-used.	3180/8177	
	Objection – smaller pieces of undeveloped land within present boundaries should be used rather than greenbelt land.	3182/8188	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before greenbelt is used, The current plan releases greenbelt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	3185/8196	
	Objection – too many houses in one year, brownfield sites must be built on first.	3190/8208	
	Objection – all brownfield sites should be used as a priority.	3191/8210	
	Comment – development on brownfield sites should be maximised.	3205/8247	
	Comment – when considering development it makes sense to build in reasonable proximity to the place of work	3210/8270	
	Comment – the policy proposes that 10 per cent of the provision for housing should be located in the villages and included two strategic sites in Copmanthorpe, ST12 and ST13. The Council has recently funded a report by North of England Civic Trust indicating that up to 800 flats could be constructed in the upper floors of City Centre shops. These 800 flats further reduce any need to locate housing in the villages.	3222/8288	
	Comment – the actual need for affordable housing in the city outstrips the total supply coming forward each year. Brownfield should be phased before Greenfield sites, it is outrageous to encourage building on Greenfield before using the brownfield sites already available.	3245/8322	
	Comment – all brownfield sites should be fully developed before there is any plan to use existing greenbelt land. It is a better option to build houses in smaller villages that need an increase of population to improve their facilities or another new village with its own infrastructure could be created.	3257/8367	
	Comment – development of brownfield sites should be maximised before greenbelt is used. The current plan releases greenbelt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	3343/8524	
Comment – push out boundary between bypass to Strensall. Do not cram any more of anything into Huntington, it is full.	3351/8544		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – before proposing new “greenbelt” development sites the council should re-develop the ‘brownfield’ sites available in York fist and then re-assess the actual building requirement.	3352/8547	
	Comment – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before greenbelt is used.	3359/8613	
	Objection – no to greenbelt land being released for housing until ALL brownfield sites have been used.	3361/8623	
	Comment – local brownfield sites should be utilised first.	3372/8652	
	Objection– building on greenbelt land when the council is sat on all the undeveloped brownfield sites.	3383/8681	
	Comment – brownfield sites should be used before any release of precious greenbelt is touched. The greenbelt should be safeguarded.	3394/8697	
	Objection – disagree with the development of the greenbelt, the proposals in the Local Plan are too large.	3399/8705	
	Comment – the proposed housing developments on and around the vicinity of the A1237 Outer Ring Road – it will be argued that these are unnecessary to meet the housing needs of York citizens. It would constitute urban sprawl with the loss of important areas of the Northern Green belt and Green infrastructure. Essential infrastructure improvements to the A1237 should be required to be in place before the proposed housing and commercial developments occur, but because there is no funding available to allow this such improvements will not occur. Despite this, the Local Plan envisages that these developments will go ahead irrespectively.	3428/8774	
	Objection – strongly disagree with losing any more of the greenbelt and would strongly resist any development around Skelton burial ground, where son is buried. If land development in York is really needed (which doubt it is one this scale): it should only be sanctioned on brownfield sites and then only when the right infrastructure is in place.	3476/8915	
	Objection – use up the empty top floors of many of the city centre shops and businesses before building thousands of new homes.	3735/10078	
	Objection – the use of the Green belt for housing development is unacceptable. There are many brown field sites available.	3752/10150	
	Comment – why think of building beyond the outer ring road when there are brownfield sites to be used.	3779/10196	
Comment – duty to provide housing for people of York but there are many brownfield sites that should be developed before encroaching on the surrounding greenbelt.	3799/10240		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – the focus of the plan should be the larger scale developments, which, with the appropriate infrastructure, can be built on identified brownfield and non-agricultural land.	3811/10260	
	Comment – housing development should first concentrate on all brownfield sites in the city before even considering the use of current greenbelt land. If greenbelt land is released before brown field sites are developed, brownfield sites will never be developed.	3852/10345	
	Objection –greenbelt land should not be built on – brownfield sites should be used if more houses must be built.	3856/10358	
	Comment – conserve precious greenbelt and green spaces. More effort should be made to develop on brownfield sites.	3879/10415	
	Objection – brownfield sites in the City of York have still not been considered and utilised to their maximum and should be used before greenfield sites.	3902/10444	
	Comment – brownfield sites should be developed before green belt. Releasing greenbelt land easily stalls the development of brownfield sites.	3954/10521	
	Comment – green belt should be green belt. No problem with plans for construction on brownfield sites or by ‘filling in’, but the draft appears to show over 4000 acres being taken from the greenbelt for the construction of 17000 of the proposed 22000 homes.	3958/10536	
	Objection – plan should look at empty properties first. If land is green belt, it should not be built on.	3966/10552	
	Comment – it is important to York to retain its historic character surrounded by greenbelt and very much support the concept of green corridors as described in Section 17 of the plan. Much effort should be put in to locating new housing on brownfield sites before using existing greenbelt land.	3980/10582	
	Comment – why are brownfield sites not being fully utilised before destroying greenbelt land?	3983/10594	
	Comment – development on brownfield should be maximised before greenbelt is used.	4003/10619	
	Alternative – Build on the old Vickers site of St John’s Collage.		
	Comment – development on brownfield should be maximised before greenbelt is used.	4012/10635	
	Comment – please use brown land and save the green land.	4037/10677	
Comment – brownfield sites must be built on first.	4040/10683		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – make better use of brownfield sites in and around York.	4049/10716	
	Objection – no new housing in York should be considered until all existing brownfield sites have been developed of which there are many e.g. Nestle Haxby Road, the former British Sugar site Boroughbridge Road, Hungate site City Centre, The teardrop site Leeman Road, the former Terry's site.	4050/11756	
	Objection – it is easy to see why development on Greenfield sites is attractive but filling up the brownfield is more important – getting rid of eyesores (Piccadilly in York) and old factory sites in Huntington Road and Haxby Road	4051/10724	
	Objection – strongly oppose any plans to build on greenbelt land when brownfield sites have not been developed.	4063/10740	
	Objection – there is sufficient brownfield land in York to cater for development.	4087/10776	
	Objection – focus should be on brownfield sites rather than new greenbelt releases.	4096/10788	
	Objection – build some houses using brownfield sites.	4101/10800	
	Objection – there are many brownfield sites needing attention before greenbelt is brought into the equation.	4102/10806	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used in preference to green field sites.	4110/10809	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used – greenbelt should not be built upon – once it is lost, it is gone forever.	4134/10845	
	Objection – building on greenbelt is a bad idea when so many brownfield sites stay unused.	4155/10870	
	Comment – disappointed to see that the council intends to meet the housing needs by building on farmland rather than building on the extensive brownfield sites within York. Even if so many houses are needed, even if the brownfield sites cannot meet the needs in their entirety, cannot understand why they cannot be used in addition to reduced greenbelt sites.	4168/10890	
	Objection – there are plenty of brownfield sites, some with existing planning permission that should be developed before any building on Greenfield sites occurs. The overall plans that other areas of York do not have this total amount of development. We do not need, require or want it here.	4174/10903	
	Objection – the immediate problem to provide a necessary and more realistic target of new houses should be the completion of brownfield sites	4193/10920	
	Comment – have all brownfield possibilities been explored e.g. the old Vickers Instruments site (more recently known as Biometrics and Nanometrics) on Haxby Road between Nestle and New Earswick.	4200/10936	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – question the need for use of greenbelt land and strongly urge to look at brownfield sites throughout the city.	4201/10942	
	Comment – a lot of brownfield sites have become available over the last few years and housing should be restricted to these only. No need for more housing in the greenbelt or green areas.	4231/10992	
	Comment – the football ground should immediately be built on Clifton Hospital site because of easy access.	4244/11016	
	Comment – the amount of development on brownfield sites proposed in the plan is disappointingly low and significantly below the number contained in earlier plans.	4257/11037	
	Comment – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used.	4268/11075	
	Comment – greenbelt land should be the last to be used – there are large sections of brown land that should be developed ahead of green belt. By building on greenbelt it alters the attraction to live in York	4286/11117	
	Comment – development on brown field sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The current plan releases greenbelt land too early, and stalls development of brownfield sites.	4287/11120	
	Comment – brownfield sites not yet developed. York in the past few years has had major developments already.	4297/11145	
	Comments – increasing numbers of low cost dwellings are clearly needed in York. However, these developments need to be inner city, thus reducing the potentially high transport costs that would detract from out of town developments. Releasing current green belt land should not happen until at least 80% of the brownfield developments have been completed.	4305/11174	
	Comment – by all means build more homes but use brownfield sites, boarded up empty houses, renovate derelict homes and empty shops before considering green belt land.	4315/11198	
	Comment – the council should be utilising brown field sites within the city for housing.	4317/11199	
	Comment – the council should be utilising brown field sites within the city for housing.	4321/11210	
	Comment – the council should be utilising brown field sites within the city for housing.	4322/11214	
	Comment – the council should be utilising brown field sites within the city for housing.	4323/11218	
Comment – housing development is needed but there are brownfield sites that could be used first. If significant employment growth starts happening in the area over the next ten years then it would be time to look at sites again when the brownfield areas have been used.	4351/11275		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – question the percentage split in the distribution of new housing between the built up area, the edge of the built up area, the new settlement and the villages. The plan does not contain adequate justification for the new settlements and the likelihood that they will deliver 9500 new dwellings to be hopelessly optimistic. As such the plan will need to identify alternative sites such as the Terry’s factory car park to meet the projected housing requirement and the plan should as a result seek to direct a greater proportion of housing to the edge of the built up area e.g. 52%.	4355/11601	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Comment – the number of proposed houses and scale of development is excessive. Any development should use brownfield sites first. Greenbelt should remain protected greenbelt	4357/11287	
	Comment - although there is undisputed need for some social housing in York, the best practice is to integrate housing within an existing street plan – by using up brownfield or infilling.	4359/11297	
	Objection – the Green belt housing land allocations are way in excess of those necessary. Brownfield sites should be developed first. It is wrong that housing numbers on brownfield sites have been reduced to ridiculous low levels to try to justify this enormous land take.	4362/11307	
	Comment – plans do not show all the brownfield sites in York. No recognition of the role of infill to the overall provision of new homes seems to have been taken into account. Priority should be given to brownfield sites developments, and current green sites should not be developed until all brownfield sites are exhausted. The current plans lack this undertaking. No work seems to have been done on giving York’s population an idea of the order in which the different areas will be developed.	4379/11338	
	Objection – there are innumerable sites within York boundaries where any of these projects (Poppleton) will not harm either rural life or the environment.	4444/11460	
	Objection – if housing expansion in York is necessary on anything like the scale envisaged, all available brownfield sites in the city should certainly be utilised as the first priority.	4481/11499	
	Objection – green belt land should be protected. Where necessary to build brownfield sites should be used.	4490/11507	
	Comment – make more use of brownfield sites.	4688/14223	
	Objection – brownfield sites in York should be used first to their full potential	4698/14252	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. Release green belt too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	4721/14226	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be maximised	4722/14256	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – brownfield and empty house to be used first.	4738/12029	
	Comment – Upper Poppleton has potential for development west of the existing railway station. Copmanthorpe/Acaster Malbis airfield south and east of the railway main line should be re-examined.	4752/14270	
	Objection –brownfield sites maximised.	4777/14276	
	Objection – re-development of City's brownfield land first	4797/14280	
	Objection – green belt land should only be used as a last resort. Brownfield sits and the York Central site would be acceptable.	4810/14285	
	Objection – before considering taking land from York's green belt all brownfield sites should be used first.	4832/12157	
	Objection – investigate and develop the existing brownfield sites as priority over current green field sites.	5130/12247	
	Objection - brownfield sites should be used first before any thought of building on green spaces and using empty spaces in the town centre will provide homes and improve the quality of the centre, areas such as Piccadilly would benefit from this.	5145/12265	
	Objection – Hungate should be added to the housing section within Policy SS3 as a strategic site.	5167/12898	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
	Objection – there should be a commitment to housing development on brownfield sites as a priority.	5178/12348	
	Objection – large areas of brownfield sites in York remain undeveloped. Productive use of these should be resolved before mass building on fields should be considered.	5186/12395	
	Objection – plan lacks a clear vision for the rural villages which surround York which have very different needs. Plan should ensure that brownfield sites are developed before any green field sites. There should be no development in any green belt areas.	5189/12400	
	Objection – totally disagree with building on green belt areas until all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	5194/12414	
	Objection – brownfield sites in and around York plus empty buildings and accommodation above shops should be used before taking green field sites. There are sufficient traditional detached and semi detached properties with gardens available and consideration should be given to predominantly multi storey housing to reduce land take. York will outgrow its medieval city ambiance and will lose its tourist attraction if the population is increased much further.	5197/12420	
Objection – new housing should in order of priority: use up existing brownfield sites within the area bounded by the outer ring road; bring unused spaces above city	5210/12445		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	centre shops into use; use other areas identified within the outer ring road which are capable of development and which do not impinge upon the green wedges extending into the city; and modest additional development based on existing village settlements, although in the case of both Stockton on the Forest and Holtby, they appear to be capable of substantial additional development.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Objection – brownfield sites could accommodate between two and three years worth of housing development. Ensure that these brownfield sites are used up before any permission is given to build on green field ones.	5224/12515	
	Objection – should not even contemplate taking land out of the green belt until the conservable amount of brownfield sites available have been exhausted.	5228/12537	
	Comment – brownfield sites, of which there are many in York, need to be exploited.	5234/12548	
	Support – the spatial distribution set out in SS3 including the provision of 10% housing in villages. Identification of New Lane, Huntington as a strategic housing allocation is fully supported.	5245/14331	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Objection – need to ensure that all brownfield sites have been filled before building on green spaces.	5277/14389	
	Objection – new housing ought to initially seek to improve communities by targeting brownfield sites and then non amenity land within existing boundaries. Where that is exhausted and proves insufficient for needs then wholly separate self contained new communities should be created.	5289/14418	
	Objection – unconvinced that there is insufficient brownfield land and derelict property to meet housing needs. Need to provide details of brownfield sites and derelict property that could potentially be converted to affordable housing. This is likely to be more central so reducing traffic issues and developing it would be more sustainable than building on agricultural land.	5296/14435	
	Objection – there are large swathes of undeveloped brownfield land, why aren't these being used first?	5302/14459	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be developed before there is any further use of greenfield sites.	5332/14990	
	Objection – York does need new homes, but need to build on brownfield sites first.	5359/14558	
	Objection – oppose the building of new housing on greenfield sites. Brownfield sites should be used first. Should cease 'right to buy' policy.	5371/14580	
	Objection – against taking land out of the green belt due to the amount of brownfield sites in York.	5376/14587	
Objection – insufficient use of brownfield sites.	5385/14617		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – seems to be a complete disregard to the useful and proper development of brownfield sites throughout the city. There are building and disused sites that could be utilised before start to encroach on green belt land.	5389/14633	York Navigator Ltd
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – small developments on brownfield sites must be the first option.	5391/14632	
	Objection – brownfield sites must and should be developed as a priority and fully maximised before any green belt land is used. The current plan releases green belt land far too early and stalls development of the brownfield sites.	5392/14635	
	Support – it is essential to build all the planned homes quickly to deal with the housing crisis.	5410/14690	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – all development in York should follow a brownfield first principle and avoid development on the green belt. As well as the city centre heritage one of the city's key attractions is how self contained it is, it has a well defined green belt and doesn't sprawl from one area to another. The plan should ensure that this remains the case.	5412/14687	
	Objection – the focus needn't largely be on developing new sites but looking at wholesale redevelopment of existing estates. By the end of the plan period some post war council estates will be 75 or 80 years old and be woefully energy efficient. These areas could be redeveloped and remodelled with more 3 and 4 storey housing to increase density on existing sites, rather than more spread of semi-detached houses.	5419/14715	
	Objection – opposed to the development of greenfield sites when there are ample brownfield sites.	5434/14762	
	Objection – opposition to plans to grow York out of all proportion and take some of the existing green belt.	5435/14764	
	Objection – no greenfield sites should be considered until all brownfield sites have been used up. If greenfield sites have to be used, they should all be within the confines of the outer ring road.	5484/14838	
	Objection – in order to minimise congestion and reduce carbon emissions, it is essential that the major housing developments are located close to strategic employment sites. This is not the case with the major developments to the south east and north west of the city.	5485/14841	
	Objection – to the excessive amount of green belt land being proposed for development when there is so much brownfield land available.	5557/13033	
	Objection – to the approach taken in identifying where development should take place. Outcomes have been determined not by planning how and where the city should grow but simply on the basis of which landowners have said they will make land available. As a result the majority of proposed development is taking place in the east and north of the city and the plan makes no effort to explain how such high concentrations can gain access to the city centre or be accommodated on the existing road network.	5570/13052	
	Objection – all brownfield sites around the city should be developed first and future development of Haxby should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it.	5574/13064	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – brown sites have not been fully utilised so if there is need for more housing then these areas which have the infrastructure in place would be better.	5579/13075	
	Objection – why develop on the green belt when brownfield sites within the outer ring road are available for development?	5584/13084	
	Objection – the proposed use of protected green belt is a travesty. Not demonstrated that sufficient consideration has been given to the redevelopment of brownfield sites. A recent report found that a further 1000 people can be housed within the city centre in existing buildings.	5585/13089	
	Objection – all brownfield sites must be used first and this must be mandatory to all potential builders.	5586/13093	
	Objection – do not understand why there are so many brownfield sites lying dormant around York and why there is the need to develop and pollute green belt land around Haxby.	5590/13108	
	Objection – to the amount of housing proposed in the eastern areas, why has the housing not been more evenly distributed?	5592/13113	
	Objection – concentrate on building houses on in fill areas and brownfield sites rather than York's green belt.	5594/13121	
	Objection – realise that in the future green belt boundaries may need to be redrawn but this is not the time to do it when there are so many brownfield sites still available and these should be used first.	5597/13129	
	Objection – the large strategic housing developments are wildly ambitious and would swamp local communities. Would prefer greater focus on brownfield sites such as York Central.	5599/13136	
	Objection – greenfield sites should not be released for development until brownfield land has been developed.	5601/13146	
	Comment – there are a number of substantial brownfield sites which should be considered and there are proposals to encourage the conversion of derelict upper parts above shops, which could in itself create a significant number of new housing units.	5604/13156	
	Objection – prefer alternatives 2 (prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through provision in the villages subject to levels of services) or 4 (prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area along key sustainable transport corridors). Opposed to the idea of a single new settlement.	5609/13172	
Objection – green belt should remain green belt, brownfield land should be developed	5610/13189		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	first and green belt land only considered once all brownfield sites are fully used.		
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – the proposed expansion into the green belt rather than utilising brownfield sites seems to be unnecessary and certainly undesirable.	5615/13199	
	Objection – suggest that brownfield sites in the central area of York ought to be the priority for development and that the huge numbers of empty properties above shops in the centre should be targeted for domestic use.	5617/13205	
	Objection – agree the need for further housing overall in the York area, but serious consideration needs to be given to existing brownfield sites. To give one example, an area on the road between New Earswick and Nestle has remained vacant for a number of years.	5625/13235	
	Comment – although York needs a green belt, the plan needs to avoid the temptation to link it to the ring road. Developments need to be positioned near existing and proposed infrastructure and if that means spreading out from the city centre along transport corridors such as the rail line through Haxby and Strensall or Poppleton then that will be better than simply filling in the land inside the ring road where transport links don't exist.	5628/13249	
	Objection – brownfield sites used first – don't allow developers to cherry pick easiest sites.	5632/13253	
	Objection – proposed plans are likely to spoil the unique feel and intimacy of several small communities by making these into larger towns where the present special village atmosphere will be lost forever. Prefer new development to concentrate on making even larger new towns in the proposed Clifton and Whinthorpe areas which are outside the York outer ring road system. In this way, the plan should be able to protect the special atmosphere of existing small villages and enable the new communities in the new towns to develop their environment in the way that best suits.	5638/13288	
	Comment – York has more accessible brownfield and peripheral sites.	5639/13271	
	Objection – to development in green belt land. Development should always be on brownfield by priority, even if this means reducing affordable quotas.	5640/13272	
	Objection – there are a number of brownfield sites in and around York which should be developed before any thought is given to destroying more of the countryside and badly affecting neighbouring areas.	5643/13276	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – urge a respect for the basic shape and size of York. Should not aspire to become much bigger but rather develop more gradually focusing on brownfield and infill sites, developing within the ring road into green field only where necessary. The ring road should be seen as the outside edge of urban and suburban York. Where there are communities already established outside, keep them distinct and work on solutions like the proposed Haxby rail link to establish communities separated from the city. Focus first on resolving the teardrop site.	5645/13278	
	Objection – fail to see why keen to see previously undeveloped land built on when there are so many empty flats and houses above shops in city centre, not to mention hundreds acres of brownfield land that has sat unused for decades.	5652/13292	
	Comment – what about the disused railway land and compulsory acquisition of an appalling eyesore in the centre of York – the White Swan?	5666/13335	
	Objection – why are the brownfield sites such as Sessions and the eye of York not being developed first before spoiling the green field sites?	5669/13342	
	Objection – all brownfield sites to be built on before any others are considered.	5674/13368	
	Objection – countryside to the north of York and the Ouse should be kept so that excess water at high rainfall periods can be channelled and stored to prevent flooding in this historic city. Green space must be preserved at all costs. Otherwise the increase in non porous surface created by development of Clifton Moor, Clifton, old British Sugar and old Manor School will create even higher flooding levels within the city.	5686/13400	
	Objection – there are other more suitable sites for development that are not in the green belt that could be used for housing development.	5688/13406	
	Objection – other sites including brownfield should be looked at more closely and areas that have been looking for better infrastructure and therefore more housing should be considered. The proposed developments should be replaced with something more appropriate.	5697/13423	
	Objection – other sites including brownfield should be looked at more closely and areas that have been looking for better infrastructure and therefore more housing should be considered. The proposed developments should be replaced with something more appropriate.	5698/13427	
	Objection – why is the plan not aggressively pursuing the use of all brownfield sites before even considering the release of green belt land?	5711/13458	
Objection – expansion of housing should not happen in any rural areas outside the current area, but brownfield sites within the city should be priority development.	5721/13485		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Comment – priority should be given to the larger residential developments which can sustain a new primary school as part of the scheme. Most of the new jobs will be created to the north and east of the city and there is already considerable congestion on the outer link road and bypass. Development on the west side of the city will not be appropriate for people working in these areas.	5734/13507	
	Objection – none of the sites in (iii) meet the criteria of preventing unacceptable levels of congestion and/or pollution without road network development beyond that covered in the plan and importantly before commencement of the development(s). In (v), Copmanthorpe has the transport links and services to expand at a far greater level than that shown and meets the major requirements of proposals; in general proposals should include the need to locate new sizable development close to existing private transport network or extension planned to be completed with early phases of development.	5740/13524	
	Objection – there is plenty of brownfield land within York for building extra homes on.	5741/13541	
	Objection – use up the brownfield sites first before destroying lovely village of Haxby.	5742/13545	
	Objection – the scale of proposed building on the green belt is wholly unnecessary and the number of brownfield sites within the city should be able to meet the city's real needs.	5744/13548	
	Objection – plan emphasises the importance of keeping villages separated from urban sprawl but seems to show developments that extend into the green belt and extend urban development towards outer villages.	5748/13560	
	Objection – the scale of proposed building on the green belt is wholly unnecessary and the number of brownfield sites within the city should be able to meet the city's real needs.	5749/13562	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The current plan releases green belt too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	5752/13576	
	Objection – to development on green belt land particularly when brownfield sites are not being used in any preference.	5753/13578	
	Objection – to building on greenfield sites, particularly as there are plenty of brownfield sites around the city. These are also closer to amenities, shops, and schools thus reducing total journey times in the city.	5764/13626	
	Objection – to all of the greenfield sites ear marked for future development. It makes sense to stop adding to the poor air quality, pollution and extra run off caused by building on more of the countryside. Loss of food producing land. York has a	5771/13649	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	multitude of brownfield sites that would be ideal for housing and jobs before ever touching green field sites.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Objection – it would make more sense to ensure that building can be done on all the brownfield sites in the area before committing the local plan to anything else.	5782/13686	
	Objection – could more be done in the plan to develop existing sites, regenerate even more brownfield sites and tackle long term empty housing rather than take up more green space which is finite, valuable and essential to the character of York and its wildlife?	5786/13696	
	Objection – shouldn't be building on green belt when there are lots of brownfield sites within York that require development.	5790/13712	
	Objection – shouldn't be building on green belt when there are lots of brownfield sites within York that require development.	5791/13715	
	Objection – please use brownfield sites and none of the current arable or greenfield sites.	5794/13722	
	Objection – the first priority must be to fast track brownfield sites that are currently available for development. Lessons should be learned from the suburban sprawl of the past, green belt must not be considered for development unless an extreme case can be made.	5800/13734	
	Comment – developments frequently go ahead on greenfield sites as this is viewed as the more profitable option but this is not sustainable practice as leads to loss of green environments, important wildlife habitats, and agricultural land in favour of development which consumes large amounts of resources, materials and energy, and creates pollution and increasing risk of flooding. Funds should be channelled into the development of current brownfield sites as the much more sustainable option, rather than allowing the degradation of current built sites while encroaching further into surrounding countryside.	5813/15005	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used before greenfield sites. Suggested expansion areas are significantly larger to the north and south of York in comparison to the east and west, this should be reviewed to make development in all areas of York more proportionate.	5828/13795	
	Objection – would like to be reassured that all of the brownfield sites in the York area have been fully considered before any development is considered on greenfield sites.	5843/13827	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used before using any green belt.	5847/13838	
Objection – houses are needed instead of building the thousands of flats for students – use that land for housing and brownfield sites not green belt land.	5858/15122		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – why not use existing brownfield sites first rather than encroaching on to green belt.	5869/15145	
	Objection – no building on green belt sites around York should be even considered until all brownfield and urban areas have been exhausted.	5870/15148	
	Objection – there are already numerous brownfield sites and sites that already have planning permission that should be used first.	5884/15179	
	Objection – enable smaller scale developments to take place on existing land rather than eat into green belt land.	5892/15196	
	Comment – need to ensure that all brown sites in the city area and other vacant sites are seen as appropriate for city dwellings.	5895/15202	
	Comment – there are no incentives for developers to use existing land.	5905/15223	
	Objection – all brownfield sites should be built on before any greenfield sites.	5936/15273	
	Objection – why is there a need for a reduction in green belt when there is a girth of brownfield sites available such as British Sugar and York Central?	5939/15282	
	Objection – no green belt should ever be used when brownfield sites are available.	5952/15304	
	Objection – just look to all brownfield sites and then consider all necessary support services – school places, medical care, traffic congestion etc – when looking at other possible greenfield sites.	5977/15345	
	Objection – before even considering using any green belt a survey should have been carried out of brownfield sites and any other areas suitable/available for redevelopment. The use of these can only enhance the image of York.	5993/15376	
	Objection – believe that an alternative approach should be taken which does not involve the identification of a new settlement. Concerned about intention to rely on a number of strategic sites to deliver both housing and employment growth. Large scale sites are notorious for the long lead in time before development commences due to issues affected by scale such as infrastructure. Hambleton District Council has assumed an average build out rate of 40 to 45 units per year on allocated sites. If this range is applied to SS3 then can only assume a maximum of 900 units per year if all strategic sites were to gain permission and commence construction at the same time. Instead of relying on a number of large strategic sites the plan should adopt alternative approach 2 and prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through provision in the villages subject to levels of services. Advocate this approach because it would require the allocation of a number of small and medium sites.	6046/15474	
	Objection – the building on houses on brownfield sites should be undertaken before	6047/15482	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	large amounts of green belt land is used.		
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – any brownfield sites within the city should be used before sites such as those in Haxby are considered.	6049/15489	
	Comment – agree to the principle of the use of unused brownfield sites and the setting of the green belt.	6055/15498	
	Objection – do not think the plan encourages a brownfield first approach. There are a number of brownfield sites that have been transferred over from the previous LDF where the numbers have been reduced but no reason given. This means that more green belt land needs to be built on. There seems to be no mechanism for dealing with sites that are not currently aware of.	6057/15507	
	Objection – there is no evidence within the site selection process that the viability of the strategic sites and new settlements has been tested. Approach is not justified as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.	6062/17459	ID Planning
	Objection – there is a very significant provision of brownfield land within the city. If the integrity of the city is to be maintained, it is vitally important that the brownfield land is prioritised for development. The use of green belt land should be the doctrine of last resort in order to protect the setting of the historic city and to prevent coalescence of suburban and urban areas so as to preserve the identity of each. Housing should be provided close to places of work and most employment is within the central area and not on the suburban fringes. There needs to be a sequential prioritisation so that brownfield land is used first.	6135/15583	
	Comment – in the creation of new towns it is vital that the city engages with creating an exemplar of sustainable transport from the start of such developments to avoid creating more traffic congestion.	6137/15593	
	Objection – are there no brownfield sites available for gypsy and traveller sites rather than building in the green belt?	6139/15601	
	Comment – whilst concerned that too much of the housing requirement has been directed to ST15, support the fact that development has been directed to a range of urban areas and villages, in particular the distribution of 10% to villages including Dunnington.	6160/15664	
	Objection – before even thinking of any developments on green belt, brownfield sites in the city need to be utilised first.	6171/15705	
	Objection – to the use of green belt for housing development. What are the brown site options?	6180/15718	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – against the use of building on green sites. Other brownfield sites should be used first.	6200/15732	
	Objection – it seems that every available green space is to be built in when there are brownfield sites available.	6206/15741	
	Objection – national policy states that preference should be given to developing brownfield sites initially and do not believe that genuine consideration has been given to these – specifically the York Central and sugar factory sites are still largely vacant. With two potential new settlements it is difficult to comprehend why the prime agricultural lands around Dunnington are even being considered.	6212/15747	
	Objection – green belt should be preserved and the suburbs and villages should not be used. Plan should focus on brownfield and urban sites to start with.	6213/15753	
	Objection – there still appear to be brownfield sites around York on which to build. It is unjustifiable to use so much green belt.	6217/15756	
	Objection – why on green belt land when there are brownfield sites within the city?	6225/15781	
	Objection – the scale of release of land from the green belt is much too large and will have a detrimental impact on York’s character as a compact historic city.	6284/15882	
	Objection – it is unacceptable to build on greenfield sites within the green belt whilst so much brownfield land within the city remains undeveloped.	6285/15887	
	Objection – consider a smaller project which would include the present brown sites for housing and would not have such an impact on the current infrastructure.	6290/15898	
	Objection – neither Whinthorpe nor Germany Beck are necessary or desirable given the availability of numerous brownfield sites.	6291/15900	
	Objection – to proposals to allocate so much green belt land for potential future housing. All available brownfield sites should be used before resorting to building on the green belt. There are plenty of large brownfield sites that could be developed and pressure should be applied to developers to utilise these areas first. Additionally plan should identify existing housing that has been empty for a number of years.	6305/15943	
	Comment – reassured to hear that brownfield sites will be built on before any green belt land is used.	6307/15947	
	Objection – the need to maintain the compactness/urban form of the city and the role and function of the outer ring road in achieving this important aim does question whether any sites immediately adjoining the outer ring road ought to be considered to accommodate housing or employment growth. There is a well established record of viewing the outer ring road as the key feature in containing and directing most growth within its boundaries - this approach is supported.	6319/15972	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – plan has no respect for the preservation of the green belt. There are many run down areas in the city which are eyesores and need developing.	6323/15982	
	Objection – need more housing but this should not be at the expense of the green belt. This should be on brownfield sites of which there are many. York is meant to be a small city not a sprawling metropolis.	6325/15987	
	Objection – there is too much new housing shown for the East side of York compared to the west. Road infrastructure to the east is struggling already.	6330/17233	
	Objection – should Whinthorpe fail to deliver then this could undermine the entire local plan strategy. As a counter balance and complementary measure suggest the plan should seek to identify a range of smaller sites which can be delivered, particularly along the major transport corridors and with good access to the cycle and footpath network.	6333/17232	
	Objection – it makes more sense to redevelop the existing brownfield sites.	6338/16018	
	Objection – reliance on 3 large sites to meet the majority of the housing requirements will mean that the plan under delivers. Therefore disagree with the proposed distribution. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased.	6339/16007	The Merchant Taylors Of York
	Objection – reliance on 3 large sites to meet the majority of the housing requirements will mean that the plan under delivers. Therefore disagree with the proposed distribution. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased.	6341/16013	
	Objection – reliance on 3 large sites to meet the majority of the housing requirements will mean that the plan under delivers. Therefore disagree with the proposed distribution. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased.	6344/16023	Escrick Park Estate
	Comment – whilst concerned that too much of the housing requirement has been directed to ST15, support the fact that development has been directed to a range of urban areas and villages, in particular the distribution of 10% to village locations.	6349/16032	Linden Homes North
	Comment – support SS3 as it identifies a significant proportion of the development within York will come from large strategic sites but plan must also recognise the considerable cost and time constraints associated with delivering a range of sites, these factors need to be included in a site specific delivery trajectory.	6351/17168	Gladedale Estates
Objection – there is no evidence that detailed viability work has been undertaken for the strategic sites to demonstrate they are deliverable. The plan includes insufficient supply to meet its housing requirements. Option 2 would be more appropriate as it	6357/16056	Ainscough Strategic Land	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would make use of existing infrastructure and ensure that new development will be in a sustainable location.		
<b>Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued</b>	Comment – the plan is relying on a number of strategic extensions along with a new settlement proposal and there is a reasonable concern that should the Whinthorpe scheme fail to deliver this could undermine the entire strategy.	6362/17230	
	Objection – it would be reasonable to set a hierarchy of development: brownfield, new settlements and expansions to existing settlements. Brownfield should be used first at the density proposed in the LDF rather than the LP. The new towns should be next and one should be completed before the other with the necessary infrastructure in place.	6363/17699	
	Objection – reliance on 3 large sites to meet the majority of the housing requirements will mean that the plan under delivers. Therefore disagree with the proposed distribution. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased.	6383/16114	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
	Objection – reliance on 3 large sites to meet the majority of the housing requirements will mean that the plan under delivers. Therefore disagree with the proposed distribution. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased.	6384/16120	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Linden Homes
	Support – the building on brownfield sites, such as the former sugar beet factory and the tear drop site and other former sites now not used by the railway industry is to be applauded.	6423/16145	
	Objection – should one of the urban extensions or the Whinthorpe proposal fall, there appears to be no contingency or flexibility within the preferred options to make up the difference? Concerned about the absence of a housing trajectory.	6439/17696	
	Objection – there should be no new housing built apart from on disused sites.	6456/16183	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6477/16200	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6484/16223	
	Objection – development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6485/16214	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – to the use of green belt to enlarge York when there is so much brownfield land available that has been left empty for so long.	6495/16230	
	Objection – brownfield should always be used rather than green belt. There are several sites of brownfield which should have primary consideration over using prime green belt land – such as next to the Barbican, the chocolate factories, the old school site on the A59 near Poppleton, the closed primary school on Hob Moor and the Beckfield Lane recycling centre. The Vale of York has excellent farmland and due to flooding issues, to take any of that farmland away would mean less locally grown food.	6502/16246	
	Objection – brownfield should always be used rather than green belt. There are several sites of brownfield which should have primary consideration over using prime green belt land – such as next to the Barbican, the chocolate factories, the old school site on the A59 near Poppleton, the closed primary school on Hob Moor and the Beckfield Lane recycling centre. The Vale of York has excellent farmland and due to flooding issues, to take any of that farmland away would mean less locally grown food.	6503/16250	
	Objection – the creation of two new towns within York’s existing green belt area is contrary to sustainable growth models.	6508/17653	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – pursuit of economic growth would require a greater use of the available brownfield sites for industry than in previous plans and this will reduce the number of houses that could be built on brownfield and so has increased the allocation of housing on agricultural land and greenfield. By adopting the traditional economic growth target more brownfield site space would be available for housing.	6510/16284	Cllr Joseph D Watt
	Objection – to the vast majority of housing being taken from precious green belt. Plan must ensure that it is proactive in building on brownfield ahead of any other.	6514/16304	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Objection – to the inclusion of the sites identified in iii, iv and v of policy SS3. Do not believe that these sites accord with Policy SS4 or the stated aspiration in para 5.4. How will adequate new education provision be secured for the proposed housing when none of the sites are large enough to provide a new secondary school?	6516/16321	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – many of the strategic sites identified in i and ii have been carried forward from previous local Plans and the arguments for and against them have been well rehearsed. There remains an issue about how many homes can be provided on each. The sites under iii, iv and v are not sustainable, impact adversely on the historic setting of the city, would contribute to a potentially damaging 25% population growth and would have a dramatic adverse impact on public services such as transport,	6517/16354	York Central Liberal Democrats

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	school and health. Brownfield opportunities should be delivered first. Making cheaper to develop greenfield sites available in the short term will simply result in large areas of derelict land in the city.		
Policy SS3 Spatial Distribution Continued	Objection – don't support this approach to spatial distribution and don't agree that the proposed developments are in sustainable locations	6518/16365	York Green Party
	Objection – brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield/green belt sites.	6519/16469	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	Objection – the effect of including all sites as phased 'within the lifetime of the plan' will undoubtedly lead to numerous greenfield/green belt sites starting early in the plan, because without the previous Local Development Framework brownfield first phasing, developers will have the financial advantage of moving onto the easier and cheaper to develop greenbelt sites. Such a policy will see brownfield sites like York Central undeveloped forever.	6521/17237	Cllr Mark Warters
	Objection – there are enough brownfield sites still waiting to be developed in and around the city.	6523/16508	
	Objection – although undoubtedly a huge need for new housing, especially affordable, this should not be located on Greenfield sites on the outskirts of York such as Whinthorpe. This land should be sacrosanct as green belt to protect the attractiveness of York as a compact and discrete city. Much more emphasis should be placed on the conversion of city centre properties and the use of derelict land for housing. Housing should be situated in places with adequate infrastructure and transport links.	6529/17758	
	Objection – the policy sacrifices York's green belt in the short term and stagnates progress on brownfield sites. The approach provides the wrong sequential approach, favouring green belt before brownfield. The evidence concludes that the only way to achieve the ambitious housing targets is to sacrifice high value green belt land early.	7313/17762	Cllr N Ayre
	Objection – to the development of land between the existing urban area and the ring road. Wish to see this land retained as green belt. Instead concentrate any new buildings at previously developed, but now unused, sites such as Terry's, Nestle South, British Sugar and the area behind the railway station.	Petition 12	
	Objection – it is absolutely vital that brownfield sites are used first.	Petition 15	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles	Objection – it will be important that this policy includes a phrase to ensure that the development of the site does not have a significant impact on international, national and locally designated wildlife sites.	42/11704	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – additional criteria should be added to the policy, requiring developments to: minimise the impacts of development upon local communities and neighbouring properties by careful design and landscaping; and ensure that adjacent local communities benefit from the development, including improvements to community facilities and access to open space and facilities.	62/12693	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection - policy must contain environmental considerations in the mix of development principles: carbon neutral, carbon reduction and mitigation of increased transport, but fundamentally in the construction and quality of the homes.	90/12827	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – development principle (iv) requires the ‘highest standards of sustainability’ but does not define ‘highest’. Principle should be amended to state: ‘to ensure the delivery of sustainable, energy efficient developments in line with national standards’. Trust that a review will be undertaken of policy to ensure that the cumulative impact of the cost of requirements is fully considered.	144/12881	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – important that adequate regard is had to the cumulative viability impacts of all policies and obligations. The Council should not rely upon site specific (or open book) assessments of viability as a remedy to unsustainable policies is not an acceptable approach. Plan policies should be realistic and achievable in the majority of cases, with open book assessments reserved for a minority of special cases. Recommends that the implications of this policy are thoroughly tested for its impact upon viability and developers will be encouraged rather than required to achieve high standards of sustainability and other requirements.	145/13859	Home Builders Federation
	Support –support the overall policy, especially development principle ii. Comment – Believe this statement could be further enhanced by the addition of the following words; ‘to ensure that social infrastructure requirements of the new community are researched and identified, then met through provision of community-led facilities and services in a planned and appropriately phased manner which complements and integrates and wherever possible enhances (with) existing facilities and services’. Pleased to see the following commitment: ‘The Council will prepare Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) for all strategic sites’ point 5.8. Would prefer to see this commitment as part of the policy principles to ensure developers and communities are fully aware of this intention.	178/13892	York Council for Voluntary Service



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued	Comment – subject to concerns about potential impact which the development of some of the strategic sites might have upon the special character and setting of the historic city, support this policy especially criterion v relating to the need to create locally distinctive places.	238/14052	English Heritage
	Comment – the Council will prepare SPD`s regarding all strategic sites. Seen as an opportunity to develop, test and encourage new and emerging technologies related to sustainable drainage and water saving. Would welcome the opportunity to work with the Council, developers and stakeholders to pursue these possibilities.	295/14157	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Comment – would like to see this policy strengthened, support point vii about open space, however we would like to see point vi strengthened to read: ‘vi, to create a people friendly and stimulating environment which promotes opportunities for physical activity, children`s play, social and community interaction (which includes understanding that children and young people can free play and socialise within their community). Specifically children`s play and physical activity are not mentioned.	387/14199	Active York
	Objection – object to the current wording of Policy SS4 on the basis that it does not fully reflect the need to ensure viability and deliverability as set out within the NPPF, in particular paragraph 173. Policy SS4 should be should be redrafted as follows; “All strategic sites identified on the key diagram and proposals map, dependent on their composition and mix and there being no adverse impact on the ability to viably deliver development on site, will be expected to reflect the following development principles.” Policy SS4: Strategic Sites Development Principle (iv); object to current wording of this principle on the basis that it does not take account of the need to have regard to viability and deliverability. The wording should therefore be revised to read as follows: “To ensure the highest standards of sustainability are embedded at all stages of the development having regard to viability and deliverability”. Policy SS4: Strategic Sites Development Principle (vii); object to second part of principle which seeks to maximise linkages with the wider green infrastructure network. The word “maximise” should be replaced with the word “optimise” as this should be both a qualitative and quantitative consideration.	434/16570	Associated British Foods plc
	Support – policy reflects the planning and design principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and as such the policy is supported. Comment – plainly unnecessary for each of the strategic sites, particularly the smaller ones, to have Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) prepared for them, question the need for SPD`s for each site.	534/16709	DPP One Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued	Objection – Policy SS4 is not justified. Failure to recognise the RSS creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16745	
	<p>Objection – object to the many principles identified within Policy SS4 as unnecessary burdens being placed upon strategic housing sites. Policy SS4 is contrary to paragraphs 173 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, where it is clear that the cumulative implications of policies and obligations should not put the implementation of sites and the Local Plan at risk.</p> <p>Comment – the Council’s current viability work is published in the Local Plan Area Wide Viability Study (June 2013). However, this study has not determined whether the policies in the emerging Local Plan are likely to impact upon the viability of the Local Plan strategy, at paragraph 3.8, this is a flaw in the Local Plan process. It is important that adequate regard is given to the cumulative viability impacts of all policies in the Local Plan. Concerned that without this level of viability work, the Council do not understand at this stage whether or not various policies or components of policies will in turn comprise the viability of various sites and hence the Local Plan as a whole. Recommend that the implications of Policy SS4 and (other policies) are tested for impact upon viability of various strategic sites and hence the Local Plan as a whole. Recommend deletion of following principle; “to ensure the highest standards of sustainability are embedded at all stages of the development.</p>	659/15074	Persimmon Homes
	Support- support the aspirations contained within York`s spatial strategy.	673/16839	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Comment – major developments must enhance the city and be designed carefully.	679/16864	
	Comment – take a balanced approach to the identified spatial principles, balanced in favour of protecting Green Belt land.	1109/17177	
	<p>Comment –believe that spatial distribution and particularly the development of land opportunities in the South and Western part of York including Strategic Sites, Urban Extensions and the New Settlement should be dependent upon agreement of a Management Strategy for the A64 and its junctions with the local primary road network by the agency and the Council.</p> <p>Support – development principles for strategic sites outlined in Policy SS4 are welcomed, specifically the aims to: Maximise integration, connectivity and accessibility to and from the site giving priority to sustainable travel options. To ensure as many trips as possible are able to be taken by sustainable travel modes and to promote and facilitate modal shift from cars to sustainable forms of travel by maximising opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport. Support the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents for all strategic sites, however,</p>	1264/17148	Highways Agency

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	any infrastructure essential to the delivery of a strategic site should primarily be identified within the Local plan document and infrastructure delivery plan.		
<b>Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued</b>	<p>Support – broadly supportive of development principles set out in Policy SS4</p> <p>Objection – concerned with the tone of the policy which refers to all strategic sites being “expected” to reflect the development principles, there may be instances where the policy is not applicable to a particular strategic site. The Council also needs to take into consideration the cumulative implications of policies and obligations it is seeking to include within its Local Plan, which should not unduly burden developments such as Whinthorpe. Supportive of the principles of SS4. The Council should undertake further viability testing. Also recommend the following changes: First paragraph reworded to: “Where viable and necessary the strategic sites identified on the key diagram and proposals map are encouraged to reflect the following development principles” Bullet point iv of policy SS4 to be deleted and replaced with: “To ensure that high standards of sustainability are embedded, where viable, at all stages of the development”.</p> <p>Comment – need for aspirational policies to be fully tested, not aware that Council has undertaken a full viability assessment of the cumulative impact of all policies and obligations within the preferred options document. Current viability work contained in the Local Plan Area wide Viability study (2013) only considers affordable housing, open space and education contributions.</p>	1337/17277	Halifax Estates
	Support/Comment – the principles of site specific development cited in the table below are to be supported with additional considerations being the adoption of a pepperpotting/random scattering of tenures/range of housing across sites, rather than a mono-tenure approach that can potentially lead to segregation and reduce social cohesion.	1346/17302	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
	Objection – makes no consideration of the potential contribution to biodiversity enhancement that can be made through high quality design. Should explicitly promote the enhancement of biodiversity and the delivery of a net gain in biodiversity as key elements of high quality design. The following additional criterion should therefore be added; “to provide a net gain in biodiversity by enhancing or creating priority habitat and providing design features to support priority species”.	1399/17358	RSPB
	Support – consider that the strong emphasis on sustainability, as evidenced by the principles of development as set out in Policy SS4, are excellent and strongly support this approach by the Council.	1491/17444	National Trust
	Objection – could lead to undue burdens being placed upon strategic sites,	1514/17471	Monks Cross North

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	implementation of these statements will impact upon developing viability, it is not the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate a policy cannot be achieved.		Consortium
<b>Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued</b>	<p>Support – these principles will be helpful in securing high quality and sustainable new development.</p> <p>Objection – development principle (iv) requires the ‘highest standards of sustainability’, the Local Plan does not define ‘highest’, request that (iv) is amended to state the following: ‘to ensure the delivery of sustainable, energy efficient developments in line with national standards’, this will ensure that this development principle is clear, accords with the National Planning Policy Framework and is therefore sound.</p> <p>Comment – welcome the recognition that the social infrastructure needs to be phased, given the scale of the strategic site allocations. It is important that this policy is properly tested through any viability assessment. Paragraph 5.8, No timescales are available for the preparation of the remaining Supplementary Planning Document’s (SPD). No objection in principle to providing further guidance for the development of strategic sites. However it is important that SPD`s do not burden the process or create delays as this could undermine the strategy of the plan. Would like to adopt a partnership approach and work closely with the Council, statutory consultees and the local community in formulating and finalising the proposals for Cliftongate. Overall, consider that a comprehensive approach can be determined through the development management process, negating the requirement for an SPD.</p>	1523/17495	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Objection – criterion (v) refers to creating new and enhancing key views. Reference should also be made to the protection of existing key views, in some instances it is not necessary to enhance key views, just simply protect and respect them as existing. The policy does not however offer protection and so the Council could not rely upon it to defend key views in relation to the development of strategic sites. Do not agree that a single new settlement should be planned for in the Local Plan, more appropriate to adopt alternative 2, which is to prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through provision in the villages subject of levels of services. Far more sustainable to see the expansion of existing communities than to plan for a whole new settlement. If a new settlement goes ahead then it is likely to add congestion on roads into York. Any policy referring to the development of a new settlement should therefore require the development to pay for the necessary upgrades to accommodate the additional traffic.	1592/17592	York Civic Trust
	Objection – unnecessary for each of the strategic sites, particularly the smaller ones,	1663/9959	DPP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to have Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), therefore support the policy as it reflects national policy but question the need for SPD`s for each site.		
<b>Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued</b>	Comment – hope that the SPDs for strategic sites can adequately and realistically establish how a co-ordinated planning approach will be achieved.	1665/12931	York Environment Forum
	Objection – part (iv) of Policy SS4 seeks to ensure the highest standards of sustainability are embedded at all stages of the development, however, there is no viability clause and one should be added to ensure that the policy does not stall or undermine the deliverability of strategic sites in York. Comment – Subject to the above viability cushion being added, generally support the principles behind the policy and note that the Council has opted to provide a local level policy to guide strategic development rather than rely on the NPPF.	1668/15028	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Comment – query whether this list of criteria is too onerous and will act to restrict or delay the strategic sites from coming forwards.	1705/9779	Gladman Developments
	Objection – this policy reflects the planning and design principles set out in the NPPF, however it is unnecessary for each of the strategic sites, particularly the smaller ones, to have SPDs prepared for them in order to provide a framework for the development of these sites.	1801/9889	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Comment – inclusion of the preferred approaches, as presently drafted, will result in a weak sustainability with new infrastructure, facilities being required for huge new developments on land within the Green Belt. Congestion will result at access points to existing infrastructure etc. Alternative 2, in essence a policy to promote the expansion of existing urban area, is preferred, this particularly applies to Whinthorpe and land to the North of Clifton Moor.	3356/8563	
	Comment – the principles will be helpful in securing high quality and sustainable new development. However, principle (iv) requires the highest standards of sustainability without defining ‘highest’. Principle should be amended to state: ‘to ensure the delivery of sustainable, energy efficient developments in line with national standards’. Welcome the acknowledgement in paragraph 5.6 that the delivery of the strategic sites will be critical to achieving the vision and intended outcome of the plan. Consider that this policy will provide an appropriate policy basis for dealing with most of the strategic sites and that Supplementary Planning Documents will only be required for complex brownfield strategic sites with technical constraints.	5245/14333	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Support – strategic site development principles: agree Option 2 local level policy.	5609/13173	
	Comment – good private transport links to a suitably sized main transport network must be in place before developments proceed to prevent further congestion and	5740/13523	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pollution. This brings the planned developments at Clifton Moor, Monks Cross and Metcalfe Lane into question in the plan timescale.		
<b>Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued</b>	Comment – Supplementary Planning Documents must be robust to ensure that 'infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs associated with new development' are implemented in full and not watered down in order to pander to developers.	5767/13640	
	Support – support the development principles relating to strategic sites set out in Policy SS4.	6062/15513	ID Planning
	Comment – the Local Plan is seeking to get approval for the creation of new towns, notably Whinthorpe. Absolutely vital that the city engages with creating an exemplar of sustainable transport from the start if such developments are to avoid creating more traffic congestion. City should be working to create a viable public transport infrastructure to link the Germany Beck site and the University of York itself to such a new public transport system. Would like to see a tram or monorail similar to London`s docklands, linking the future developments, the system could then cross one of the green corridors into the city. By creating a monorail or light elevated railway running on electric power, the city would at last be providing an attractive low carbon alternative to the car.	6137/15594	
	Objection – understand two large undeveloped sites, which could be developed to include accommodation for gypsy/travellers are located at Holme Hill and Cliftongate. If these were utilised when the gypsy/traveller accommodation could be incorporated from the start – rather than encroaching on long established settled communities plus building in Green Belt.	6139/15602	
	Support – the policy is supported, however it is plainly unnecessary for each of the strategic sites, particularly the smaller ones, to have SPD`s prepared for them. Therefore support the policy as it reflects national policy but object to the need for SPDs for each site.	6160/15665	The Trustees Of The Richardson & Penty Families
	Comment - it is plainly unnecessary for each of the strategic sites, particularly the smaller ones, to have Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) prepared for them. Therefore support the policy as it reflects national policy but object to the need for SPDs for each site.	6349/16034	Linden Homes North
	Objection – policy could lead to undue burdens being placed upon strategic sites and the implementation of the wide ranging statements included in the policy will impact upon development viability. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the cumulative implications of policies and obligations should not unduly burden	6351/17169	Gladedale Estates



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developments. Should not rely on site specific assessments of viability as a remedy to unsustainable policies. Plan policies should be realistic and achievable in the majority of cases, with open book assessments reserved for a minority of special cases.		
<b>Policy SS4 Strategic Sites Development Principles Continued</b>	Comment – support the development principles but the proposed strategic housing allocations should be assessed against these principles to ensure they comply with the policy.	6357/16057	Ainscough Strategic Land
	Comment – do not understand how adequate new education provision will be secured for the proposed housing. Whilst some of the strategic sites are large enough to provide new primary schools none of them are large enough, on their own, to provide a new secondary school. It is difficult to see how the plan can be sound in this particular respect.	6516/16334	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Comment – whilst some of these principles are supported by more detailed policy elsewhere in the Plan, others are too vague and ill defined: (iii) not clear what this means; (iv) ‘the highest standards of sustainability’ – what does this mean? The highest standards of sustainability would require all development sites to be developed as zero carbon, yet the Plan includes no such requirements. Neither the wording here nor on chapter 23 on Transport convinces that the negative transport impacts of the proposed level of development can be sufficiently mitigated. Support - (viii,ix and x) Strongly support these three principles but would still like to see these strengthened in the Plan.	6518/16366	York Green Party
<b>Para 5.04</b>	Objection – Would disagree that economic and housing growth aspirations are met in a way which ‘recognises the character and setting of York’ or ‘the relationship between York and its surrounding settlements’. There needs to be a more robust assessment. Four of the strategic sites bring development right up to the ring road (Sites ST14, ST8, ST15 and ST19) and three would extend development beyond the ring road (ST19, ST14 and ST15). Site ST14 also threatens the separation of settlements in the Green Belt.	238/14053	English Heritage
<b>Para 5.06</b>	Objection – concerned about the use of ‘exemplar’ as an undefined term, without full consideration of how this could impact on the cumulative viability of the delivery of strategic sites. The term should be deleted from paragraph 5.6.	1337/17278	Halifax Estates
<b>Para 5.07</b>	Objection – opposed to the reference to the potential for solar farms on sites to the south of Heslington. The visual impact of such development would be very harmful to the setting and special character of the city.	62/12695	Fulford Parish Council



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Para 5.07 Continued</b>	Objection – vision and ambition is that Whinthorpe will deliver the services and infrastructure that support the vision of an eco-settlement but remain cautious about committing to this until more fully understand the thinking behind the vision. Suggest paragraph 5.7 is deleted and replaced with: ‘In addition to the potential for all of the strategic sites to provide sustainable development, it is the Council’s ambition that the proposed new settlement at Whinthorpe (ST15) be developed as a sustainable new community. This would embrace high standards of sustainable living, incorporating an appropriate and viable proportion of affordable housing, green space and services that are in walking distance to all residents. The proposals should also demonstrate how Whinthorpe will reduce its carbon footprint through a range of measures which may include renewable and/ or low carbon technologies.	1337/17279	Halifax Estates
<b>Para 5.08</b>	Objection – it is considered that SPDs will only be required for complex brownfield strategic sites with technical constraints, where a number of technical issues need to be considered to bring the site forward.	144/12882	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – There is an existing Council approved SPD, further changes to ensure conformity to the new Local Plan must be in accordance with the NPPF and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.	434/16571	Associated British Foods plc
	Support – Local Plan appears to suggest that the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would be prepared following the adoption of the Local Plan. Following adoption of SPD a planning application would then be submitted. Whilst it is understood that this is a normal process for such sites, because of the scale of development proposed at Whinthorpe, this would cause unnecessary delay to an important strategic site. Whilst the principle of the SPD is not objected to, if the Council is to progress with the SPD it does need to be undertaken in parallel with the local plan process. This would ensure delivery of Whinthorpe is not delayed by approximately 12 – 18 months by a further tier of planning policy. Would suggest a new policy be included for Whinthorpe in the Local Plan (see paragraph 9.24)	1337/17280	Halifax Estates

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt	Support – considered that the preferred role of the green belt is appropriate.	6/11640	Ryedale District Council
	Comment – like York, Selby is looking to review the green belt (where it applies in Selby District). A coordinated approach would be beneficial. Would welcome exploration of opportunities for joint commissioning where appropriate.	9/11658	Selby District Council
	Support – supports in principle the commitment in the plan to set out the boundaries and extent of green belt insofar as it lies within the City's administrative area. Welcomes in principle the commitment to allocate land within the area currently considered to be green belt for development within the plan period as well as further safeguarded land for development thereafter.	11/11674	North Yorkshire County Council
	Support – the trust is supportive of this policy Objection – could be improved by providing support for developments which improve biodiversity in the green belt.	42/11705	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Support – agree that preserving the setting and special character of York as the primary purpose of the proposed green belt. Comment – believe that preserving the setting and character of York's villages should also be the purpose of the green belt. Believe green corridors are equally important for both the city and surrounding villages.	59/12633	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – Foss Bank Farm (site reference 569) should be taken out of the green belt. The parish council voted unanimously in support of this with the proviso that this land be developed for residential use only and in keeping with the surrounding residential developments in Earswick.	60/12681	Earswick Parish Council
	Support – agrees with the primary purpose of the York Green Belt as set out in SS5 Objection – believe that all the other purposes of the green belt as stated in the NPPF should also be referred to. The green belt should include the open space on the western side of Fordlands Road opposite Fulford Cemetery to maintain the openness of this land in order to preserve the green wedge and the distinctive identity of the Fordlands Road estate. This estate should be washed over by green belt so that effective control can be maintained over the forms of development taking place there.	62/12694	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – do not feel that the plan should safeguard land for development as outlined in SS5 since there is no way of predicting the impact of development on these sites in the medium to long term future on the natural and historic environment.	90/12837	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – whilst Hogg Builders (York) Limited welcomes the Council's positive approach to defining Safeguarded Land in order to meet longer term housing, employment and community needs (policy SS6). The plan states that this land could only be released through a Local Plan Review (Policy SS5iii). Hogg Builders (York)	144/12883	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>consider that a more appropriate approach would be a criteria-based policy setting out the housing supply conditions under which Safeguarded Land could come forward. Local Plan Reviews can be extremely complex and time consuming exercises. They do not therefore represent an appropriate means by which to trigger the release of Safeguarded Land.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Support – generally supportive of the principle of taking a long-term view regarding the inner boundaries of York's Green Belt and the identification of safeguarded land to accommodate the long-term development needs this should help provide certainty for developers and residents alike.</p> <p>Comment - the Plan should, however, take a longer-term view with regards the Green Belt boundary than the 25 years currently proposed. Does not accord with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 85. It is unclear when the 25 years commences, is it 2012 in line with the housing requirement or from adoption? If the 25 years start in 2012 this would only provide a further 7 years after the plan period. Given that NPPF paragraph 157 advises Local Plans should cover a period of 15 years than 25 years is sufficient as the Green Belt will need to be reviewed immediately after the current plan period. The setting of the inner Green Belt boundaries should therefore take account of the need for York's development requirements until at least 2045 (15 years past 2030)</p> <p>Objection – criteria iii of Policy SS5 is unsound as it will inhibit growth in the long-term. Criteria iii – such prohibitive criteria are not considered to be in the spirit of positive planning and does not provide sufficient flexibility to enable the plan to respond to changing economic and development requirements. The potential release of safeguarded land could be used to provide flexibility should any of these sites fail to deliver or become stalled. Delete criteria iii of Policy SS5, provide new criteria which outline the conditions against which safeguarded land will be considered for release.</p>	<p>145/13860</p>	<p>Home Builders Federation</p>
	<p>Objection – recognise that the primary purpose of the green belt is to provide a physical and environmentally distinctive character to the landscape. However this policy doesn't fully describe the equally important secondary affect upon community identify, sense of place, attached and belonging. In areas that are (or will be) physically defined by the landscape, that is the greenbelt (places such as Haxby and Wigginton, Copmanthorpe and proposed developments at Whinthorpe and north of Clifton Moor) the greenbelt landscape is a significant factor in helping communities to develop their sense of identity and belonging. This should be reflected in the policy statement.</p>	<p>178/13893</p>	<p>York Council for Voluntary Service</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt	Comment – welcome the level of housing provision and the identification of safeguarded land, concerns that because the capacity of some strategic sites to deliver the scale of housing identified has been overestimated, more land is required now for both allocations and safeguarding.	187/13914	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
Continued	Objection –the purposes of the Green Belt are not given sufficient emphasis. All five purposes as listed in the National Planning Policy Framework should be listed in this policy and in particular two of them listed as the primary purposes of the Green Belt for York. Firstly as stated, to preserve the setting and the special character of York. Secondly, to prevent coalescence between settlements, that is between the urban edge of York and its villages. Historic boundaries should be included. (There is reference elsewhere to the importance of historic boundaries.) The physical boundaries listed are not necessarily best and should not anyway be the reasons for Green Belt boundaries.	192/13993	
	Comment – the Policies which define the extent of the Green Belt (Policy SS5) should be set out before Policy SS3 which identifies the sites for development.	238/14044	English Heritage
	Objection – object to the way in which the proposed green belt boundaries have been arrived at. The council's evidence base including the approach to the green belt appraisal (2003) was updated in 2001 and again in 2013. Neither of these two revisions looked again comprehensively at the boundaries that had been established in 2003 and only consider minor revisions or alterations to the areas and boundaries contained within it. Main objection is in relation to the green belt boundaries contained within the Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper Update (2013). Whilst these have been used to help inform the proposed Green Belt surrounding York they have not been open to the same scrutiny as if the Council were reviewing existing or established boundaries. Object to the proposed green belt boundary around Bishopthorpe. Development opportunities are to a degree already constrained due to flooding issues and for the village to be able to grow additional land would be required outside of the flood plain or flood zones 2 and 3. Do not therefore agree with constraining the expansion of existing sustainable villages and not that if the green belt were to be confirmed it would effectively halt and further expansion of this village or the next 25 years. This approach seems wholly at odds with the NPPF in terms of supporting the rural economy and the delivery of new facilities and services as well as rural affordable housing. Would like to see a minor revision to the proposed green belt around Bishopthorpe so that land to the west of Bishopthorpe Road is excluded from the greenbelt. If the Council are not minded to allocate additional land contend that	432/16545	Church Commissioners for England

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the Council should consider safeguarding additional land around the village.		
<b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b>	Objection – object to the designation of land at Stockton Lane, Heworth as green belt. It does not have the relevant attributes necessary for the five purposes of including land in the green belt. The sites designation is contrary to the NPPF in that it is not necessary to keep this land permanently open and it would fail to take an important opportunity to support sustainable development. It is a lost opportunity to secure a modest urban extension for residential purposes which would have no adverse implications on environmental, social and economic terms. It is a lost opportunity to design in flexibility to the local plan in the context of serious doubt over the deliverability of the housing requirement for the city in the plan period. The Council have failed to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances for designating this site as green belt. The alternatively proposed green belt boundary would provide a permanent long term boundary and be consistent with seeking to meet existing and longer term development needs. The Council is respectfully invited to review its position and to exclude the site from the prospective green belt and include it as a residential allocation as a modest urban extension.	451/16599	Linden Homes North & Miller Homes
	Objection – whilst it is supported that the establishment of a permanent green belt boundary for York is well overdue it is fundamental that green belt boundaries are not drawn too tightly. Strongly disagree with SS5 criterion ii in respect of site H9 in Acomb. Support the future identified and delivery of H9 for housing development but strongly question the proposed site boundary which does not follow and natural boundary and there is no logic to the boundary proposed. The boundary should be extended. See response for detail.	528/16661	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Support – the policy makes it clear that to meet the current and future development needs of the district, land that is otherwise open and could be included in the Green Belt will need to be identified for development. This is a realistic approach and is welcomed. Welcome and support acknowledgement that Green Belt boundaries, once defined, are intended to be permanent and endure for at least 25 years. All the above accords with national policy.	534/16701	DPP One Ltd
	Comment – preserving the setting and special character of York should be the primary purpose of York's Green Belt.	540/16735	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection – Policy SS5 is not justified. Failure to recognise the Regional Spatial Strategy creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16738	
	Comment – generally supportive of the principle of taking a long term view regarding the inner boundaries of York's Green Belt and the identification of safeguarded land to	659/15069	Persimmon Homes

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>accommodate the longer term development needs of the city. Feel that more flexibility is needed within the Local Plan as to when safeguarded land can be brought forward. Object to the wording in the Local Plan and Safeguarded Land Technical Paper (June 2013) that such land could only be brought forward either in part or as a whole should necessary at the time of a plan review. Suggest that if the Council is struggling to bring forward some strategic sites and 5 year supply of housing land, then the Council should be looking to bring forward earlier than anticipated safeguarded land. Recommend the following sentence is added to page 60: ' Should the allocated strategic sites not come forward in the Plan period, then the Council will encourage safeguarded land to come forward in this Plan period'.</p> <p>Objection – consider criteria iii of policy SS5 should be amended as in the long term it will inhibit housing growth. Strongly object to the sentence in criteria iii that indicates safeguarded land can only come forward for development following a Plan review. This does not include sufficient flexibility to enable the Plan to adapt to changing development requirements. Suggest that with the Plan relying heavily upon a number of strategic sites, enough flexibility in this Plan to allowing the potential release of safeguarded land should any of the strategic sites fail to deliver or become stalled be included as part of an amended criteria iii of Policy SS5. Recommend that criteria iii of Policy SS5 should read: 'To ensure that there is a degree of permanence beyond the plan period sufficient land is allocated for development to meet the needs identified in this plan. Safeguarded land can be brought forward in this plan period to respond to changing development circumstances and/or the failure of strategic sites to deliver their housing target (the inclusion of this amended criteria could also assist the Council in maintaining a 5 year supply of housing land'.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Support – support the aspirations contained within York's Spatial Strategy. Objection – the plan should, however, take a longer-term view with regards the Green Belt boundary than the 25 years currently proposed. The setting of the inner Green Belt boundaries should therefore take account of the need for York's development requirements until at least 2045 (15 years past 2030)</p>	<p>673/16840</p>	<p>Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</p>
	<p>Support - the green belt south of York up to the A64 must be kept at all costs. It is supported by clear statements in the Heslington Village design statement.</p>	<p>863/16932</p>	
	<p>Comment – much is made of the green belt and rightly so. But have City of York actually got one properly adopted? One thing that never seems to get fixed is the green belt. Isn't it time it was fixed in tablets of stone?</p>	<p>1008/17019</p>	
	<p>Objection - consider that the opportunity should be taken to assess whether all land</p>	<p>1140/17078</p>	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>within the Green Belt serves the defined purposes of the Green Belt and whether sustainable development can be achieved through the re-designation of certain parts of the Green Belt. The principle of Green Belt release is accepted in the Local Plan Preferred Options. The site north of Vicarage Lane does not contribute to the preservation of the setting of the special character of the City of York. Development of the site north of Vicarage Lane would not result in uncontained sprawl of a large built-up area or uncontrolled encroachment into the open countryside; nor result in coalescence of settlements. In this context, it is considered that the extent of proposed Green Belt should be reviewed in order that it serves only the purposes as outline in national policy. The extent of the defined Green Belt should be reconsidered so that it serves only its principal purpose of preserving the Special Character of the City of York, rather than simply ‘washing over’ settlements and land where the Green Belt, as defined, plays no such role. The site does not perform a meaningful role in Green Belt terms and should be included within the Development Limits of Naburn.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York’s Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection – pleased to note that Whinthorpe is not included within the land which the Council wants to leave open, they are concerned with the continued reliance on a study from 2003. Since this appraisal was undertaken in 2003, the amount of land required for housing has increased, which is reflected in this Local Plan. Concerned that Figure 5.3 has now been superseded by a more up to date site selection process and may not be consistent with the Local Plan and the proposals map.</p>	<p>1337/17272</p>	<p>Halifax Estates</p>
	<p>Objection –agree ‘preserving the setting and special character of York’ as the primary purpose of the proposed Green Belt, however, believe ‘preserving the setting and special character of York’s villages’ should also be the purpose of the Green Belt. Green corridors are equally important for both the city and the surrounding villages.</p>	<p>1457/17389</p>	
	<p>Support – support the strengthening of the Green Belt through its identification and inclusion within the Local Plan. Support the statement as set out in Policy SS5(i) that the primary purpose of the Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of York, but also recognise that it has a role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p>	<p>1491/17445</p>	<p>National Trust</p>
	<p>Support – supportive of the Council’s approach to taking a long term view regarding the inner boundaries of York’s Green Belt and the identification of safeguarded land to accommodate long term development needs providing certainty for developers and residents alike. The Plan should however, take a longer term view with regards the Green Belt boundary than the 25 years currently proposed, such a timeframe does not accord with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 85. The setting of the inner</p>	<p>1514/17472</p>	<p>Monks Cross North Consortium</p>



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Green Belt boundaries should therefore take account of the need for York`s development requirements until at least 2045 (15 years past 2030).		
<b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York’s Green Belt Continued</b>	Objection – Welcome the positive approach to defining safeguarded land in order to meet long term housing, employment and community needs. Local Plan reviews can be extremely complex and time consuming exercises; they do not therefore represent an appropriate means by which to trigger the release of safeguarded land. A more appropriate approach would be a criteria based policy setting out the housing supply conditions under which safeguarded land could come forward. Recognise that the Local Plan identifies sites for residential development up to 2030, however it does not consider which sites will be required beyond this period.	1523/17496	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Comment – support the protection of the existing Green Belt.	1579/17625	
	Objection – do not consider that it is York that needs preserving, it is more important to protect the village communities, their setting and their special characters whether they are defined Green Belt surrounded or have washed over status. It also adds a dimension of non-encroachment from other larger built up city and urban areas to prevent coalescence.	1589/17560	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – welcome reference to the primary purpose of the Green Belt in York being to preserve the setting and special character of York, and this being the preferred approach. Welcome the setting of long term boundaries beyond 25 years in order to provide a framework and manage expectations of how York might develop in the future. Objection – the policy is disingenuous because it then goes on to recognise only one of the five purposes of Green Belt when reference is made to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The second sentence of Policy SS5 should refer to the main aim of Green Belt, once boundaries have been established, is to ‘prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’ paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	1592/17593	York Civic Trust
	Support – welcome the inclusion of Green Belt to the areas surrounding the village and the allocation of Green Belt to both sides of the A59 in the vicinity of Station Road. In Knapton, welcome the proposal to establish the boundary of development and allocation of Green Belt to preserve the integrity of the village.	1599/9932	
	Objection - Policy SS5 notes the primary purpose of the Green Belt as being to preserve the setting and special character of York. The policy states that the general extent of the Green Belt is provided in the plan Key Diagram and specific boundaries on the proposals map reflect readily recognisable features that are likely to endure.	1661/9948	Linden Homes

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>The need to ensure permanence is also mentioned in the policy, reflecting the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. In each of these areas, the plan is deficient in respect of land at Askham Lane. The Council have taken a blanket approach to the land on the west side of Woodthorpe, defining all of this area as “Areas Retaining Rural Setting”. This approach is counter to the approach stated in the Historic Character and Setting Technical Report (2011). Considered that the land to the north and west of the Great Knoll provide little in the way of views or an open setting to the historic city as this area is not well appreciated from external view points. The land at Askham Lane represents an opportunity which may be appropriately removed from the Green Belt and allocated for viable and deliverable residential development, assisting in meeting the housing and growth requirement of the plan.</p>		
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York’s Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Support – wholly support the fact that Figure 5.3 shows that ST13 does not perform any Green Belt or other spatial objective purpose. Policy SS5 and Figure 5.3 is supported.</p>	1663/9960	DPP
	<p>Support – agree that the role of the Green Belt should identify ‘preserve the setting and special character of York’ as the primary purpose. Agree with identifying sufficient development sites for the duration of the Plan, safeguarding land to provide options in the future, as it is more realistic, given the time frame. The alternative has attractions too, in that it would permit a wider vision to be taken which would present a more holistic and joined up approach to development and, crucially, infrastructure.</p>	1665/12933	York Environment Forum
	<p>Objection – object to part iii of the policy, it is too rigid and does not offer enough flexibility to enable safeguarded sites to come forward during the plan period should circumstances change. Request that part iii of the policy is deleted especially as there is a separate policy (SS6) dealing specifically with safeguarded land.</p>	1668/15032	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	<p>Objection – the council have not undertaken an up to date comprehensive strategic review of the green belt, therefore by proposing significant new development within the green belt without a robust evidence base, the local plan is contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. This would ensure that all potential development options have been thoroughly investigated to identify the most appropriate and sustainable development options. Green Belt Settlement Study undertaken, see response for detail. Identified two main failings. The plan proposals do not follow a clear and transparent methodology for the spatial allocation of development areas and does not offer examples or locations where key characteristics can be found or how and why the areas proposed as allocations have been determined</p>	1705/9781	Gladman Developments

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to be appropriate. In selecting the areas for development the evidence base does not address at least three of the five stated purposes of the greenbelt and therefore cannot truly be considered an appraisal of the landscape in relation to its appropriateness for green belt inclusion/retention.		
<b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b>	<p>Support – the policy makes it clear that to meet the current and future development needs of the district, land that is otherwise open and could be included in the green belt will need to be identified for development. This is a realistic approach and is welcomed. Also welcome and support the acknowledgement that greenbelt boundaries once defined are intended to be permanent and endure for at least 25 years. This all accords with national policy.</p> <p>Objection – object to the identification of land north of Drome Road, Copmanthorpe as fulfilling green belt purposes to stop the merge of the Copmanthorpe and Bishopthorpe. Considered that the site would actually infill the gap between two parts of Copmanthorpe that have historically been separated by the railway line. The proposed allocation of this land would therefore reacquaint the two urban areas and restore the relationship thus strengthening the community. Figure 5.3 is incorrect. Propose that it be amended to show land to the north of Drome Road to be excluded from the preventing coalescence designation and allocated as safeguarded land for potential future development.</p>	1801/9890	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	<p>Objection – neither the York Green Belt Appraisal (2003), nor the Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper (January 2011), includes the York Lakeside Lodges site in their assessment of areas of land which make a contribution to the setting and character of the city. The Historic Character and Setting update paper of June 2013 also does not refer to York Lakeside Lodges. This land did not therefore appear to be significant in relation to the stated purposes of including land in the Green Belt, it is also notable that the site does not feature in any of the key views and local views of the Minster set out in the Central Historic Core Conservation Area appraisal, this would reinforce the conclusion that it does not make a contribution to the setting and character of the city. Policy G11: Green Infrastructure would be more appropriate for this purpose. Clear that there are no functional links to the open farmland to the South and no visual link between the site and land to the South. Control over future development on the site could be adequately exercised via proposed Policy G11.</p>	1952/231	York Lakeside Lodges
	Objection - ignores safe guarding of green belt.	2340/3293	
	Objection – present proposals do little to inspire confidence in the future security of the green belt from urban sprawl.	2416/6593	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued	Comment – would like to see the local plan as an opportunity to recognise the important of Knapton as a discrete settlement in open land, the only such settlement within the outer ring road and therefore valuable. Should take the village design statement as a starting point for proposals for development which is proportionate and appropriate but which at the same time improves the highly pressured environment and retains the settlements much valued character.	2442/6726	
	Objection – whilst it is supported that the establishment of a permanent green belt boundary for York is well overdue it is fundamental that green belt boundaries are not drawn too tightly. Considered that H41 and H42 will not provide enough housing for Bishopthorpe to ensure its vitality in the long run. Considered that the development of agricultural land to the south west of Bishopthorpe as an edge of town development is much more sustainable and less harmful to the green belt than a new settlement such as the proposed ST15. Consider that the site is a suitable location for green belt release and available to accommodate residential development during the early stages of the plan. See response for detail.	2769/7320	
	Objection – object to Policy SS5.	2788/7390	
	Objection – Green Belt land should be protected and Brownfield sites should be utilised first.	2796/7418	
	Objection – why build on Green Belt land ?	2802/7436	
	Objection – extremely concerned at the significant threat to the green belt implied in the plan, specifically in Rufforth. It needs preserving.	2814/7473	
	Objection – object to any green belt development in any village	2865/7600	
	Comment – Poppleton Sites; this land needs to stay in the Green Belt because some Green Belt should be kept within the inner ring road limits and the approach to the City.	2869/7602	
	Comment – create a Green Belt to ensure we don't have the problem that is affecting us all now.	2957/7716	
	Comment – pleased that the Council is to create a Local Plan and recognise its importance in making the Green Belt legal.	2991/7770	
	Objection – Green Belt boundary	3063/12892	
	Comment – the Green Belt must be protected and adhered to.	3353/8556	
	Comment – the five purposes of the Green Belt should be reflected in this policy and should not be limited to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	3356/8564	
Comment – Fordlands Estate should stay in the Green Belt to maintain the character of Fulford village.	3908/10447		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued	Comment – the villages of Rufforth and Knapton are 'washed over' within the Green Belt, would like to see Knapton remain as the only village within the ring road having the distinction of being surrounded by fields.	3980/10585	
	Objection – consideration to site as a suitable, available and achievable site for renewable energy production, it is considered that the site should be excluded from the Green Belt as set out and the proposals map should be updated accordingly to reflect this. Site does not serve the purposes of the Green Belt for the following reasons; Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas by keeping land open. The development of the site would not constitute unrestricted sprawl of the built up area, is not open countryside but forms a redundant former mine site with a clear sense of permanent and physical separation between the site and the urban edges of York and Selby. Even in the event that the existing buildings are knocked down, the site will not remain open and so would not conflict with this purpose. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The site is very well separated from the nearest villages of Escrick, Deighton and Wheldrake with defensible boundaries (including Spring Wood, the screening bunds and New Road) and therefore its development would not result in merging towns. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Site does not perform the role or function of the countryside given its brownfield nature and the existing development present on the site, which has currently little aesthetic quality, therefore the function of the Green Belt land to assist the safeguarding of the countryside for encroachment is obsolete in this instance. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The nearest village surrounding the site does not comprise 'historic towns' and there are no nearby conservation areas or listed buildings. Furthermore due to its location the development of the site would not impact on the historic setting or character of York city centre, therefore the removal of the site from the Green Belt would not cause demonstrable harm to the surrounding character of the Green Belt. Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging recycling. At 23ha the site is a relatively minor proposal for release from Green Belt and could be used to met the city`s waste management and renewable energy needs. Whilst the development of the site would not directly assist urban regeneration by the reuse of derelict and other urban land, it would bring a previously developed, derelict, vacant site back into beneficial use, therefore derelict land would be regenerated without undermining urban regeneration.	4382/11349	Peel Environmental & North Selby Mine Waste Ltd
	Support – support of the decision not to include Site 83 as land suitable for development and would ask that this land be designated as Green Belt.	4140/11754	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Objection - object to the inclusion of the following sites within the Green Belt: Terry's Car Park (see response for map), this site is previously developed land has clearly defined boundaries It does not perform any green belt function. Land to South of Terry's Car Park (see response for map), this land is bounded by Bishopthorpe Rd to the west, the floodplain of the River Ouse to the east, and the urban area of York to the north. It is considered that some of this area could be readily developed without giving rise to any material adverse impact on the Green Belt in this part of York.</p>	4355/11602	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	<p>Support – reassuring to see that a defined and protected Green Belt will be created.</p>	5145/12263	
	<p>Comment – agree 'preserving the setting and special character of York' as the primary purpose of the proposed Green Belt. However, 'preserving the setting and special character of York`s villages' should also be the purpose of the Green Belt. Believe that green corridors are equally important for both the city and the surrounding villages.</p>	5178/12332	
	<p>Support – a 'Green Belt' should have been properly established long ago. Applaud the expressed determination to clearly define its boundaries now.</p>	5192/12464	
	<p>Objection – object to the removing of areas from the current Green Belt designation – such as the Fordlands Estate in Fulford and the designer outlet. This makes a mockery of having the Green Belt designation in the first place if it is removed simply to allow for development.</p>	5209/12442	
	<p>Comment – this plan attacks the draft Green Belt around York.</p>	5234/12551	
	<p>Objection – whilst Hogg Builders (York) Limited welcomes the Council's positive approach to defining Safeguarded Land in order to meet longer term housing, employment and community needs (policy SS6). The plan states that this land could only be released through a Local Plan Review (Policy SS5iii). Hogg Builders (York) consider that a more appropriate approach would be a criteria-based policy setting out the housing supply conditions under which Safeguarded Land could come forward. Local Plan Reviews can be extremely complex and time consuming exercises. They do not therefore represent an appropriate means by which to trigger the release of Safeguarded Land.</p>	5245/14334	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	<p>Comment – Poppleton Area: General villages surrounding the city, but separated from the existing conurbation should remain separate spaces with sufficient space in order that the character of the village status is retained and distinctive features are preserved. The village boundary depicted in the Plan development plan is already affected by the development of the Park &amp; Ride facility opposite the A59, whilst a permitted use of Green Belt land, it does provide a distinctive area of development adjacent to the main entrance to the village from the A59. Accordingly, this</p>	5332/14989	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development had already removed a significant amount of open space adjacent to the village. Existing separation around the ring road is required to ensure the geographic separation of the village from the city. This view is supported by the Poppleton Village Design Statement.		
Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued	Support – the proposed Green Belt land will protect the character of all our areas.	5410/14691	
	Objection – the use of the phrase 'safeguarded land' is misleading – 'safeguarded' means preserving something in its current state – another phrase should be used e.g. 'ring fenced for a later change'.	5557/13034	
	Support – delighted that the Council recommends the maintenance of the Green Belt inside the A64 to the South of York.	5602/13151	
	Support – agree with first option on role of York's Green Belt. Safeguarded land: Option 2.	5609/13174	
	Comment – need for a Greenfield buffer between the Westfield, Acomb, Knapton area and the northern by-pass (A1237), important now as it was in 2011, the Knapton/Rufforth plain is an important feature of Northern York and should be respected. The Council should take the opportunity to confirm it in the Green Belt.	5759/13615	
	Support – a realistic approach and is welcomed, also welcome and support the acknowledgement that Green Belt boundaries, once defined, are intended to be permanent and endure for at least 25 years, all accords with national policy. Wholly support the fact that Figure 5.3 shows that the land at Common Road and Hassacarr Lane, Dunnington does not perform any Green Belt or other spatial objective. However object to the fact that the site, despite being allocated for development and as a result will no longer appear open in character, is not contained within the settlement limits. Land which does not need to be kept permanently open should not be included within the Green Belt.	6160/15666	
	Objection - the Local Plan does not provide for Greenbelt boundaries which take account for the need for York's development subsequent to the current plan period. This will inevitably cause difficulties in the future. Greenbelt land should be allocated on the basis of landscape and other objective criteria. The proposed Greenbelt for land at Simbalk Lane will restrict further development of educational associated uses and will serve no meaningful purpose. Suggested that to restrict the use of this land by Greenbelt designation will have adverse economic effects in the York area and restrict the potential for logical further development. University and College sites in York now form one of the principal employment generators within the York Council area.	6327/17647	Blacker Brothers



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>Policy SS5 The Role Of York's Green Belt Continued</b></p>	<p>Support – wholly support the fact that Figure 5.3 shows that ST12 does not perform any Green Belt or other spatial planning objective purpose. Policy and Figure 5.3 are justified in so far as it relates to ST12 being based on a thorough assessment of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, and will ensure the effective delivery of development in accordance with national policy.</p>	6349/16035	Linden Homes North
	<p>Support – no objection to both plots of land lying to the west of Strensall Road, Old Earswick being removed from the green belt.</p>	6387/17242	
	<p>Objection – Agree with the preferred approach regarding preservation of York`s Green Belt but believe it should also include 'preserve and protect the setting and character of York's villages'.</p>	6508/17654	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	<p>Support/Comment – support 'preserving the setting and special character of York' as a primary purpose of York`s Green Belt. However, believe that the proposals in this Plan will undermine that objective by taking significant steps towards a pattern of development which does not preserve York`s setting in the surrounding countryside. Objection – do not support the general extent of the Green Belt shown in the Key diagram, this should remain generally as the working Green Belt established for development control purposes in 2005 (which had a housing allocation of around 640 per annum) and site allocations should be re-assessed with a view to a much lower level of development.</p>	6518/16369	York Green Party
	<p>Comment – agree with the preferred approach regarding York`s Green Belt but believe it`s primary purpose should also include protecting the setting and character of York`s villages. Do not think the preferred options put forward support this goal but in many cases the proposed allocations would have the opposite effect.</p>	6519/16460	Cllr Jenny Brooks

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land	Support – considered that the approach to safeguarded land is appropriate	6/11641	Ryedale District Council
	Comment – the plan should identify sufficient development sites for the duration of the plan and for Dunnington this should be done through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	59/12634	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – the parish council considers that safeguarded land should only be identified where sites do not fulfil important green belt purposes. There is no mandatory requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework to identify safeguarded land when determining detailed green belt boundaries. Paragraph 85 says that authorities should satisfy themselves that boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. However this can be achieved by the authority taking the view that beyond the plan period a significant proportion of York's development requirements should be met outside the city boundaries.	62/12696	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – do not feel that the plan should safeguard land for development as outlined in SS6 since there is no way of predicting the impact of development on these sites in the medium to long term future on the natural and historic environment.	90/12838	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Comment – unclear as to what the land is being safeguarded from? Perhaps the term is confusing as it seems to imply being saved from some other usage, rather than being planned for a potential future usage. Concerned that the safeguarded sites at Haxby and Wigginton, North of Clifton Moor, Knapton, Copmanthorpe and Whinthorpe are on a similar scale to the proposed developments (or in Knapton`s case, the existing village). The implications for sustainable community services are of concern as the development site including the safeguarded area (potential future development) is likely to present a significantly different set of community needs and challenges compared to the current development area alone. The proposals as they stand are likely to lead to a piecemeal approach to community facilities and services that is either inappropriate (too much) for the first phase alone or insufficient (too little) for the second phase. Community facilities and services need to be planned on a long term and stable basis and concerned that this approach will make it very hard to build cohesion between the communities. Think consideration should be given to either developing, or safeguarding whole sites rather than this two stage process on several sites.	178/13894	York Council for Voluntary Service
	Support – in setting the boundaries of the Green Belt there should be flexibility to both accommodate development requirements but also respond to changes in development needs caused by example by the need for additional housing in the life of the plan. Welcome the identification of safeguarded land to ensure the longer term permanence of the Green Belt boundary beyond the plan period.	187/13913	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Objection – should be clearly stated that the temporary users referred to as being permitted meanwhile on safeguarded land will conform to the uses allowed in the Green Belt.	192/13994	
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Objection – support the principle of identifying sufficient development sites for the duration of the plan and of safeguarding land to provide options for future consideration during the life time of the Green Belt. Have concerns about the implications which scale of growth which is being proposed might have upon York`s special character and setting and the choice of some of the sites which it is proposed to safeguard for development beyond the life time of this plan.	238/14047	English Heritage
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Comment – the approach to safeguarding land is not objected to and in line with Green Belt policy is an appropriate mechanism to allow for future development needs without having to fundamentally revisit Green Belt boundaries. The spatial distribution of safeguarded land does not assimilate or correspond to the spatial distribution of the plan as expressed within Policy SS3 and there is no explanation as to why a fundamentally different approach to safeguarding of land is taken compared to proposed allocations within the plan period.	452/16605	Miller Homes Ltd
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Support – the identification of sites to be identified as safeguarded land is support. Objection – the majority of the proposed safeguarded sites significantly protrude into the open countryside and green belt. There are several more suitable and more sustainable sites within the outer ring road to provide future development sites which would not lead to detrimental development on the countryside and potential urban sprawl. Sites to be safeguarded for long term development should be reassessed.	528/16663	York Diocesan Board of Finance
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Comment – neither the policy nor the explanatory text indicate which growth scenario has been used to arrive at the safeguarded land quantum. Support – support the identification of safeguarded land as it means the plan is responsive to changing circumstances and will ensure that the Green Belt, once defined, will endure all in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. The quantum of land identified also appears to be a realistic and justified as it is based on the extrapolation of trends used to forecast the housing and employment land needs, would like to have seen greater clarity as to how the figure was arrived at. The Local Plan has therefore been positively prepared.	534/16703	DPP One Ltd
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land continued	Objection – welcome the approach to identifying safeguarded land but if genuine options for alternative patterns of growth are to be available in the longer term, the amount of safeguarded land to be provided in the current plan must be considerably in excess of the assessed development land needs in the next plan period.	540/16737	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land Continued	Objection – Policy SS6 is not justified. Failure to recognise the Regional Spatial Strategy creates a fundamental flaw which underpins the whole plan.	544/16746	
	Support – support the aspirations contained within York’s spatial strategy.	673/16841	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Objection – safeguarded land, giving the impression that it was safe from future development. This has undoubtedly misled and misinformed many people. In practice, this safe-guarded land will extend the building of Cliftongate to Skelton cemetery.	1009/17035	
	Comment – any future work on the impact of the new proposed settlement at Whinthorpe should also consider the SF3 site safeguarded for longer term development.	1264/17149	Highways Agency
	Objection – the Plan should identify sufficient development sites for the duration of the Plan (15 years) safeguarding land to provide options for future consideration during the lifetime of the Green Belt, and for Dunnington that this should be done through the Neighbourhood Planning process. ‘Reason’ - To give Localism meaning and for example to ensure new contiguous expansion land if required under the Neighbourhood Plan is available for Dunnington School and compatible community services and facilities.	1457/17390	
	Objection – the Plan should take a longer term view with regards the Green Belt boundary than the 25 years currently proposed. The setting of the inner Green Belt boundaries should therefore take account of the need for York`s development requirements until at least 2045 (15 years past 2030).	1514/17473	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Objection – the proposed allocations in the plan are considered to have been insufficiently tested in terms of their capability to meet the current plan requirements. The consequence of under provision will be to place additional pressure on the safeguarded land and other green belt land to be released outside of a plan review.	1661/9946	Linden Homes
	Comment – neither the policy nor the explanatory text indicate which growth scenario has been used to arrive at the safeguarded land quantum. Support the Council`s identification of safeguarded land.	1663/9961	DPP
	Support – support the principle of identifying safeguarded land. Comment – request that a clause is inserted in Policy SS6 to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility for safeguarded sites to come forward during the plan period should circumstances change, which mean that such sites are required sooner.	1668/15033	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection – not undertaken a comprehensive review of the green belt and development opportunities in the green belt in order to make amendments to the boundaries and determine the most appropriate green belt release sites.	1705/9782	Gladman Developments
Objection – neither the policy nor the explanatory text indicate which growth scenario has been used to arrive at the safeguarded land quantum. Support the Council`s	1801/9892	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	identification of safeguarded land. Object to the lack of a safeguarded land allocation in relation to the land North of Drome Road, Copmanthorpe.		
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land Continued	Objection – To describe an area as ‘safeguarded land’ is misleading, what it actually means is that the site is safeguarded for future development.	1914/107	
	Objection – present proposals does little to inspire confidence in the future security of the green belt from urban sprawl	2416/6594	
	Objection –use of the word ‘safeguarded land’ is disingenuous, land is currently designated Green Belt and is being earmarked for future development, not being ‘safeguarded’ but the opposite!	2536/6823	
	Objection – the plan posted to the public is misleading, areas of land described as ‘safeguarded’ give the impression of being protected for Green Belt. In fact they are reserved for future building.	2631/6978	
	Objection– whilst the identification of sites to be identified as safeguarded land is supported, the majority of the proposed safeguarded sites are considered to significantly protrude into the open countryside and green belt. There are several more suitable and more sustainable sites on the edge of existing settlements which can provide future development sites which would not lead to detrimental development on the countryside and would not lead to potential urban sprawl.	2769/7324	
	Comment – areas of land described as ‘safeguarded’ give the impression of being protected for Green Belt. In fact they are reserved for future building.	2826/7490	
	Comment - areas of land described as ‘safeguarded’ give the impression of being protected for Green Belt. In fact they are reserved for future building.	2837/7516	
	Objection – sites that are marked as ‘safeguarded’ should be marked as ‘for future development’ to help residents identify the areas that the plan will develop on.	3075/7947	
	Objection – use of the term ‘safeguarded land’ is misleading as many people thought the land was safeguarded as green belt and not to be built on.	3257/8368	
	Objection – incorrect use of the term safeguarded, which by definition means protected from risk, when applied to land that has been earmarked for possible future development. ‘Reserved land’ would be a more accurate and less confusing term.	3447/8403	
	Objection – opposed to 180 acres being taken out of the green belt to be ‘safeguarded’. Would have thought that being in the green belt would make land safe from development.	3894/10438	
	Objection – terms such as ‘safeguarded land’ are deceiving since the green belt would be anything but safeguarded.	3970/10571	
Objection – use of the word ‘safeguarded’ in this context is deliberating misleading and	4797/14281		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	entirely inappropriate as casual reading will suggest that the areas so designated will not be developed in the future, whereas they are safeguarded for redevelopment.		
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land Continued	Objection – the identification of safeguarded land should be done through the neighbourhood planning process.	5178/12333	
	Objection – fail to understand the logic of safeguarding land by taking it out of the green belt when there are so many unused units in existing business parks.	5228/12524	
	Support – supportive of the approach to safeguarded land.	5609/13175	
	Objection – use of the word ‘safeguarded’ is misleading.	5671/13347	
	Objection – no safeguarding of green belt land. The word is deliberately misleading.	5674/13367	
	Objection – use of the phrase ‘safeguarded land’ is misleading. This means preserving something in its current state. Another phrase such as ‘ring fenced for a later change’ should be used.	5755/13602	
	Objection – labelling a site as simply ‘safeguarded land’ suggests that the land is safeguarded against development whereas in fact it is safeguarded for development.	5796/9542	
	Objection – whilst it is maintained that a larger area of the land off Moor Lane (ST10) is suitable for allocation for residential development, at the very least this additional land should be identified as land to be safeguarded for longer term development. Half of the identified safeguarded land sites adjoin proposed strategic housing allocations. Given the suitability of a wider area of Moor Lane site for development identifying this land as safeguarded land provides additional flexibility towards the end of the plan period in the event that some of the allocated sites do not come forward or deliver fewer houses than expected.	6062/15514	ID Planning
	Support – the identification of safeguarded land as it means that the plan is responsive to changing circumstances and will ensure that the green belt, once defined, will endure all in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It is unclear which growth scenario has been used to arrive at the safeguarded land quantum.	6160/15668	The Trustees Of The Richardson & Penty Families
	Support – the identification of safeguarded land as it means that the plan is responsive to changing circumstances and will ensure that the green belt, once defined, will endure all in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It is unclear which growth scenario has been used to arrive at the safeguarded land quantum.	6349/16037	Linden Homes North
Objection – to the language regarding safeguarded land which suggests that the green belt has a ‘lifetime’ or a certain number of years. Green belt has existed in its current form since the 1950s and there appear to be no reasons to put a limit on its future existence. Do not believe either of the two alternative approaches on safeguarded land is realistic as it is impossible to identify sites with precision when looking up to 25	6508/17655	City Of York Council Conservative Group	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	years in the future. Therefore propose that the plan should only identify sufficient development sites for the duration of the plan.		
Policy SS6 Safeguarded Land Continued	Objection – object to the inclusion of the safeguarded sites.	6516/16322	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – large areas of land are to be ‘safeguarded’. Such land will always be liable to developers seeking to exercise an early development opportunity.	6517/16356	York Central Liberal Democrats
	Objection – serious concerns about the policy on safeguarded land. It is not credible when looking at development beyond 2030 to consider only housing, employment community facilities. It is even more crucial that a longer term vision for York consider the availability of agricultural land close to the city for both food and energy provision and for the protection of biodiversity and open space. Extrapolating from the figures used for the plan period (unlimited growth) is not an acceptable policy. It is hard to understand why safeguarded sites have been identified without applying an assessment of so-called secondary constraints which the plan claims elsewhere are critical factors in site selection. Why is it helpful to identify an extensive tract if it is not in fact a suitable site when more assessment is done (paragraph 7 of Local Context)? Appreciate that safeguarding allows the green belt to endure beyond the plan period but have concerns about the areas of land safeguarded and their status when a plan review does occur.	6518/16370	York Green Party



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF1 Land South Of Strensall Village	Objection – land has been excluded from green belt in order to meet housing targets which are unacceptable. Doubts over whether the Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works can deal with the addition of 870 dwellings in the longer term. The only access to this land is across land which is leased to the parish council on a 99 year lease ending in 2095 – the only access over the leased land is for agricultural purposes and the parish council would not wish to change these access rights. Conflicts with National Planning Policy Framework as land falls into Class 3a or better agricultural land and must be rejected. Strensall Common Site of Special Scientific Interest also abuts the site and is a reason for rejection. Policy SS2 (ii) seems to have been ignored when choosing this site. No compelling reason to change the green belt in and around Strensall.	77/12763	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment- seek the allocation now of safeguarded land south of the York-Scarborough rail line now to support the provision of infrastructure and meet the shortfall in housing provision. There are doubts as to whether residential allocations identified in Policy H3-particularly the strategic sites- will be able to deliver the level of house completions identified. The plan proposes the provision of a rail halt at Strensall. There are costs and infrastructure that will need to be provided for this. The allocation of safeguarded land in this plan period would provide a more rational basis for the provision of these wider infrastructure needs.	304/14179	Shirethorn Ltd
	Objection - land is greenbelt and forms part of the wedge of land that links up the village with Strensall Common Site of Special Scientific Interest. This is valued by residents.	494/16623	
	Objection- site is inappropriate due to its close proximity to the Nationally Significant Nature Conservation Site and Site of Importance to Nature Conservation.	528/16664	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Support- supportive of the site being excluded from the green belt and allocated as safeguarded land.	534/16710	DPP One Ltd
	Objection- the proposal is considered to be without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core.	544/16775	
	Objection – the area identified as “safeguarded” in Strensall is of considerable importance to the character of the village, a green lung for the village, which connects it to the nearby important nature conservation areas.	1355/17336	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – safeguarded means protected, therefore the inference is this land is protected from development, this is a very misleading term and is surely a misrepresentation of the position and is designed to create a false impression. No development should be allowed between the railway line and Ox Carr Lane/Flaxton Road, this will destroy the openness and remove a green swathe of countryside	1552/17522	Architectural & Creative Design Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	entering the village and impinge on the Site of Special Scientific Interest. Development will destroy the village feel of Strensall in such a prominent position. Sewers and schools are at full capacity, the existing housing densities being adapted/imposed by the Council will create social problems in the future due to overcrowding of units and ever decreasing room sizes in speculative development for a few selected developers profit at the expense of the people, not good socialist policies ?		
Site SF1 Land South Of Strensall Village Continued	Objection – want to keep the green belt around the village. Do not want a Strensall town. We are a village.	2404/6557	
	Objection – SF1 is considered to be inappropriate due to its close proximity to the Nationally Significant Nature Conservation site and Site of Importance to Nature Conservation.	2769/7326	
	Objection – to proposed safeguarded land (SF1), is Green Belt and forms part of the wedge of land linking Strensall Common.	3062/7925	
	Objection – massive amount of Green Belt would be developed in Strensall Ward. Strensall has been greatly developed over the last few years and will be unable to take on all this extra development. Would increase the housing stock dramatically and ruin the village community, setting and local facilities. The Plan has not factored in the increase in traffic. More residents would lead to more water usage and drainage issues. Site SF1 is full of wildlife. Taking this land out of agricultural use as a local farmer produces his Winter feed on here would again lead to the need of increased traffic to deliver these supplies from elsewhere in the country. The village school is one of the biggest in York. Increased development and demand on this service would not be sustainable and children`s education would suffer. Other facilities such as doctors, shops, public houses etc. would all be located away from this major development.	3075/7948	
	Objection – object to the Local Plan on the grounds of the adverse impact it would have on road safety, local wildlife and the community facilities in and around Strensall. The proposed developments are highly inappropriate and will put immense strain on the already struggling local infrastructure of the area. Strensall has already been overdeveloped, with a housing population in excess of 6000. The endangered wildlife in this area includes barn owls, badgers, bats and great crested newts.	3297/8465	
	Objection – development of urban sprawl. Significant loss of land to York’s northern green belt and green infrastructure. Lack of transport infrastructure to support the developments, in particular the A1237. Subsequent impact on the A1237.	3428/8787	
	Objection – object to the development of the proposed safeguarded land (SF1), which proposes a substantial large scale development of 600 to 700 houses, on what is	4054/10734	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	currently farm land. This land links to the SSSI site of Strensall Common and is another important wildlife corridor. The village of Strensall is currently on the English Heritage at risk register and is marked as deteriorating and CYC has responsibility to protect the conservation area.		
Site SF1 Land South Of Strensall Village Continued	Objection – object to the removal of Green Belt designation on land Ref. H30 & SF1.	4081/10765	
	Objection – The H27 Brecks Lane 80+ is a step too far as is the H30 proposal for 61 opposite Northfields. The possibility of 600/700 houses on SF1 between the railway line and the Flaxton Road simply defies belief as this would overpower the roads and limited facilities and complete the destruction of quality of life in the ‘village’.	4139/10850	
	Objection – object to the development of the proposed safeguarded land (SF1) covering 20Ha between the railway line and Flaxton Road.	4250/11023	
	Objection – very much object to the proposal to remove the Green Belt status of land at Strensall as shown in plan H30 and SF1.	4318/11204	
	Objection – strongly object to the removal of the Green Belt designation on the land ref. H30 and SF1.	4394/11385	
	Objection – object to land being taken out of ‘Green Belt’ for housing. In particular site H30 which has been allocated for 61 houses and the safeguarded land SF1.	4495/11525	
	Comment – SF1 safeguarded land, a good reason to increase this area of land and bring forward the plan period allied to the proposed new rail link.	4752/12045	
	Objection – object to the loss of any more Green Belt i.e. site H30 and SF1.	4769/12061	
	Support – fully support the identification of land to north of Flaxton Road as part of a wider area of safeguarded land. Development of this site will not cause any undue harm upon the purposes of green belt. SF1 is surrounded by existing built development to north, east and west and would create a cohesive developed boundary to the south.	5245/14336	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – the land to the South of the railway, own a large portion of this, want to work with the Council and local Parish Council to create a usable centre to the village linked with the railway halt which is the way forward with transport.	5336/14526	
	Objection – Strensall’s infrastructure cannot cope with this amount of development. The drains, roads, schools, unless City of York Council Labour leaders propose to allocate more money for these. The wildlife so very close to Strensall Common.	5492/14860	
Objection – proposals for Strensall will impact seriously on the overloaded ring road, which would also impact adversely on traffic flow in and out of Haxby. If carried through, feel strongly that this would be bad for Haxby, a case has not been made as	5627/13245		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to why more houses are required in the York area.		
Site SF1 Land South Of Strensall Village Continued	Objection – impact on road safety, community facilities, local wildlife and the historical character of the village. Proposed development is inappropriate in the green belt and will put immense strain on the already struggling local infrastructure.	6152/15642	
	Objection – object to the removal of green belt designation on land SF1.	6312/15957	
	Objection – object to removal of 29 hectares from the green belt and safeguarding site SF1 for future development. Removal of this land from green belt would destroy the very substance of Strensall as a village. It offers a vital green lung for the village, providing an essential natural habitat for wildlife and ensuring Strensall doesn't become a built up dormitory town. Access would be a problem, in part by being separated from the village by the railway line and due to a lease extending to 2095 which restricts access points to agricultural purposes. There are no major local employers so commuting to work is unavoidable. Aside from the pressure on inadequate local facilities and services, such a major development here would also mean hundreds of extra cars on our roads, contributing to existing congestion problems in the village and the A1237.	6514/16311	Cllr Paul Doughty

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF2 Land North Of Clifton Moor	Objection – cemetery is an idyllic location in open countryside, which will eventually become subsumed within this area of safeguarded land for development. Demand that the environs of the cemetery be protected from any nearby housing development for perpetuity.	75/12758	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – land would join the new town to Moorlands Road/Moor Lane and subsume Skelton’s burial ground.	136/12873	Skelton Village Trust
	Objection – figure 5.3 implies that no land beyond the ring road is important to keep open in order to safeguard the rural setting of the historic city. This is clearly not the case and was not considered to be the case by the 1994 inspector. SF2 lies in the open countryside 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 the city with the settlements of Skelton and Haxby but also threaten the separation between these settlements and the main built-up area of the city. In combination with ST14 this area will result in development on both sides of the ring road which will also alter people’s perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the city within an area of open countryside. The safeguarding and eventual development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the city and therefore would conflict with the saved policies of the RSS and national planning policy.	238/14063	English Heritage
	Objection- inappropriate to provide safeguarded land at SF2. This allocation should be relocated into small parcels of land and directed to other sustainable areas such as Woodthorpe and to sustainable settlements.	534/16721	DPP One Ltd
	Comment – safeguarded land appears on the map to encompass and engulf the Skelton cemetery. No clear explanation has been made as to how the development will occur in this area and how the resting place of the dead will be respected. The Clifton Moor retail and business park already appears to be encountering some economic difficulties, difficult access due to congestion, by adding over 4000 new homes directly NW of this site without guaranteeing necessary investment in the outer ring road the future of Clifton Moor can at best be described as uncertain.	1355/17323	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Support – support the exclusion of the draft allocation at Cliftongate (134ha) as well as the safeguarded land North of the site, from the Green Belt.	1523/17509	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Objection – the village proposed is bigger than Skelton. Presumably there are comprehensive plans for infrastructure to support the needs of this new community.	1899/64	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	But there is no way these will be able to deal with the increased traffic and increased delays on the ring road that such a development will produce.		
<b>Site SF2 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued</b>	Objection – the safeguarded land is misleading and should have had an explanation with it. SF2 was not on the original submitted site plans, but was designated after council-led discussions with land owners. This area of future development would absolutely ensure that Clifton Gate would join to Moor Lane, having huge detrimental effects on Skelton in terms of tranquillity, increased traffic, as well as the impact on Skelton Cemetery. The burial ground currently has a beautiful and peaceful setting, surrounded by woodland and fields, yet in 20 years it could be completely surrounded by housing and industrial units which is highly inappropriate.	1901/71	
	Objection – the ability of infrastructure to service this development. York Ring Road, additional traffic will only lead to a state of gridlock. Healthcare, site of YDH is restricted, requirement for major reform of the central hospital? Additional sewage works, construction of more electricity pylons to service the new developments. Additional run-off water, no viable options for the removal of rainwater from the new development without increasing the occurrences of flooding in York or other population centres further down river. York should be actively working to protect the Green Belt, this development increases the urban sprawl around York, will bring a totally different feel to the character of the City and surrounding area. Use of the term ‘safeguarded land’ taken by many to mean land which will never be developed when in fact it is land for future development.	2580/6919	
	Objection – remote from transport corridors and will aggravate flooding in adjacent areas.	2673/7076	
	Objection – Skelton Cemetery; it eventually becomes subsumed within an area ‘safeguarded’ for future development, the environs of the Skelton cemetery must be protected from any nearby housing developments – for perpetuity.	2789/7398	
	Objection – the safeguarded land extension goes up to Moorlands Road. Moorlands Road is unsuitable for any increase in traffic, particularly as through Skelton it has to pass through narrow streets to reach the A19. The description of safeguarded and would normally be taken to mean that this land would not be development but would be left as is. Why has this description been chosen?	3034/7886	
	Objection – the proposal to safeguard the agricultural land part of the former Skelton common appears not to safeguard the land for agricultural purposes, but instead to blight it by the prospect of future building on it.	3157/8131	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF2 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – development of urban sprawl. Significant loss of land to York’s northern green belt and green infrastructure. Lack of transport infrastructure to support the developments, in particular the A1237. Subsequent impact on the A1237.	3428/8788	
	Objection – opposed to SF2.	4068/10751	
	Objection – the appalling prospect likely to be visited upon our local infrastructure – roads, sewage, flood prevention etc., effect on local schools, particularly at secondary level, enormous strain on medical resources i.e. hospitals, GP practices etc. Surely excess noise plus the disfigurement of our area for what are very dubious benefits. There appears to be little or no social or economic reason in York for such a large increase in housing.	4095/10784	
	Objection – safeguarded land North of Clifton Gate (SF2) would swallow Skelton’s tranquil and beautiful burial ground, the environment of Skelton`s cemetery should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected within its current Green Belt land.	4204/7799	
	Comment – safeguarded land for future use will encroach on Skelton burial ground.	4302/11160	
	Objection – the development of Clifton Gate, together with the ‘safeguarded land’ will result in the total urbanisation of the area from Clifton Moorgate to Moor Lane, virtually surround Skelton cemetery thereby creating sensitivities amongst those with loved ones interred in a once rural setting.	4391/11378	
	Objection – the City will come to a standstill, visitors will stop coming for fear of sitting in the ever increasing traffic. The Park & Ride system is a joke for Skelton residents we may as well drive all the way. You cannot use tickets on all public transport as in other cities so confusion reigns and residents use their cars, there are little benefits to York residents from the City as it stands. So what does ‘safeguarding’ actually mean, sell it to the highest bidder? The village is already full and the local school struggles for funding and further development. There are so many empty buildings i.e. The Black Swan hotel has been neglected for 20 years plus which is a real eyesore, concentrate on the character of York rather than modern soulless developments in the country. Skelton needs to be protected for future generations; the term ‘village’ will be a thing of the past.	5356/14548	
	Objection – the proposal to have safeguarded land adjacent to Moorlands Road and by implication when building occurs; access is likely to be needed onto an already ‘rat-run’ road with significant traffic issues, such a proposal should not be even contemplated by any sane development.	5577/13069	
	Objection – safeguarded land gives impression that it was safe from future development. This has undoubtedly misled and misinformed many people, in	5589/13107	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	practice; this safeguarded land will extend the building of Clifton Gate to Skelton cemetery.		
Site SF2 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – object to the number of homes which are to be developed on this area of land will only exacerbate the traffic problems around an already congested Clifton Moor area and will further impact on traffic problems getting in and out of Haxby.	5854/15106	
	Objection – object to 180 acres of land being taken out of the green belt and safeguarded for future long term development. There is an abundance of brownfield sites still to be developed. Congestion created by 10,000 or more cars with no guarantees for improvements on infrastructure. No infrastructure proposals such as access, drainage, statutory services, health, education, retail or workplace. Potential loss of the uniqueness of the village of Skelton and consequential impact on greater York.	5939/15278	
	Objection – strongly oppose building on the excellent arable land surrounding Skelton cemetery. The term safeguarded land is wide open to misinterpretation. Reject all building on land marked 'safeguarded'.	6177/15710	
	Objection – Skelton's cemetery is in an idyllic location in open countryside. On the proposed plan it eventually becomes subsumed within an area safeguarded for future development. This is unbelievably callous. The environs of the cemetery must be protected from any nearby housing developments for perpetuity.	6510/16288	Cllr Joseph D Watt

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF3 Land At Whinthorpe	Comment – as with Whinthorpe (ST15) concerns about highway impact on A64, lack of public transport infrastructure and visual intrusion in the flat landscape (see comments on ST15).	9/11655	Selby District Council
	Comment – some queries over the scale of development proposed to take place at Whinthorpe, especially when considering the additional land that is safeguarded for future development beyond the plan period (see comments on ST15).	10/11663	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – object to a further 430 acres set aside for the expansion of the town (Whinthorpe). Plan does not give any details as to how the local infrastructure will cope with the potential influx of residents. Potential damage to the Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest. Site subject to flooding.	58/12627	Deighton Parish Council
	Objection – do not feel that the plan should safeguard land for development as outlined in SS5 and SS6 since there is no way of predicting the impact of development on these sites in the medium to long term future on the natural and historic environment. Especially SF3 which has biodiversity issues.	90/12839	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection- the site lies to the south of the area considered by the Inspector in his 1994 report. Consequently, many of his conclusions would be applicable to the allocation and eventual development of this site. SF3 lies in open countryside in an area which forms part of the rural setting and historic City- the development of this area will change the relationship of the southern edge of York with its countryside to the south. It will alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the City within an area of open countryside. Even if an incursion of this size into the open countryside was acceptable in principle, the relationship of this area to the City does not reflect the way in which settlements have traditionally developed around York. It is considered that safeguarding and eventual development of this area would likely harm the special character and setting of the city and would conflict with the saved policies of the Regional Spatial Strategy and national planning policy.	238/14064	English Heritage
	Objection – seriously question the deliverability of ST15 and SF3. The proposed safeguarded land of 174 hectares is considered to have an adverse impact on the green belt. It proposes a significant risk to the green belt with large swathes being proposed for development when there are more acceptable sites for development.	528/16665	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – object to deliver the challenging house building rates a wide range of sites are needed. Lots of small sites are better than one large site to provide for long term housing need. It is therefore inappropriate to provide safeguarded land at SF3. This allocation should be reallocated into small parcels of land and directed to other sustainable areas such as Woodthorpe and to the sustainable settlements. If SF3 is	534/16722	DPP One Ltd

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to be retained then additional safeguarded land will be needed as SF3 will not be brought forward in the timeframe envisaged.		
<b>Site SF3 Land At Whinthorpe Continued</b>	Objection – the proposed allocation is without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core but extending out into the countryside with no evidence to indicate such selections as sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the green belt.	544/16776	
	Comment – any future work on the impact of the new proposed settlement at Whinthorpe should also consider the SF3 site safeguarded for longer term development.	1264/17151	Highways Agency
	Support – support the principle of land at Whinthorpe being released from the proposed Green Belt and safeguarded. However, as a result of the initial analysis of how much land should be allocated for development at Whinthorpe. Recommend that the 174ha of safeguarded land attributed to Whinthorpe should be reduced to 78 hectares.	1337/17281	Halifax Estates
	Objection – the new town could impact on the parish community, causing permanent division, as access between Heslington village and Whinthorpe be likely cut off. The probable 10 years of construction work would place the existing amenities in the area under great strain and could detrimentally affect congestion issues on nearby roads. The impact of additional thousands of cars on the A64, A19 and A1079 has not properly been assessed. The new town would at least need two access points, which means congestion issues on either the A19 or A1079 or both. Congestion around the whole ring road could be tremendous, it would impact not only York`s economy, but also the quality of life for those living around the city. It is not clear which schools would serve the children of Whinthorpe and how the Council have come to the conclusion that they would achieve funding for school extensions or an entirely new secondary school.	1355/17321	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – proximity of safeguarded land to adjacent Grimston Wood Site of Local Interest. General access would be in direct conflict with the technique that has changed the plantation to open woodland: grazing bull, cows and calves.	1887/30	
	Objection – plans to create a new village will have a clear negative impact on the green belt. The land and infrastructure in and around the proposed location cannot support such a large development. Unsustainable development is not helpful, it would be much better to develop existing brownfield sites. York attracts tourists and residents in part because of its beautiful green belt.	1894/54	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF3 Land At Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – Whinthorpe is more akin to a conurbation and is completely unsustainable with York’s existing roads, schools and hospital, and the impact and devastation on the green belt is horrendous. Loss of trees, habitats and hundreds of acres of productive farmland.	1901/69	
	Objection – this development is located in a wholly in appropriate area that is entirely open countryside. The area is low lying at an average height of only 10 metres above sea level. Drainage from the site is inadequate and will lead to flooding in Escrick and Stillingfleet. Access to the site form the A64 will lead to increased congestion on the outer ring road, remoteness from all existing transport corridors will lead to a massive rise in CO2 emissions. The need for a housing area of this size outside the ring road has not been demonstrated and is based on a presumption that people will move into the area without there being jobs to support them.	2673/7074	
	Objection – considered that SF3 in particular propose a risk to the green belt with large swathes of green belt being proposed for development when there are more acceptable sites that can be safeguarded for development.	2769/7325	
	Objection – Whinthorpe and Clifton Gate are completely unsustainable with York`s existing roads, schools and hospital, the devastation on our existing Green Belt is horrendous, how many trees and habitats will be lost? Not to mention the hundreds of acres of productive farmland.	4204/7797	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposal of a new development of 5580 dwellings (and with space set aside for the same again) outside the ring road near the A19. Already continuous backed up traffic on A19. Building new settlement would fly in the face of plan’s stated principles.	5108/12215	
	Objection – SF3 appears to be sited in a location of dubious sustainability. The ability to develop this site will very much hinge upon the necessary support from the Highways Agency for a new grade separated junction on the A64. This support cannot be assumed. The proposed site is located within Green Belt; although not traditionally considered to be a major constraint by the council, the National Planning Policy Framework places further restrictions upon potential development in such locations. It appears baffling that a new strategic site is being considered that would place more vehicle movements upon the already congested radial routes of the A19 and A63; unless a new, discrete public transport corridor is under consideration but not shown in the Local Plan consultation.	5776/13665	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby	Objection – concerned about how such a massive increase of residents in Haxby will impact on the infrastructure. Increased traffic suggests a need for additional roads. Brownfield development areas should be exhausted before any development of green belt land takes place. Eastern section of SF4 is bisected by overhead power lines and pylons making a large area of the site unsuitable for either development of recreational use.	63/12722	Haxby Town Council
	Objection - doubts over whether the Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works can deal with the addition of 870 dwellings in the longer term.	77/12778	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – do not feel that the plan should safeguard land for development as outlined in Policy SS5 and SS6 since there is no way of predicting the impact of development on these sites in the medium to long term future on the natural and historic environment. Especially SF4 which has biodiversity issues.	90/12840	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Support – welcome to recognition that this site does not perform any material or important green belt purpose and is therefore excluded from the greenbelt. The site should be allocated for housing now, not at some point in the future.	534/16715	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – the proposed allocation is considered to be without evidential support to justify growth at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core but extending out into the countryside with no evidence to indicate such selections as sustainably preferable to development with an expanded inner boundary to the green belt.	544/16774	
	Objection – greenbelt land, strain on already creaking infrastructure, lack of drainage and sewerage infrastructure, increased amount of cars would lead to already congested roads being at a standstill, increase air pollution and noise, cannot see the provision of extra school places, no open space is mentioned, where are people going to come from to buy these houses? Need for an expansion of the cemetery, character of Haxby is a village, not urban sprawl.	549/16782	
	Objection – village is suffering from over development, the town cannot absorb more residents, the infrastructure for roads, sewerage and general amenities cannot cope.	551/16789	
	Objection – this site should be brought forward for development immediately as it is available, suitable and achievable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	659/15076	Persimmon Homes
	Objection – great concerns of the effects in the roads, drainage and sewerage, increased pressure on schools, doctors surgeries and well as local facilities such as libraries. Congestion is intolerable, serious thinking about all these infrastructure facilities must be given equal emphasis as the whole proposal itself.	904/16940	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton suffer from flooding and surface water issues, relating to the drainage and sewerage system, increases in cumulative surface water run off is like to have a further impact on this, concerned about the existing provision of school places.	1355/17328	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection -development will have impact on local schools and increase traffic on Usher Lane a key school route.	1890/41	
	Objection – greenbelt land should not be used for housing, the proposed site will increase traffic, most onto minor roads which are unable to cope with the present weight of traffic.	1908/87	
	Objection – object to the number of houses planned, where do the roads emerge for traffic to safely join the busy traffic in Haxby? Flooding already occurs, fields are low lying with a high water table, lack of primary school places following closure of Oaken Grove, cemetery needs extra land, traffic congestion, number of houses will swamp the village, conservation of the wild flowers and birds most go hand in hand, where are the plans for this if green fields go?	1948/221	
	Objection - Proposal to take 70 acres out of green belt unsustainable and unacceptable. Roads in and around Haxby and Wigginton are disintegrating. This will make it worse. Outer ring road not currently coping with present volume of traffic.	2128/933	
	Objection - Wrong to forfeit green belt land in this way. York is the attractive city it is, partly because it is surrounded by green belt.	2334/3283	
	Objection – object to the 70 acres of green belt land north of Oaken Grove safeguarded for future long term development.	2411/6570	
	Objection – surface water already causes problems. Floodplains are not the places to build new houses.	2417/6690	
	Objection – will have a large impact on the existing infrastructure of Haxby, roads, shops, schools etc. York Road and Wigginton Road are already very busy at peak times. Will put a massive strain on all the resources. The current schools, transport links etc. could not support this development.	2419/6699	
	Alternative – SF4 will lead to more traffic on already busy York Road, more noise, more delay and other problems. A better solution would be to move this development to the west of ST9 and adjoining B1363 which could then take a large proportion of southbound traffic with little impact on existing houses.	2423/6708	
Objection – there is already overcrowding in the village, parking problems for residents, congestion on the roads, increased congestion on the northern outer ring road, waiting lists for primary schools, many of the roads need serious attention and	2456/6731		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	there are a lot of patients registered with the doctors surgery, doubt the practice will be able to cope with many more, have the doctors been consulted?		
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – the following facilities in Haxby and Wigginton are already under pressure: GP surgery, parking, library, primary schools and closure of Oaken Grove, facilities for young people, unreliable bus services.	2473/6761	
	Objection – the bus service to Haxby is excellent but with a vast increase in traffic resulting from the proposals this service will experience sever delays to a point where it could be unusable at peak times. Schools have been closed and now will the council pay to build more? With more development the roads will be congested, walking and cycling could be the only viable way to travel out of Haxby at peak times.	2549/6849	
	Objection – the plan is not sustainable and will destroy the beauty and character. The greenbelt is there to protect the setting and for the benefit of the surrounding area. Drainage is a key issue. The amount of traffic generated. The ring road is already heavily congested. Will there be enough employment and schooling and medical facilities?	2553/6870	
	Objection – the area is a bog and would need extensive drainage, there is poor and narrow access, existing schools cannot cope with further numbers.	2643/7008	
	Objection – proposal will place extreme demands upon infrastructure. Increase traffic, delays in traffic movement, reduced air quality, availability of school places, inadequate parking and facilities, increased problems with poor drainage.	2684/7131	
	Objection – proposal will place extreme demands upon infrastructure. Increase traffic, delays in traffic movement, reduced air quality, availability of school places, inadequate parking and facilities, and increased problems with poor drainage.	2685/7135	
	Comment – what strategies have been put in place to support the development e.g. transport, schools and other vital services?	2756/7283	
	Objection – against extra housing as it would put undue pressure on infrastructure.	2759/7291	
	Objection – all brownfield sites should be developed before encroaching on greenbelt. An increase of 45% of the population would destroy the area. There is very poor drainage in the area. A shortage of school places, inadequate parking, another health centre would be needed.	2775/7345	
	Objection – another 70 acres to be taken from the greenbelt. A cuckoo lives in this area; no doubt the area is rich in other wildlife. This is an area of historic ridge and furrow and old enclosure hedgerows.	2797/7424	
Objection – too many new houses, inadequate local facilities for increase in population, lack of open space, local drainage is already poor, all available brownfield sites should	2937/7677		



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be utilised first, local roads would not be able to cope, railway station would need to be opened as a priority.		
<b>Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued</b>	Objection – to increase the population of Haxby by 45% will have a dramatic impact on the village and it will struggle to retain its current status. The high street in Haxby will become congested, there would need to be further facilities such as schools, shops, leisure, and medical facilities. The surrounding countryside currently enjoyed by walkers and cyclists will be a great loss as will the habitats of a variety of wildlife. Such a major development of housing in this area would be ridiculously out of proportion.	2940/7686	
	Objection – in Haxby now there is a lack of parking, schools are full, sewers and drainage need improving and roads are gridlocked.	3017/7853	
	Objection – development should not happen until local infrastructure can show it can cope and all available brownfield sites have been utilised.	3024/7866	
	Objection – the potential growth of the village will not be able to cope. There should not be any further pressure on schools. The drainage and telecommunications cannot cope.	3065/7934	
	Objection – green belt should be protected, impact of traffic increase, busy school drop off and pick up times, stretched school capacity, need for a new sewerage and drainage problem, amenities could not cope with influx of residents.	3086/7968	
	Objection – infrastructure could not cope with influx, parking is already difficult, too much pressure on local schools and recreational areas, poor drainage, all available brown field sites should be developed before anything else is considered.	3145/8096	
	Comment – limited parking spaces available, need for more primary school places, existing sewerage system overloaded, it is essential that existing problems are given priority before any decision is made regarding the suitability of SF4 for inclusion in the proposed development plan for York.	3214/8281	
	Comment – need for more recreational land and this should be addressed before any development north of Haxby happens. There seems to be little concern for surface water flooding, despite significant areas suffering from flooding after heavy rain storms. Sewerage systems cannot cope; housing density numbers will leave little ground for absorbing surface water, impact of considerable traffic in and out of the area. Strensall Common might be threatened by biological disturbance and increased recreational pressure resulting from development.	3256/8363	
	Comment – Haxby would lose its charm and identity.	3273/8409	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – does the need for housing supersede the need to provide sufficient infrastructure to support additional population?	3346/8533	
	Objection – all brownfield sites must be utilised before greenfield sites are considered. Haxby is struggling to cope with existing volumes of traffic and lack of parking.	3354/8559	
	Objection – this is an over populated area with an infrastructure that is already collapsing.	3370/8648	
	Objection – the ring road is very congested, there will be three footpaths in this area that can no longer be used as it is now far too dangerous to cross the ring road, many houses have problems with flooding.	3407/8722	
	Objection – massive increase in traffic, limited parking spaces, existing drains needs replacing, lack of primary school places, need for extra health centres.	3420/8742	
	Objection – if these proposal on and around the A1237 outer ring road goes ahead there is the potential to completely swallow up the northern Green Belt and green infrastructure, creating a northern wedge of development sprawl.	3428/8789	
	Objection – do not want population growth of 45%. This will make extreme demands on the town's infrastructure. Issues include increased traffic, reduced air quality, extreme pressure on all services, inadequate parking and increase in poor drainage. All future development should only occur when the infrastructure can cope with it and after all brownfield sites.	3444/8821	
	Objection – infrastructure is at saturation point, there are numerous traffic offences occurring daily, issues with drainage system, greenbelt location,	3520/9454	
	Objection – there are many pockets of brown field sites in and around York. Traffic is heavy in this area, further schools will be needed in the area, and an increase in pedestrian and cycle traffic provision, medical facilities, sewerage and ancillary services could not cope, air quality will deteriorate.	3546/9509	
	Objection – increase in resident numbers will impact on the infrastructure, an increase in traffic and reduced air quality, extreme pressure on services such as health centre, dentists and primary schools, inadequate parking, poor drainage. There is a need to provide allotments and recreation land,	3632/9646	
	Objection – overloading of drainage on an already poor system, provision of school, medical and transport services, inadequate parking, congestion, shops and leisure facilities would not be able to cope, fear of flooding.	3651/9665	
Objection – Haxby's infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic and drainage in at capacity. It will have a bad effect on health. Brownfield sites should be developed, also needed are allotments and more land for the cemetery.	3773/10186		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment – York Road is at capacity, the drains in the Oaken Grove and Lowfield Drive area are already under extreme pressure and often flood, Oaken Road is used as a rat run.	3779/10195	
	Comment – York Road is at capacity, the drains in the Oaken Grove and Lowfield Drive area are already under extreme pressure and often flood, Oaken Road is used as a rat run.	3780/10199	
	Objection – place catastrophic demands on the town’s infrastructure and a huge increase in traffic and reduced air quality, as well as pressure on local services such as schools, shops and parking, it will make the poor drainage worse.	3793/10215	
	Objection – would place catastrophic demands on the town’s infrastructure and a huge increase in traffic and reduced air quality, as well as pressure on local services such as schools, shops and parking, it will make the poor drainage worse.	3794/10219	
	Objection – poor drainage in the village, roads need repairing, heavy traffic on Usher lane and moor lane, a new school will be required and demands on the medical centre will be over whelming, the Council should utilise all brownfield land before using green field sites.	3800/10249	
	Objection – Haxby is a village and should remain as so. The increase in traffic would devastate the roads, the shopping area would be unable to cope, not enough school places, and a large cemetery is needed, drainage requires attention.	3850/10338	
	Comment – the road network is unable to cope, add to pedestrian dangers, lack of parking spaces, local amenities under strain, such as a schools and doctors, cemetery needs extending and extra recreation facilities, increase in pollution.	3851/10342	
	Objection – increase in traffic, increase road hazards, need for extra school places, improvements needed to sewerage system, water, electricity, impact on scenery, use of open space and impact on wildlife.	3854/10355	
	Objection – pressure for school places, traffic congestion and lack of parking.	3865/10382	
	Objection – the whole village would be swamped with development. The green belt and green feel of the city would be lost. Haxby and Wigginton have a severe problem with drainage, new drains would be needed and improvements to the network. There would not be enough amenities for an increased population. Commuter traffic is slow and often at a standstill. Increased population would make the situation more congested and far more dangerous.	3931/10468	
Objection – build on brownfield sites, renovate derelict and unused buildings. The outer ring road is often at a stand still. What other facilities will be provide, e.g. GP surgeries, schools, recreation facilities for young people, parking in the village.	3956/10532		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Flooding issues.		
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – traffic density, particular York Road and Eastfield Ave. Poor parking in Haxby, existing public services are inadequate for population as it is, significant demand increase on infrastructure e.g. drainage and road repair.	3984/10596	
	Objection – the current infrastructure would be over whelmed and the community would be over developed.	3987/10599	
	Objection – extreme pressure on the infrastructure, drain system is running to capacity, increased risk of flooding, schools will need to be extended, extra medical services, with a knock on effect to York District Hospital, poor air quality from the increased numbers of cars, public transport in the area is already poor, bin collections are slow already, post does not arrive until 3.30pm, devaluation of existing properties, development of the greenbelt which destroys the natural habitat of wildlife in the area.	4002/10617	
	Objection – roads are choc-a-bloc with traffic, drains and sewers are full, schools are full, not enough parking, over subscribed doctor's surgery.	4066/10748	
	Objection – there are no proposals for infrastructure development to support the proposals.	4112/10815	
	Objection – being a pedestrian is already dangerous without the added blight of construction traffic on roads not intended for this purpose. Infrastructure is not in place, surgery cannot cope, parking is inadequate, schools are stretched and access is difficult, greenbelt location.	4129/10836	
	Objection – will swamp existing amenities to a point where further shops and schools would be required, inadequate roads and access, should build on land between York road and landings lane.	4149/10860	
	Objection – traffic increase, medical facilities, schooling, leisure areas, major facilities such as water, gas and electricity.	4151/10865	
	Objection – immense strain on the existing amenities, which are already struggling to cope with the existing population. There is no indication or guarantees that the infrastructure will be upgraded. There would need to be a huge investment in the infrastructure to support the dramatic increase in people.	4158/10875	
	Objection – immense strain on the existing amenities, which are already struggling to cope with the existing population. There is no indication or guarantees that the infrastructure will be upgraded. There would need to be a huge investment in the infrastructure to support the dramatic increase in people.	4159/10881	
Objection – traffic problems, bottlenecked village centre, lack of parking, brownfield sites should be used first.	4199/10932		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – detrimental impact on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton. Congestion and air pollution will increase, there will be a need for more schools, further medical services and there will be pressure on drainage.	4216/10966	
	Objection – sewerage and drainage in the whole of Haxby is totally incapable of functioning properly at present. Green belt location.	4253/11065	
	Objection – unsuitable location for the size of the village because drainage and sewerage capacity, congestion and traffic, inadequate school places and medical facilities. Green belt location, pylons at that location.	4298/11149	
	Objection – will put extreme demands on the town’s infrastructure, increased traffic and reduced air quality on the ring road. Children using the cycle lane to Joseph Rowntree school will be at increased risk, the parking in the village is inadequate, access is narrow due to people parking outside their houses on the road, poor drainage and increased surface water and flooding, an extension is needed to the cemetery.	4317/11201	
	Objection – will put extreme demands on the town’s infrastructure, increased traffic and reduced air quality on the ring road. Children using the cycle lane to Joseph Rowntree school will be at increased risk, the parking in the village is inadequate, access is narrow due to people parking outside their houses on the road, poor drainage and increased surface water and flooding, an extension is needed to the cemetery.	4321/11212	
	Objection – will put extreme demands on the town’s infrastructure, increased traffic and reduced air quality on the ring road. Children using the cycle lane to Joseph Rowntree school will be at increased risk, the parking in the village is inadequate, access is narrow due to people parking outside their houses on the road, poor drainage and increased surface water and flooding, an extension is needed to the cemetery.	4322/11216	
	Objection – will put extreme demands on the town’s infrastructure, increased traffic and reduced air quality on the ring road. Children using the cycle lane to Joseph Rowntree school will be at increased risk, the parking in the village is inadequate, access is narrow due to people parking outside their houses on the road, poor drainage and increased surface water and flooding, an extension is needed to the cemetery.	4323/11220	
	Objection – negative impact on the environment, last traces of the old field system, along with mature trees and habitat of wildlife. An increase of 45% would place an intolerable burden on the local infrastructure. Pressure on services such as education, healthcare and drainage. Additional traffic will be generated and affect residents quality of life.	4385/11354	
	Objection – drainage system lacks capacity, localised flooding, traffic congestion, increase in population, lack of school places, decrease in property prices, loss of the	4396/11391	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	greenbelt, usher lane is a busy high speed road despite speed warnings.		
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – housing proposed is massively over what is needed in the area. Will destroy the character of Haxby and Wiggington. Plan will over burden a struggling infrastructure. If with improved infrastructure these proposals will do irreparable damage to the area. Greenbelt land should be preserved; smaller projects in more areas would be more suitable, large amounts of space remain unused around the city and should be used first.	4421/11445	
	Objection – green areas should be preserved for people to enjoy and helping their well being. Development would have a severe strain on the health centre, roads would become gridlocked, parking, shops, extra sewerage and thoughts to build a new school are needed.	4427/11452	
	Objection – roads are congested, schools are over subscribed, increased medical services, car parks are needed, ring road needs to be upgraded to dual carriage way, until this is done no thought should be given to development north of the by-pass.	4475/11493	
	Objection – there should be prior improvement to our local road system, especially widening the ring road and expansion of the parking facilities, essential changes to the drainage facilities.	4481/11496	
	Objection – access is very difficult, drainage system is inadequate, the three primary schools are full, there should be a site meeting to discuss alternative options.	4482/11502	
	Objection – infrastructure is inadequate, heavy congestion from construction traffic, green belt should not be used until brownfield sites are exhausted, massive increase of pressure on all services, including primary school places and parking.	4491/11515	
	Objection – negative and damaging affect on the town as a whole, extra demand on already poor drainage, not enough primary school places, not enough buses and poor service, flood risk, increase traffic volume, poor air quality and increased pollution, damaging effect on people's health, postal service will be effected, not enough parking, increased demand on doctors, devaluation of houses, loss of community, increase demand on local facilities, effect on wildlife by destroying their natural habitat.	4492/11519	
	Objection – every school is over subscribed, Doctors surgery is over subscribed, inadequate sewerage system, access into Haxby has not been improved, poor provision of cycle lanes which stops at Joseph Rowntree school, to say more land is protected is misleading, Haxby needs more allocated green space per person.	4687/14217	
	Objection – the increase in population can not be met by the services now in existence, such as medical, education, sewerage, drainage, recreation and shops, the	4688/14222	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	increase of traffic could cause major problems, railway crossings causing delays.		
<b>Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued</b>	Objection – village is lacking in facilities, increased road traffic, railway crossing needs to be updated, health surgery is already under pressure, York District Hospital is under pressure, additional shops will be required, buses will need to be re-routed, poor drainage, employment in York is poor – why are more housing being planned when there are not the jobs to sustain the increase.	4702/11995	
	Objection – greenbelt land should only be considered when brownfield sites are developed and the increased infrastructure needed is in place. There are no proposals for increased school capacity, upgrading of existing poor drainage north of Oaken Grove, prolonged disruption on feeder roads.	4714/12005	
	Objection – Haxby is already grossly over developed, existing local facilities cannot cope, parking is practically impossible and drainage is at breaking point, there should be increased access to the ring road,	4717/12008	
	Objection – necessary facilities i.e. schools, health centres and ambulance depot, roads, drainage are at full capacity.	4724/12023	
	Objection – the village is already very congested with little car parking facilities, some historic character remains but could be lost with further development, the outer ring road A1237 is often very slow moving, Haxby and Wigginton is very low lying with previously many ponds some of which no longer exist, drainage is especially poor, roads flooding with sewers backing up, more houses will make this worse, there is a need for more medical facilities, local schools are already very full.	5112/12223	
	Objection – the city does not have the facilities to upgrade the infrastructure to successfully accommodate these extra homes.	5139/12257	
	Objection – the quality of life for existing residents will be adversely affected by this proposal, roads are congested, particularly when the railway crossing is in use, the existing cycle route does not provide a viable alternative for parents as it stops north of the hospital, the schools are at capacity and it is impossible to get access to an NHS dentist. What does the council propose to do to deal with these infrastructure issues?	5158/12291	
	Objection – the local infrastructure is already overloaded and the character of the village is at risk, main street is heavy with traffic, to add extra home without improving the infrastructure would only add to these problems significantly, this is a conservation area.	5260/14353	
	Objection – there has been a deterioration of life quality due to uncontrolled expansion and increased traffic, the village infrastructure is already strained including parking, schooling and drainage.	5271/14370	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – any further housing in the village, the infrastructure cannot cope with any further housing, there are only two ways out of the development , these lanes cannot cope with extra traffic, there has been no consultation with the National Grid or Northern Power regarding the two power lines with dissect the site.	5274/14382	
	Objection – road infrastructure is already overloaded, this plan is not workable unless the road infrastructure to enter and exit Haxby is significantly improved. There are also implications for schools, health services.	5276/14386	
	Objection – proposed erosion of the green belt, the infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed extra homes, additional demands on local schools, parking and drainage, there are unsuitable recreational facilities.	5286/14408	
	Objection – Haxby does not have the infrastructure in place to support such large scale development, particularly in respect to local parking, recreational facilities, transport and education. All alternative brownfield sites should be considered for development prior to expanding the York conurbation beyond the outer ring road.	5288/14411	
	Objection – this development will have a detrimental affect on the existing community. Surely new housing ought to initially seek to improve communities by targeting “brownfield sites” and then non-amenity land within existing boundaries.	5289/14417	
	Comment – homes are connected to over loaded sewers, the drainage needs significant investment for it to be effective. Traffic levels in Haxby will be significantly worse, this needs to be address. Haxby is already developed to a level which is bordering on full capacity.	5290/14414	
	Comment – details cannot be found as to how the local infrastructure will be improved to support the large increase in traffic that this proposal will cause. What improvements are planned to prevent the grid lock expanding up/down both Haxby/York and Wigginton roads.	5298/14445	
	Comment – the intention to ‘ earmark’ a large portion of land for future development that runs along the current cemetery boundary, where we will we bury our dead?	5302/14455	
	Objection – the current infrastructure is already struggling with the loads put on them by the current population, the A1237 ring road is extremely congested during the rush hour, there is danger of flooding in the area as more land is built over.	5307/14467	
	Objection – the drainage area of Haxby and Wigginton is suspect, further development will increase the risk of flooding enormously. The potential increase of the population in that area by about 45% will need significant changes to the services required by the inhabitants.	5320/14488	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – any further development would place extreme and unacceptable demands on the town’s already pressured infrastructure. Increased traffic is a major concern. School places, parking drainage are under pressure. There are often sewage floods.	5324/14497	
	Objection – such a massive increase of residents in Haxby will detrimentally impact on the infrastructure, increase traffic, poorer air quality, car parking, school places, poor drainage. Development should only be considered once the appropriate infrastructure is in place and all available brown field sits have been utilised.	5329/14504	
	Objection – the infrastructure cannot cope with additional people and cars. Increased strain on public and private local transport, increase noise and pollution, park and ride is not big enough, parking is at a premium, York ring road is slow moving, local primary schools are full, surgeries are full, hospital is under strain, council taxes are high enough, drainage system is poor and struggles, Haxby will not longer feel like a village, impact on air quality, some of the proposed building land can be used for farming, children and adults require parks and countryside.	5330/14507	
	Objection – existing roads are barely adequate to cater for peak traffic, infrastructure such as gas, water and electricity will not be able to cater for the increase without significant improvement, the planned improvements on the ring road are repeatedly put back, improvements to all the facilities are needed first.	5331/14510	
	Objection – Haxby’s infrastructure is already under strain, specific areas of concern are traffic congestion, parking and access to public facilities, schooling and potential increase in anti-social behaviour.	5333/14514	
	Objection – the drainage in Usher lane is inadequate, traffic flow is heavily congested, existing schools could not accommodate influx of children, doctors is very busy, parking is inadequate, brownfield sites should be utilised first.	5340/14524	
	Comment – if this development goes ahead we will need Haxby rail station, school investment, Whilst the council’s suggestions of more spaces in the cemetery and more allotments should be considered in a growing population, they should not be presented as (and are not) the solution to such a major development in Haxby.	5343/14534	
	Objection – there is not the infrastructure to cope with the huge traffic demands, especially on York Road. It will put extreme pressure on all services, including primary schools. There is inadequate parking in Haxby centre and poor drainage. Brownfield sites should be considered before greenbelt.	5361/14564	
	Objection – there is not adequate services or travel infrastructure to sustain such a development. Schools, play areas, local shops and pubs would find it hard to cope. There are only three roads out of the area and currently no train station, the road	5362/14567	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surface is of a poor standard. The small town nature of the area would be destroyed leading to a decreased standard of living. The infrastructure should be built first.		
<b>Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued</b>	Objection – improvements should be made to the infrastructure before development commences, including roads, cycle paths and bus services, drainage, recreation land, allotments and school places. There is not enough parking in Haxby village. Calling SF4 “safeguarded land” is misleading, it is being grabbed for further unsustainable development.	5379/14600	
	Comment – this is prime agricultural land with some particularly fine specimens of oak tree both by the road side and in the field just adjacent to Moor Lane. Moor lane and Usher lane are already busy routes, more homes would increase pressure on the existing road structure, existing drainage problems in North Haxby are likely to be made worse by further development. The three remaining schools in the area are busy and do not have space for expansion. The health centre is operating at capacity.	5381/14603	
	Objection – population growth of 45% will put extreme problems on the infrastructure, schools, healthcare and roads can be extremely busy. The town centre is not built for a large influx of people and traffic. Pollution is a real issue. Usher lane is too narrow for the large amounts of traffic that would have to use this road.	5383/14609	
	Objection – primary school places are stretched, there needs to be serious investment in the infrastructure, ring road is often overloaded, parking amenities are over stretched, question whether there is enough parks and recreational land, unable to find out whether the ring road will be upgraded or new schools will be built in Haxby.	5400/14658	
	Objection – a 45% increase would create significant issues within Haxby/Wigginton itself as well as around the ring road and feeder roads to the ring road. The town only have two main road access points at York Road, Haxby and Mill Lane, Wigginton. These points already suffer significant congestion. Another primary school would be required in Haxby. More GP provision and the central Haxby precinct will become difficult to park. The western ring road needs to be duelled for any development.	5413/14698	
	Objection – parking and traffic flow are already inadequate, no consideration has been taken into account of school places and leisure facilities.	5418/14712	
	Objection – there should be no more development until the ring road junction is improved ideally with a full sized two way underpass for traffic heading to/returning from York via New Earswick and adequate slip roads for vehicles wishing to access and leave the ring road with the consequent relief on congestion back into Haxby. There is inadequate parking in Haxby.	5420/14722	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – this represents an over development of the existing greenbelt, it would overwhelm the current infrastructure of Haxby including roads, drainage, schools and health facilities. There would be insufficient local employment to support the level of growth. The development would likely precede any increase in the capacity of the ring road further increasing congestion.	5444/14779	
	Objection – further erosion of the greenbelt, the protection of green corridors is essential, upheaval and disturbance for a number of years along a narrow country lane, the eradication of any quality of life for residents in the locality, impass of traffic trying to access and utilise the York ring road, insufficient school places, health centre is stretched, Haxby has limited youth facilities, further development will eradicate it's unique peacefulness.	5465/14810	
	Objection – will destroy community spirit, loss of attractive countryside, area contains lots of fields, trees and hedges which provide a habitat for wildlife, people use the surrounding racks for cycling, running and walking, the environment will be irreversibly lost if it is developed for housing, the road infrastructure is unsuitable for accommodation a population increase, the two roads accessing Haxby and Wigginton are already jammed, the road through the village is already dangerously busy and there is a lack of parking. Oaken Grove is already used as a "Rat Run".	5481/14836	
	Objection – the transport links are poor, there is only one safe walking and cycling route towards York, the bus service is frequent but not quick. The outer ring road is only a single carriage way link and is regularly at a standstill. There is no benefit of having a railway line as there is no station and the gates cause traffic delays. Will there be any provision for traffic calming and pedestrians prior to the increase in construction traffic? Further education facilities and medical services will need to be provided, What job opportunities will be created in the village for the added population or will they just add to the commuter traffic to York, Knaresborough, lead and out of town centres? While the village shops are adequate for daily necessities, most families travel to monks Cross, Clifton Moor or York for their weekly shopping. The village shops are not suitable for the population of Haxby and Wigginton today – even without an increase.	5501/14876	
	Objection – such extensive development would adversely change the character of Haxby, parking is already difficult, lack of primary school places, the road system struggles to cope, no consideration of the impact on existing traffic from Haxby, let alone that added by proposed developments, meeting that from a new town at Clifton Moor.	5557/13038	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – such a massive increase in residents will place extreme pressure on the infrastructure on the village. The increased traffic will cause congestion in the centre of the village which is struggling to cope with the present population. The parking in the centre of the village is not sufficient, the increase in residents will impact on the availability of primary school places and appointments at the doctors surgeries. Already problems with poor drainage. These plans are more likely going to spoil the attraction of living in this village.	5574/13063	
	Objection – highly concerned about the impact of building such a large number of homes in an already busy village. Particularly concerned about increased traffic in and around Haxby especially during rush hours, inadequate parking in Haxby centre. The availability of school places.	5581/13078	
	Objection – areas are currently identified as greenbelt, should remain so. There are only two roads from Haxby and Wigginton which access the A1237 York outer ring road and these roads are far too busy at peak times, with queuing traffic, causing air pollution. Would place huge pressure on local services, especially the primary school.	5582/13081	
	Objection – the influx of people will place great strain on local resources, amenities and facilities. A new school will have to be built to cater for rising numbers if the proposal goes ahead. The local traffic infrastructure is inadequate.	5587/13096	
	Objection – the roads are heavily congested.	5588/13101	
	Objection – will put severe pressure on the infrastructure, massive increase in traffic, increase congestion and reduce air quality.	5594/13122	
	Objection – the infrastructure cannot cope resulting in blocked drains, flooded gardens, the whole infrastructure would need to be greatly improved. Almost 800 new houses is unsustainable. Traffic flow is a problem, access from the side roads can be very difficult at times, parking is extremely difficult, site is prone to bad drainage, standing water and flooding.	5597/13127	
	Objection – with the extra housing, people and vehicles the following problems will arise: traffic congestion along usher lane. There is not enough parking, existing doctors, dentists and schools would be inadequate. The existing sewerage and drainage problem is already having problems and would have to have a major upgrade to cope with the extra usage. Where would all these people find employment?	5600/13142	
	Objection – Haxby is not equipped for more residents; will new access routes be provided to the bypass? The drains cannot cope. A new school will be needed. More money to increase the number of GPs and hospital capacity.	5607/13165	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby is not equipped for more residents; will new access routes be provided to the bypass? The drains cannot cope. A new school will be needed. More money to increase the number of GPs and hospital capacity.	5608/13168	
	Objection – access is slow onto the A1237, the village centre is congested at weekends, parking is difficult, school places are already at a premium, Haxby will lose much of the green area around it. Haxby has reached its limit in terms of capacity, and to expand further is to lose the character and essence of the community.	5613/13194	
	Objection – there have been no improvements of the drainage system and the area is unable to cope with surface water. Traffic movement is an everyday problem; capacity at the schools is inadequate. Further development will only worsen this.	5615/13198	
	Objection – the local infrastructure is not good. The bypass creates major problems at peak periods. The bus services have deteriorated. Parking in Haxby is dire. Seems to compromise the cemetery whose expansion is inevitable given current trends which are unlikely to change. Should improve the infrastructure and use brownfield sites first.	5617/13204	
	Objection – this is a congested village with little car parking, an increase in traffic will make this worse, the infrastructure of drainage is very poor and unable to cope with heavy rainfall. Local primary schools are at capacity, the age profile of Haxby and Wigginton means local GP surgeries are under strain. There is also a problem with the aged and lonely people of the parish. The church and other caring agencies support but the parish is already over stretched.	5621/13219	
	Objection – the drainage system and traffic congestion is already a problem, another school will be required.	5625/13237	
	Objection – the quality of life for residents of Haxby will be adversely affected by this proposals. There are already traffic problems, the existing cycle route does not provide a viable alternative for parents attempting to ferry children to and from school and for anyone working in the centre of town. The schools in the area are already at capacity and it is impossible to get an NHS dentist. What does the council propose to do about these infrastructure needs?	5626/13240	
	Objection – Haxby has already expanded far enough and even the present infrastructure cannot cope, in particular traffic and drainage system. Haxby should remain its present size with improvements made to the infrastructure.	5627/13243	
	Objection – village facilities are already at full capacity, parking and driving is dangerous. Public transport links could not cope. The infrastructure is not in a position to support additional housing on the scale that is proposed.	5635/13266	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Usher Lane will not cope with the increased volume of traffic which would be generated, The drainage is inadequate. Traffic congestion is already too high and will become intolerable if the proposal go ahead. Existing schools in the area could not cater for the increased demand for places.	5647/13284	
	Objection – traffic volume is already at its limit and will only get worse with more development if no plans are made to make a further access road in or out of Haxby.	5654/13299	
	Objection – the effect of extra people on the rush hour traffic down Usher Lane, this is already congested. Where the extra primary school places that will be needed are going to be found? Can that be made part of the Local Plan?	5670/13346	
	Objection – the size of the project will almost double the population. It will destroy the character and environment of the community. There is not the infrastructure in place to deal with this kind of expansion. There are already problems with parking, traffic, existing poor drainage and air quality.	5672/13351	
	Objection – inappropriate in a green belt location and unsustainable, put immense strain on the existing amenities of Haxby and Wigginton village, there is no indication or guarantee that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope.	5673/13361	
	Objection – the local countryside is home to many wild animals which would certainly lose their homes, habitats would be lost. There maybe open spaces around York which could be used or even take time to renovate empty houses. The basic infrastructure in Haxby struggles already, the drainage is poor.	5685/13395	
	Objection – it is difficult to see how the proposed development will fit well with the current infrastructure. Anything built will rely on the A1237 which will only add to the congestion. Usher Lane is made narrower by on street car parking, York Road comes to a standstill at certain times, traffic flow down Moor Lane and into Mill lane to Sutton road as an alternative route to the A1237 will only add to the problem, traffic lights were installed at the junction between Mill Lane and Sutton road to improve traffic flow but congestion is building again, bus service is good but roads do not seem wide enough, park and ride is not an alternative, Railway halt has been deferred again, Oaken Grove school was closed so more pressure on existing primary schools, same for secondary.	5690/13412	
	Objection – Haxby is a village and will change in nature with these proposals. Haxby cannot accommodate more traffic, insufficient parking, local facilities would be overwhelmed, new developments need to respect the fact this is a village not a sprawling part of the city of York.	5692/13414	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby has grown far too past its original village boundary already, this will inevitably put an excessive load on the local infrastructure. Roads are already congested, schools under pressure, issues with parking, flooding, drainage and general quality of the environment.	5697/13421	
	Objection – Haxby has grown far too past its original village boundary already, this will inevitably put an excessive load on the local infrastructure. Roads are already congested, schools under pressure, issues with parking, flooding, drainage and general quality of the environment.	5698/13425	
	Objection – this would be enormously detrimental to the Haxby community. This would overload the village infrastructure,. Transport, congestion, local service, schools parking. Of equal importance is the social impact. Haxby is unique in the way the population has increased gradually and overtime new arrivals have integrated slowly, there is a strong familial bond in the village. This huge movement of population from outside the area will drastically undermine this sense of the familiar and turn it into a village of strangers who have no sense of place or attachment to the community.	5699/13429	
	Objection – there is great concern as to how the area could cope with potentially an extra 1651 homes without substantial infrastructure improvements.	5715/13466	
	Objection – concern about how such a massive increase of residents in Haxby will impact on the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton. Stretching schools, roads/traffic, parking, recreation/play areas. The devaluation of existing properties, the density of new housing. Any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it and after all available brown field sites in the city have been utilised.	5718/13477	
	Objection – the infrastructure would not be able to cope, more routes in and out of Haxby need to be provided, the increase in traffic and subsequent damage to the environment are unacceptable. Who would be responsible for providing more schools, youth clubs, doctors, dentists, Haxby does not have the capacity for so many more householders.	5722/13487	
	Objection – Haxby is only just retaining its village feel with current housing numbers and traffic levels, there is no solid mention of opening a railway station in Haxby, where are the widened roads and safer cycling routes? The village centre is currently just about coping with traffic flows, open, recreational space is not sufficient for the village, what is proposed to replace this green space?	5724/13490	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – increased traffic congestion on the only two roads out of Haxby/Wigginton. Increased pollution, potential accidents. Increased pressure on all local services including schools, doctors surgeries, drainage, house values, lose of community feeling, impact on the surrounding natural environment and wildlife.	5736/13512	
	Objection – Haxby already has the population of a small town with the infrastructure of a village. Parking is already difficult, primary schools are full, road system struggles to cope with traffic flows, no consideration on the impact on existing traffic from Haxby, where are the people going to be working, York’s largest employers are scaling down.	5755/13607	
	Objection – impact on the infrastructure of both villages and increased traffic due to increased population.	5756/13608	
	Objection – any large scale development of the Haxby area will be very damaging to the schools, shops and infrastructure of the area. Arterial routes are straining to cope with the traffic flow, extra cars will push the roads beyond their limits, Haxby has gone from being a village to a town, is the next step for it to be a city?	5757/13610	
	Objection – the infrastructure of Haxby could not cope. Parking is already limited and South Lane is very congested. This would be made worse if the proposed houses were built. It would be better to build a purpose built village in one location near to good roads, where is all the infrastructure such as shops and schools could be provided.	5758/13612	
	Objection – the increase of houses will choke existing roads, create more flooding and mean that a new school will be needed in the area, Has a new school been planned for the Local Plan?	5763/13624	
	Objection – Haxby does not have the services or structures necessary to support such a large increase in population, the proportion of social housing is too high.	5814/13756	
	Objection – unsustainable pressure on the local road system, town infrastructure, services and will devastate more agricultural land. Services such as healthcare and education rarely keep pace with expansion of population.	5819/13772	
	Comment – question whether the two available access routes into the site will be sufficient to accommodate the extra traffic generated.	5826/13787	
	Objection – Larch Way has poor drainage and not suitable for access, impact on wildlife and habitats. Road access is restricted and congested.	5831/13809	
Objection – concerns of how the infrastructure will be affected by the extra dwellings. The need for ore schools, roads will be very busy, village amenities and parking is over subscribed, devaluation of housing, sewer and drainage system already insufficient, extreme negative impact on noise, air quality, traffic, pollution and general dirt, the balance between green areas and built up areas with in the village would be affected,	5843/13825		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	healthcare is already at capacity, Accident and Emergency department already struggles.		
Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – roads to the bypass are bad enough, the drains cannot cope, not enough facilities in the village to cope with more families.	5845/13833	
	Objection – concerns that the infrastructure will not have capacity to cope, road congestion, primary school places, healthcare facilities, local GP and Hospital over subscribed drainage issues.	5846/13836	
	Objection – the ring road will become solid with traffic, services for the village are already full, the drainage at Usher park is already an issues.	5848/13843	
	Objection – additional traffic, excess strain on the road network, duelling of the ring road is not guaranteed, Haxby suffers from flash flooding, mains water pressure is already low, increase in pollution	5854/15104	
	Objection – it is unsustainable, the sewerage and drainage systems are already at maximum capacity and cannot cope with more houses, issues with traffic, primary schools are full, lack of parking, doctor surgery is at its maximum.	5864/15132	
	Comment – it is good that there is mention of new open space and it is important that community land should be locally managed.	5865/15135	St Mary's Parochial Church Council
	Objection – this would potentially create a huge number of new houses and necessitating a new road infrastructure.	5867/15140	
	Objection – concerns around the supporting infrastructure and transport for a development of this scale. There will be major increase in traffic volume, the northern ring road is at a standstill for a good part of the day, and this is multiplied by the proposed developments at Clifton Moor and Monks Cross. Detrimental effect traffic has on air quality, parking and general safety, Haxby is significantly lacking in green space for a town of its size, drainage is an issue, has proper consideration been given to other central amenities such as schools?	5875/15161	
	Objection – the size of the proposal is far too large for the area. Haxby is at full capacity for the area in regards to people and vehicular traffic. Current problems that need addressing are the quality of roads, drainage, foliage upkeep, traffic volume. The increase of air pollution and travel time an increase in traffic will bring. The amount of heavy vehicles expansion will bring will pose a safety risk. Primary schools will suffer as a result of increased numbers.	5876/15164	
	Objection – this would create a settlement in its own right, it should be planned as such rather than a large extension.	6041/15464	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Site SF4 Land North Of Haxby Continued</b>	Objection – increased traffic from this large development will exasperate the issues faced. There will be a temptation to use the roads within the existing south Haxby estate to avoid increase in traffic on York Road. Substantial investment would be needed in schools, doctor’s surgeries, parking and transport links. Area of this size and with a village atmosphere creates a uniquely appealing place for visitors to the York area. The proposals would make them unrecognisable and significantly less attractive part of the greater area of York.	Petition 8	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe	Objection – development of the safeguarded land would double the size of Copmanthorpe and turn it into a town requiring substantial infrastructure investment. It would also destroy the countryside and rural landscape setting of York at its principle gateway on the inbound A64, to the detriment of both visitors and inward investors.	57/12618	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a very large village, to extend it further risks losing its strong village community identify.	192/14006	
	Objection – this should not be safeguarded land and should remain in the greenbelt to ensure Copmanthorpe retains its rural feel.	433/16557	
	Objection – This proposal is considered to be without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core, but extending out into the countryside with no evidence to indicate such seletions as sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the greenbelt.	544/16772	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe's identity as a village.	917/3052	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Proposed density much higher than currently the case in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	1053/3343	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/627	
	Objection – deeply concerned about the impact that 600 new houses will have on the existing infrastructure and amenities in the village. Grave concerns over the impact of potentially over a thousand more cars joining the A4 from Copmanthorpe everyday.	1355/17335	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New village should be key component to satisfy main increase in demand and should be situated adjacent to railway line with a station stopping point giving access directly into York and Leeds. All other development should be inside ring road which should be improved.	1504/2183	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Growth rates significantly higher than justified by national projected trends. Would place unsupportable pressure on local amenities and infrastructure. Volume of traffic generated dangerous and unacceptable. Location more likely to attract and reinforce commuter residents. Proposals place housing on highly productive grade 1 arable land.	1884/11	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No thought has been given to infrastructure for these plans. No provision for roads, schools are already full, the two doctors	1885/17		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surgeries could not handle more patients, shops inadequate, surface water drainage and sewage at capacity, bus service would not suffice. Proposals to build would be on prime farming land.		
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Surface water and drainage systems cannot cope. Access roads not wide enough. Improvements needed to junction of Manor Heath and A64. School full to capacity. Shopping and car parking need to be improved together with healthcare provision. Copmanthorpe is full to capacity and will no longer be a village.	1886/25	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No proposals to support high density housing with better infrastructure. Calculations used for housing need are spurious. Water pressure in village is mediocre and no plans to address impact of further 600 houses. Adding large number of houses in green belt will exacerbate York’s transport problems. Scale of proposal is out of keeping with existing village framework.	1888/37	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why not use Acaster Airfield, a brown field site. Destroy village making it into a small town. Using green belt. Problems of drainage for surface water and additional sewerage. No evidence of plans as to where additional employment will come from. Cannot proceed unless infrastructure of village is enlarged.	1892/48	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gateway junctions have problems particularly westerly gateway with traffic waiting on bend to cross oncoming traffic from A1237. Parking facilities already insufficient. Nearby school oversubscribed. Village cannot assimilate anticipated 35% increase in population and traffic without destroying environmental quality of village.	1917/118	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses will totally overwhelm the village. Cannot park, roads are inadequate, school, doctors and shops will not cope. Will totally spoil quality of life for all.	1940/178	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why not use Acaster Airfield, a brown field site.	1942/1545	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1954/238	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/252	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/260	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/268	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/276		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/283	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1964/291	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/299	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No new jobs will be created. All industry lost from York. People will commute to Leeds. Roads already a mess before putting more traffic on them.	1966/307	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be extremely dangerous.	1967/315	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where will new jobs be created? Cost of upgrading infrastructure. Considerable proportion of new properties will be bought by people who commute to Leeds.	1968/323	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/331	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should not be built on. Disruption and noise. No evidence that houses are needed. Effect on local property prices.	1970/339	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/347	
		1972/355	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/362	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/370	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/377	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/383	
		1977/391	
		1978/399	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/406	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1980/414	
1981/422			
1982/429			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/437		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses. Countryside should be protected.	1985/447		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/455	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/463	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/471	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/478	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Develop city centre/sites near to city centre where residents can walk/cycle to the centre. Development on outskirts adds to congestion. Bus service not fit for purpose. Congestion around shops at Copmanthorpe would worsen. Increase in cars around school at pick-up/drop-off time would be dangerous.	1990/486	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character OF Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/493	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/501	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure measures should be provided as part of development rather than adding houses where there is an easy green field target.	1993/509	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/523	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/530	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/538	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/546	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no objection.	1998/554	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/560	
		2000/568	
	2001/576		
	2002/584		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No provision for additional access roads to A64. Existing junction would be too busy leading to increase of use through village.	2002/584		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/611		
	2012/619		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/635	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/643	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/650	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2016/658	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/666	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2018/674	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2019/680	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2020/688	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/696	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/703	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/711	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/719	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/727	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/735	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/741	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/749	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/756	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2030/763	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2031/770	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2032/776	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/783		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/791		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/799		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/807		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/815		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/823	
		2039/831	
		2040/839	
		2041/847	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Proposed density much higher than currently the case in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	2042/855	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/863	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/871	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/879	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/886	
		2047/894	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not take into account land in Temple Lane area. Developing this part of village might bring two halves closer together or at least reinstate a bus service.	2048/902	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/910	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/918	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/941	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/948	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.	2060/956	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited in village and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/962	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/970	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bungalows required to allow elderly to downsize leaving large houses available. Why build houses for people to work in Leeds. No access to A64.	2063/976		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/984		
	2065/992		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed increase in housing too great for a village of this size and cannot be supported by current infrastructure including emergency services.	2066/1000	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1007	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1015	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1023	
		2070/1030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1037	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1045	
		2073/1053	
		2074/1061	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal to create thousands of new jobs in York not credible. Should concentrate on creating employment for those currently unemployed in York.	2075/1069	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1077	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2077/1085	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt land.	2078/1092	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1100	
		2080/1107	
		2081/1115	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2082/1123	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If proposals go ahead Copmanthorpe will cease to exist as a village. Will be more congestion on roads, more flooding and no green belt.	2083/1130		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1138		
	2085/1146		
	2086/1153		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or	2087/1161		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	large enough to prevent people from travelling.		
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1168	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1174	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1180	
		2091/1188	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1196	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1204	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1212	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full.	2095/1220	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1227	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1233	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1241	
		2099/1249	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Ruin York.	2100/1256	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1264	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2102/1270	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2103/1278	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.	2104/1286		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Object to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2105/1293		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with community leading to development of Local Plan.	2106/1301		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2107/1309		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Medical services won't be able to cope. Visitors to York will have to drive past sprawling housing estate instead of green fields. Houses will be built on green belt land which has been laid aside to give York breathing space and a more attractive approach.	2108/1317	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2109/1325	
		2110/1333	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Lose status as a village. Roads wouldn't cope. Have brown field sites e.g. two airfields which could be used.	2111/1341	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites situation.	2112/1349	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1357	
		2114/1365	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2115/1373	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2116/1381	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2117/1389	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2118/1397	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More flooding and loss of allotments.	2119/1404	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development will spoil village.	2120/1411	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2121/1419	
		2122/1427	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Character of Copmanthorpe will change as a result of strain put on facilities. Ludicrous to relinquish green belt in this fashion.	2129/1442	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1450	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. To build houses in hope this will attract people before there are sustainable jobs is putting the cart before the horse	2131/1458	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1466	
		2133/1474	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1482		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1490		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1497		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1505	
		2138/1513	
		2139/1521	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Don't let us lose village identity. Central car parking inadequate. School oversubscribed. Use of good agricultural green field land for housing is criminal.	2140/1529	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2141/1537	
		2142/1553	
		2143/1560	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1568	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1576	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1583	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1591	
		2148/1599	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1607	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses is excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. 200 to 250 is more realistic but sewage, drainage systems and power supply would need improving. Development of green belt land on Manor Heath could set a precedent in the city. Extra traffic would cause congestion.	2150/1615	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1621	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be protected for future generations.	2152/1629		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1636		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1644		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1651		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1659	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1667	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1675	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1682	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1690	
		2161/1698	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around York.	2162/1706	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1714	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1722	
		2165/1729	
		2166/1737	
		2167/1744	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1750	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will have severe and detrimental impact on village. Ongoing problems with sewage and drainage will be compounded by scale of development.	2169/1758	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1765	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1773	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2172/1781	
		2173/1789	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2174/1797		
	2175/1804		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1810		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1818		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1825		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1833	
		2180/1849	
		2181/1857	
		2182/1863	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1871	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1879	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1887	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1895	
		2187/1911	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will dramatically destroy nature of village. Current infrastructure only just capable of coping with present population and vehicle movements. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Proposed density much higher than currently the case in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	2188/1919	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1927	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1934	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues.	2191/1941	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1949	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1957	
		2194/1965	
		2195/1973	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made?	2196/1981	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1989		
	2198/1997		
	2199/2004		
	2200/2012		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2019		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2027	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2035	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2043	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2051	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2057	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary.	2207/2065	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2073	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2080	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2088	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2096	
		2212/2104	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2112	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2120	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2135	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2143	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2151	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2159	
		2219/2167	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2175	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2191	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will become a dormitory village for commuters into Leeds and W. Yorks. Where are the jobs for 20000 houses (50000 people)?	2222/2199		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2207	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2213	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2221	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2229	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2237	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2244	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are four active badger setts on the proposed development site.	2229/2252	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath be destroyed?	2230/2260	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2268	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2276	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2284	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2292	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 – 200 houses.	2235/2299	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street in village will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2307	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic queues already many mornings at junction with ring road/A64. Additional housing (if needed) should be spread around York and in villages, not in a single large concentration.	2237/2314	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Exit road from Manor Heath to Leeds and the overhead roundabout already over-burdened. Manor Heath too narrow for extra traffic.	2238/2322	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village could not cope with extra traffic.	2239/2330	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why would anyone want to move into a new home which may have a wind turbine near the back? Transport infrastructure will not be able to cope. Primary school would need redevelopment. Loss of green space and walking amenity to village.	2240/2337		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2345		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2353	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2361	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2368	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2376	
		2246/2384	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2392	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2399	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2407	
		2250/2415	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2423	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2431	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Large areas of land such as Monks Cross within the bypass limits should be considered before any external ring road green belt land. Smaller villages such as Rufforth could be developed and still be smaller than Copmanthorpe currently is. Let developers pay for infrastructure.	2253/2439	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2447	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2455	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy existing community. Scale of development too large and design of housing not sympathetic to conservation area. Inadequate provision for education.	2256/2463	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2471		
	2258/2478		
	2259/2486		
	2260/2494		
	2261/2502		
	2262/2510		
	2263/2518		
2264/2524			
2265/2532			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2266/2540	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2267/2548	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2556	
		2269/2564	
		2270/2572	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2580	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely.	2272/2588	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2596	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village centre could not cope with increase in size of village. T-junction at top of Manor Heath will be a real problem. Cannot have a wind farm so close to such a development or vice versa.	2274/2604	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2610	
		2276/2617	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them.	2282/2635	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2643	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2651	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2659	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2667	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded.	2287/2675	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel of Copmanthorpe.	2288/2683	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2289/2691	
		2290/2698	
2291/2706			
2292/2714			
2293/2722			
	2294/2730		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2295/2738		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2296/2746	
		2297/2754	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2298/2762	
		2299/2770	
		2300/2778	
		2301/2786	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2794	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2802	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2810	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2818	
		2306/2826	
		2318/2834	
		2319/2842	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2320/2850	
		2321/2857	
		2322/2865	
		2323/2873	
		2324/2881	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2889	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2897	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2905		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2911		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2919		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with YCC.	2330/2926		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2934		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2942		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2949		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3158	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3166	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2955	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2962	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2970	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2978	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2986	
		2374/2993	
		2375/3001	
		2376/3008	
		2377/3015	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2378/3022	
		2379/3030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3037	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3044	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If we have to have some houses, why can they not be fitted with solar panels? Far better than wind farms.	2382/3060	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3067	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3075	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3083		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New park & ride at Askham Bar will bring further chaos to surrounding roads at peak times without additional vehicles from Copmanthorpe.	2386/3091		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3098		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3106		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3113	
		2390/3121	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3129	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3135	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3143	
		2394/3150	
		2395/3174	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3180	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in poor repair. Considerable increase in traffic will worsen this. Copmanthorpe is a village and should not be allowed to become another suburb of York.	2397/3188	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already enough children hanging around shops and residential areas causing trouble. This will worsen. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. New housing estates will result in a very different new “sub-village”.	2410/3196	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3203	
		2449/3211	
		2450/3219	
		2451/3250	
2452/3227			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	2488/3234		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2489/3242		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	2490/3257		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3359	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.	2494/3367	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Access to and from York does not cope well even now and will become untenable. Increased impact of traffic on A64/Tadcaster Road.	2495/3375	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3382	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3390	
		2498/3398	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3406	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3414	
		2501/3422	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3335	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3351	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3312	
		2570/3320	
		2571/3327	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Medical services won't be able to cope. Visitors to York will have to drive past sprawling housing estate instead of green fields	2589/3304	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3430	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3437	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Lack of shops. This is a village not a suburb of York. Green fields are precious to villagers and wildlife. Where are thousands of new jobs coming from?	2610/3445		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3453		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3460		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3468		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3476	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3484	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3492	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3500	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.	2640/6016	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3578	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3586	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3592	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.	2932/4002	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe has had significant development over the years. Land is green belt and prime agricultural land. Build within ring road instead and spread development on several communities. When A64 was upgraded, several areas of land were ruined and made unworkable by excavation (opposite new park and ride and York College) – why have these not been earmarked for development? Will need to increase and improve all services which are already at breaking point. Need to retain or replace any of the trees lost through widening roads into Copmanthorpe. Mixture of house type and size? Limit on height of properties. Provide parking	2988/4525	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4009	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration of impact of extra vehicles on the village and roads. Exit onto A1237 junction needs improvement. Burial ground is insufficient for the amount of extra residents and may need to be extended. Difficulties in widening Moor Lane. Not a good idea to build houses so close to the railway lines.	3047/7906	
	Objection – to building additional housing on the outskirts of Copmanthorpe. Loss of Agricultural land, green belt and wildlife. Insufficient drainage and sewage. Increased flooding and congestion. Use empty properties or non green belt land. Impact of 30% increase in population on the school. How will these houses create	3082/7962	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	jobs in York, most residents currently commute out of York on A64 for work.		
<b>Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued</b>	Objection - safeguarded land is currently in the green belt, the purpose of which is to safeguard the special character of York. This special character includes the open approaches to the city. These proposals would impose an area of suburban sprawl just at the beginning of the green wedge running from Askham Bog through to Hob Moor and the Knavesmire. Proposals would damage the important landscape setting and increase traffic, congestion and overcrowding. Allocation of large green field site in Copmanthorpe will delay the re use of urban brownfield sites. Distance of sites from centre of village will mean that majority will travel by car causing congestion and using already overloaded facilities such as school and health care as well as foul and surface water drainage. Additional housing will add significantly to the overloading of the Manor Heath junction onto ring road. Developments will attract commuters from Leeds and encourage long distance commuting rather than sustainable development. Loss of highly fertile agricultural land. No significant employment opportunities in Copmanthorpe so there will be significant increase in commuting into York and Leeds which is against all current environmental policies and air quality.	3222/8289	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4017	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely alter community.	3283/4025	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4041	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4049	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan. Concern over safety on roads due to additional traffic.	3292/4033	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3318/4057	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan. Will spoil rural charm of village and quality of life.	3327/4064	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	3330/4072	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.		
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should build on brown field sites or establish new villages where new full infrastructure suitable for number of houses is built and paid for by developer rather than tag on to established villages.	3412/4080	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4088	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased parking in street will cause congestion. Bus service not good so car use essential. Less houses and better quality would keep charm of village.	3414/4095	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4103	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4111	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8869	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8876	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8845	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8853	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8861	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6024	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don't see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6031	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6038	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe's green belt/open space will be virtually eliminated by proposed building of dwellings and wind farm. Increased traffic congestion as a result of 1000 plus extra vehicles. School size would need to be increased. Insufficient capacity in main sewage pipe. Car parking and shopping centre facilities cannot cope with 1500 extra residents. Increased strain on already busy roads. Increased health care facilities needed. What provision to increase health facilities is proposed to accommodate huge expansion?	3626/9317	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Impact of extra houses on area. Plans don't include provision of amenities e.g. shops, school, doctors, dentist etc. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3726/6001		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.		
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6009	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All services already at capacity.	3888/4561	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Existing services are already full. SF5 states purpose: 'to enable enough people to live in the village to maintain the services currently offered' but all services are already at capacity.	3889/4569	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3903/4588	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	4057/4691	
	Objection – proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are absolutely inappropriate on the green belt and will put immense strain on the local infrastructure and the A64.	4128/10828	
	Objection – the safeguarded land added to the proposed development of 600 houses will lead to gross overdevelopment. No mention of infrastructure development. Are the existing roads adequate for another 1000 to 1250 cars? Will add to the daily congestion on the northern ring road.	4329/11243	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about ability (or inability) for school to cope with additional number of planned children. Council's forecast would mean not all Copmanthorpe children could attend local school unless a second school was built.	4434/5202	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can't cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5209	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan. Not only roads in Copmanthorpe will not be able to cope but major routes into York will become even more grid locked. Copmanthorpe will no longer be a village.	4451/5217	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Proposed density much higher than currently the case in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	4737/5282	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5332	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reserving of more land to build a further	4761/5338	



Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	600 houses in the future is totally out of scale for the village. Land is green belt and loss of amenity is significant. Infrastructure in the village cannot support this level of development – particularly junction with A64, roads in the village, parking near the shops, sewage system and surface water drainage systems. Impact on wildlife and flora. Impact on site of Roman settlement.		
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5346	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4763/5354	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. School would not be able to cope with quantity of new pupils. Youth groups are at capacity. Existing problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. No mention of improving facilities. Problems with parking in the centre of the village. Road system cannot cope with extra vehicular traffic. Plans to re open railway station or improve buses? Secondary school at capacity.	4764/5362	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5370	
		4766/5378	
		4770/5386	
	Objection – the development of the additional ‘safeguarded land’ would turn it from a village into the size of a small town. Many village amenities already overstretched – school, car parking, drains and sewers, flooding, water pressure, electricity supply and congestion on the access points by car. Development in this location would skew its population significantly away from the current centre. Suggestion of additional facilities ignores the fact that having a clear centre and single school are important elements of its character. Loss of green belt land. This is important approach to city.	5239/12577	
	Objection – development would have a negative impact on all infrastructure and local services which would not be able to cope with these additional houses. All services would require overhaul and significant upgrade, including schools, drainage, highways, healthcare, local shops. The highways in Copmanthorpe could not cope as the majority of cars would use Manor Heath and would overwhelm the local highway network. This is a long established green belt.	5766/13637	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would have to be massive investment in drainage, roads, sewage, additional schools, additional welfare facilities, doctors, dentists, water supply, and electricity supply before housing should even be considered. Green belt should be protected. Wasting prime agricultural land.	5806/6230	
Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would have to be massive investment in drainage, roads, sewage, additional schools, additional welfare facilities, doctors,	5807/6238		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	dentists, water supply, and electricity supply before housing should even be considered. Green belt should be protected. Wasting prime agricultural land.		
<b>Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued</b>	Objection – already long queues at Manor Heath junction with ring road and at the Tadcaster Road junction. Manor Heath junction is dangerous. As no proposals for employment or increased school provision in Copmanthorpe there will be an unsustainable increase in vehicle journeys. Junction at Main Street and Wilstrop Farm Road cannot cope with further cars. Lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage - loss of agricultural land will make this worse. Primary school is full. No proposal to build a further GP surgery. Existing parking provision in the shopping centre is inadequate. Any infrastructure proposals would need to be agreed and carried out before additional houses can be approved. Land should be safeguarded as agricultural land use only. Building on safeguarded land would completely detract from the open character of the green belt.	6292/15908	
	Objection – already long queues at Manor Heath junction with ring road and at the Tadcaster Road junction. Manor Heath junction is dangerous. As no proposals for employment or increased school provision in Copmanthorpe there will be an unsustainable increase in vehicle journeys. Junction at Main Street and Wilstrop Farm Road cannot cope with further cars. Lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage - loss of agricultural land will make this worse. Primary school is full. No proposal to build a further GP surgery. Existing parking provision in the shopping centre is inadequate. Any infrastructure proposals would need to be agreed and carried out before additional houses can be approved. Land should be safeguarded as agricultural land use only. Building on safeguarded land would completely detract from the open character of the green belt.	6293/15914	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15925	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6327	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Developments will cause significant traffic and public service issues. Will destroy beautiful green surrounding landscape that makes Copmanthorpe such an attractive place to live.	6433/6334	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6342	
		6435/6350	
6457/6371			

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		6467/6392	
Site SF5 Land To West Of Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is not necessarily a good thing. Should build only accommodation for natural increase in the community already here. Infrastructure doesn't need to be hugely enlarged as don't need additional development.	6486/6438	
	Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for housing.	Petition 9	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF6 South Of Airfield Business Park, Elvington	Support – supportive of the reference to SF6 South of Airfield Business Park because it acknowledges the fact that the land does not contribute to the purposes of green belt and it recognises the need for the land to be released for development in the future. Objection – the land is required for development before the end of the plan period (see reasons under SS3).	1674/9758	William Birch & Sons
	Objection – if land is required for development outside the ring road then land between Elvington village and the Airfield which is at present not included in any proposal could be utilised within the plan period and has much more merit than SF6.	4752/12046	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Site SF7 Land Adjacent To Designer Outlet</b>	Support – supportive of the removal of this land from the green belt. Objection - consideration could be given to allowing development of this land within the plan period, particularly for a relocated park and ride facility.	244/14132	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Objection – proposal for safeguarded land is dubious. Designer outlet is important, not for its shops but for its park and ride. There seems to be quite enough room for more car parks within the existing very lavish site.	3242/8309	
	Objection – expansion of designer outlet is very worrying, when originally proposed it was forecast that it would put an extra 3,000,000 vehicles per year on the A19. What would an expanded leisure centre do? Surely there are enough sport and leisure facilities at Clifton Moor and elsewhere in York to meet the demand?	4787/12084	
	Objection – opposed to removal of designer outlet from the green belt and being designated for strategic leisure. Even at present there are instances of incredibly loud music from the designer outlet, without noisy outdoor sports and music events. Impact on 100+ year old adjoining orchard. Loss of one of York’s most attractive and peaceful ‘quiet places’.	5708/13451	
	Objection – SF7 should not have been removed from a green belt character area in the 2013 Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper.	6284/15883	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park</b>	Objection – object to the very high percentage of the total employment land required which has been allocated for development and as safeguarded land at Northminster. Removes a large area of green belt, will impact on the function of the A59 as a green finger running up to the urban edge of the city. Size is inappropriate especially in its proximity to Poppletons and Knapton and will impact visually on both villages which are part of special village-dotted green belt setting of York. Character has already been severely affected by the loss of green belt for the park and ride and associated highway infrastructure (enlarged A59 roundabout). Creeping ribbon development on the A59 from urban edge of York to Station Road. Traffic generated will recreate congestion problems for the A1237 and A59. ST19 should become the safeguarded land and SF8 remain in the green belt.	192/13996	
	Objection – the northern area of SF8 would drastically reduce the gap between the existing development at the Business Park and the settlement of Nether Poppleton. The safeguarding and eventual development of parts of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.	238/14065	English Heritage
	Objection – this allocation is without evidential support to justify it as a growth point at an outlying settlement not connecting towards the central urban core, but extending out into the countryside with no evidence to indicate such a selection as being sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the green belt.	544/16773	
	Objection – see response 9	801/3708	
	Objection – see response 9	895/3618	
	Objection – see response 9	977/3847	
	Objection – the phrase ‘safeguarded’ is misleading. It suggests to the layman that this land is safe from developers when in fact it means the opposite. The size of 100 football pitches waiting to be developed – less green space, more cars and more pollution to come.	1217/17120	
	Objection – see response 9. Concerns about the semi-rural community being lost in urban sprawl. Worried about increases in traffic, the pressure on schools and threats to wildlife.	1231/17130	
	Objection – see response 9	1579/17531	
	Objection – see response 9	1580/17541	
	Objection – gross defamation of the draft green belt, could not be described as ‘infilling’, is a great loss of grade 2 valuable agricultural land and will only promote the use of vehicular transport. Taken together with ST19 and the existing business park	1589/17561	Nether Poppleton Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and the park and ride, this has nearly the same area as the Poppleton villages. This will have a materially greater impact than present use on the draft green belt and would detract from the open character of the green and prejudice the setting and special character of Poppleton and Knapton historic villages. No provisions to account for extra road movements and the increase in problems accessing local amenities.		
<b>Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9. The area is already over populated considering air pollution from tip near Rufforth and sewage plant at Rawcliffe. The problems need rectifying before contemplating causing more. Narrow roads throughout area concerned a major factor also.	1585/3656	
	Objection – see response 9. Is there really such a need when there are empty offices already? Shops closed in York, only restaurants, bars, cafes in the City Centre.	1588/4120	
	Objection – see response 9	1597/3904	
	Objection – this area should be incorporated into the green belt in order to reinforce the principles of the ‘open aspect’ and mitigating the impact of the park and ride development – in compliance with guideline 3 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement. In order to compensate for loss of employment the designated gaps between the two areas allocated to the south of Northminster business park should be designated as a strategic employment site to provide a more cohesive employment zone.	1599/9933	
	Objection – see response 9	1891/7809	
	Objection – see response 9	2009/6497	
	Objection – see response 9	2550/6857	
	Objection – see response 9	2580/6915	
	Objection – see response 9	2600/3530	
	Objection – see response 9. Too much development will upset the balance and create more traffic problems and pollution.	2605/3554	
	Objection – see response 9. Even with the new park and ride the increase in traffic will make Boroughbridge Road a nightmare to use.	2606/3562	
	Objection – see response 9. Will cause serious congestion in the village.	2607/3570	
	Objection – see response 9	2855/3600	
	Objection – see response 9	2856/3609	
Objection – see response 9	2858/3631		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	2859/3638	
	Objection – see response 9	2860/3647	
	Objection – see response 9	2861/3665	
	Objection – see response 9. Any developments which would turn the villages into suburban sprawl would be a blight to the wider area and utterly detrimental to York.	2862/3674	
	Objection – see response 9	2864/3690	
	Objection – see response 9. Object to any Green Belt development in any village around York.	2865/3699	
	Objection – see response 9	2867/3721	
	Objection – see response 9	2868/3728	
	Objection – see response 9	2870/3741	
	Objection – see response 9. This proposal would be the beginning of the end for Poppleton as a village, must be stopped at all costs.	2872/4536	
	Objection – see response 9	2873/3756	
	Objection – see response 9	2874/3765	
	Objection – see response 9	2875/3774	
	Objection – see response 9. Local Amenities are already at breaking point, the junior school is unable to take anymore children. There are enough people in this village without thousands more if you build these houses.	2876/3783	
	Objection – see response 9. The village feel is being lost with every new house being approved and its local services are unable to handle this increase.	2877/3792	
	Objection – see response 9. York is being turned into an overpopulated sprawl. Brownfield sites should be developed and the countryside kept as it is.	2878/3801	
	Objection – see response 9	2879/3810	
	Objection – see response 9	2880/3819	
	Objection – see response 9	2881/4542	
	Objection – see response 9	2882/3831	
Objection – see response 9	2883/3840		
Objection – see response 9. Object to the principle of using Green Belt land for development purposes.	2884/3856		
Objection – see response 9	2885/3865		
Objection – see response 9. Should these proposals proceed then the infrastructure should be in place before any further development.	2886/3878		
Objection – see response 9. Have the council considered the gridlocked roads and	2887/3887		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overcrowded primary schools?		
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	2888/3896	
	Objection – see response 9. There should be a firm policy in place which maintains the physical separation between the City and the villages outside.	2889/3910	
	Objection – see response 9	2890/3918	
	Objection – see response 9. Infrastructure entirely inappropriate and insufficient to support development on this scale. Would alter the character of Poppleton and the surrounding area.	2892/3933	
	Objection – see response 9. Contrary to existing VDS and would alter the character of the area. Insufficient provision for infrastructure.	2893/3942	
	Objection – see response 9	2894/3951	
	Objection – see response 9	2895/3960	
	Objection – see response 9. This development will destroy for ever the village atmosphere of both Knapton and Poppleton.	2896/3969	
	Objection – see response 9. Why not use brownfield sites and leave the Green Belt alone?	2897/3978	
	Objection – see response 9	2911/4139	
	Objection – see response 9	2912/4149	
	Objection – see response 9	2962/4155	
	Objection – see response 9	3004/7841	
	Objection – see response 9	3022/7861	
	Objection – see response 9	3029/4162	
	Objection – see response 9. Will spoil and degrade the standard of life, landscape and special environmental nature of this super village.	3030/4171	
	Objection – see response 9	3032/4178	
	Objection – see response 9	3037/4187	
	Objection – see response 9	3038/4194	
	Objection – see response 9	3040/4208	
	Objection – see response 9	3042/4223	
	Objection – see response 9	3043/7895	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposals for employment at SF8.	3099/7992	
Comment – do not see why such a large expansion would be required. Take up of industrial/commercial units has largely stalled since the recession. The nearby York	3209/8269		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Business Park is still to a large extent empty fields – surely this should be developed first?		
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	3248/4240	
	Objection – see response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved throughout this area.	3271/4256	
	Objection – see response 9. Farmland needs to be treasured.	3278/8424	
	Objection – see response 9. The scale and extent of the proposed development causes concern.	3284/4266	
	Objection – see response 9. The scale of development is too large.	3285/4275	
	Objection – this land is green belt and farm land and should not be earmarked for industrial development.	3378/8676	
	Objection – see response 9	3384/8689	
	Objection – see response 9. It is hoped that the council will build major roads and flyovers to cope with the traffic this will create.	3419/4290	
	Objection – see response 9	3423/4299	
	Objection – development of urban sprawl. Significant loss of land to York's northern green belt and green infrastructure. Lack of transport infrastructure to support the development, particularly the A1237.	3428/8790	
	Objection – see response 9	3441/8806	
	Objection – see response 9	3443/8817	
	Objection – see response 9	3468/8932	
	Objection – see response 9	3472/8940	
	Objection – see response 9	3473/8949	
	Objection – see response 9	3474/8958	
	Objection – see response 9. All this proposed development will cause extra traffic on Boroughbridge Road which will be chaotic.	3475/8968	
	Objection – see response 9. Do not need another Clifton Moor.	3479/8975	
	Objection – see response 9	3481/8984	
	Objection – see response 9	3482/8994	
Objection – see response 9	3483/9003		
Objection – see response 9	3484/9014		
Objection – see response 9	3485/9023		
Objection – see response 9	3486/9033		
Objection – see response 9	3487/9043		
Objection – see response 9. The infrastructure of Poppleton could not adequately	3488/9052		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	support the proposals of the Local Plan.		
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	3490/9062	
	Objection – see response 9	3491/9071	
	Objection – see response 9	3492/9080	
	Objection – see response 9	3493/9089	
	Objection – see response 9	3494/9098	
	Objection – see response 9	3495/9107	
	Objection – see response 9	3502/9116	
	Objection – see response 9	3503/9126	
	Objection – see response 9	3504/9136	
	Objection – see response 9	3505/9145	
	Objection – see response 9	3506/9154	
	Objection – see response 9	3550/9166	
	Objection – see response 9	3554/9177	
	Objection – see response 9	3555/9187	
	Objection – see response 9	3556/9194	
	Objection – see response 9	3557/9205	
	Objection – see response 9	3559/9219	
	Objection – see response 9	3560/9228	
	Objection – see response 9. Please leave Poppleton as a village.	3561/9236	
	Objection – see response 9	3562/9243	
	Objection – see response 9	3563/9252	
	Objection – see response 9	3564/9261	
	Objection – see response 9	3565/9269	
	Objection – see response 9	3566/9278	
	Objection – see response 9	3567/9287	
	Objection – see response 9	3568/9297	
	Objection – see response 9. There is no need to extend Northminster Business Park as there is much vacant accommodation elsewhere in York.	3623/9308	
	Objection – see response 9	3634/9362	
	Objection – see response 9. Over development.	3637/9372	
	Objection – see response 9. Important to preserve the green areas.	3638/9380	
Objection – see response 9	3639/9388		
Objection – see response 9	3640/9396		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	3641/9404	
	Objection – see response 9	3642/9413	
	Comment – will there be a Park & Ride if houses as put there. Hopes a hospital will be close at hand.	3677/9422	
	Objection – see response 9. More development will create more congestion and through traffic.	3728/10039	
	Objection – see response 9	3730/10054	
	Objection – see response 9	3731/10064	
	Objection – see response 9	3738/10089	
	Objection – see response 9	3741/10105	
	Objection – see response 9	3742/10115	
	Objection – see response 9	3743/10125	
	Objection – see response 9	3745/5802	
	Objection – see response 9	3746/10135	
	Objection – see response 9	3911/4602	
	Objection – see response 9	3942/4629	
	Objection – see response 9	3946/4638	
	Objection – see response 9	3947/4646	
	Objection – see response 9	3966/10549	
	Objection – opposed to proposals to safeguard the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development. The existing site together with the A59 already impacts on the green belt policies for York as defined by the Government. Any further expansion would further erode the green belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	3976/10578	
	Objection – see response 9. Need more information as to what is intended. Infrastructure has to be a priority or are we going to have many more vehicles in an area which is trying to cut down on vehicles?	4055/4682	
	Objection – once again good arable farm land is to be taken out of production, this was designated green belt. A considerate council should not be proposing any development on farmed land until all brownfield sites and disused sites are better utilised. If by 200 we are supposed to have the large population projected then where are we to grow food if the land has been irrevocably taken out of production.	4070/10757	
Comment – see response 9. SF8 seem 'least bad' options for transport.	4077/4715		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9. Proposals will attract further traffic without any form of amelioration which will significantly reduce safety and amenity in the local area.	4078/4724	
	Objection – see response 9. Of great concern as to pressure on Poppleton facilities.	4079/4733	
	Objection – see response 9. Cannot be accommodated on the road network and will reduce road safety and amenity.	4080/4742	
	Objection – see response 9	4082/4751	
	Objection – see response 9. Roads cannot cope, the green belt corridor needs to be retained so that the villages remain villages and are not sucked into York City by urban sprawl.	4084/4761	
	Objection – see response 9. Over development, no consideration given to infrastructure , especially roads,	4085/5817	
	Objection – see response 9	4087/4770	
	Objection – see response 9. Creeping urbanisation of an area which was always supposed to be separate from the main York City by a preserved green belt.	4088/4779	
	Objection – see response 9. Businesses on Northminster Business Park cannot plan future expansion because of the thread of the area being ‘safeguarded for development’. What development?	4103/4801	
	Objection – see response 9	4111/4821	
	Objection – see response 9	4127/4843	
	Objection – see response 9	4145/4861	
	Objection – see response 9. The fields surrounding Poppleton are already blighted by the new Park & Ride (highly unnecessary). To extend an industrial estate will further blot the landscape.	4191/4894	
	Objection – strongly object to SF8 Industrial Development (safeguarding) of 110 acres adjacent to Northminster Business Park.	4416/5057	
	Objection – see response 9	4386/11362	
	Objection – see response 9	4425/5070	
	Objection – see response 9.	4431/5080	
	Objection – see response 9	4435/5089	
	Objection – see response 9	4437/5098	
	Objection – see response 9. The road infrastructure will not support increased volume of traffic, the rural environment will be further eroded, will add to the destruction of York’s essential character as a medium sized attractive city and there is no excuse for diminishing the green belt, should be safeguarding the environment.	4438/5107	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued	Objection – see response 9	4440/5122	
	Objection – see response 9. The green belt should be preserved for future generations.	4441/5130	
	Objection – see response 9	4442/5139	
	Objection – see response 9	4443/5148	
	Objection – see response 9	4445/5162	
	Objection – see response 9	4446/5169	
	Objection – see response 9	4447/5177	
	Objection – see response 9	4462/5185	
	Objection – see response 9	4463/5194	
	Objection – see response 9	4650/5243	
	Objection – see response 9	4755/5292	
	Objection – see response 9. Suggest compromise – do not develop SF8 to preserve for now the green area behind the Park & Ride site which may require future expansion anyway.	4756/5302	
	Objection – see response 9	4759/5311	
	Objection – see response 9	4767/5320	
	Objection – reservations about the scale of proposed development on land which is semi-rural in nature. There are other brownfield sites in York where such industrial development would be better suited.	4829/12150	
	Objection – this area is essential since it preserves essential features of any green belt and any incursion on it would clearly leave any 'green belt' east of the ring road in that area in tatters.	5192/12466	
	Objection – SF8 should be incorporated into the green belt along with the strategic employment sites that is offset from the Northminster Business Park towards Burlands Lane in order to reinforce the principles of the open aspect and mitigating the impact of the Park & Ride. This would require the re-designation of safeguarded land to A59 side of the existing development into Green Belt. To compensate for the loss of strategic employment in the designated gaps between the two areas allocated to the south of Northminster Business Park should be designated as a strategic employment site to provide a more cohesive employment zone.	5332/14996	
Objection – oppose proposals for SF8	5408/14678		
Objection – strongly reject the development of Northfield Lane Business Park. The traffic is increasing year by year, businesses open on Saturdays and lorries parked	5735/13509		



York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: Spatial Strategy Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overnight with engines running. Only one street light and no footpath mean the 60 speed limit is ridiculous. Area is becoming far too commercial looking with the business park and park & ride.		
<b>Site SF8 Land At Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – will directly impact on the village environment which is relaxed and green with minimal traffic.	5817/13769	
	Objection – to industrial development and area under threat. Impact of increased traffic through the village.	5829/13804	
	Objection – see response 9	5948/6248	
	Objection – to employment and safeguarded land.	6038/15458	
	Objection – to the proposals for SF8.	6131/15561	
	Objection – strongly object to proposal to safeguard land adjacent to Northminster Business Park	6133/15578	
	Objection – see response 9. Potential access and traffic issues.	6190/6103	
	Objection – see response 9	6191/6111	
	Objection – see response 9	6203/6128	
	Objection – see response 9	6206/6140	
	Objection – opposed to the scale of the proposed developments at SF8 on land which is semi rural in nature. There are other brownfield sites in York where such industrial development would be better suited.	6360/16075	
	Objection – see response 9	6413/6280	
	Support –believe the housing need of the city are good enough to warrant this development	6414/6289	
	Objection – see response 9	6421/6305	
	Objection – see response 9	6425/6316	
Objection – see response 9	6438/6360		
Objection – see response 9	6483/6431		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 5.01	Support - agree with the preferred approach to the role of York's green belt and to safeguarded land.	188/13937	
	Support - Policy SS1 reflects the need to have a robust policy and affirm that flood risk should not be increased. This policy should be retained in its current format. Prefer the use of brownfield sites centred on the city but accept that other forms of development would be needed. Imperative that the associated documents linked to development sites are guided not only by flood maps but also reflect the local context and is robust enough to recognise that the weight of local experiences, particularly in regard to flooding and infrastructure, is fully considered. Support the development of locally based guidance as the only means of wholly addressing the characteristics of the respective locations and optimising sustainability. In this context York Central, the River Foss Corridor, Monks Cross, Bishopthorpe, Osbaldwick, Fulford, Elvington and Naburn should be identified as areas where specific policy guidance would be prudent, incorporating where necessary, surface water management plans or other local guidance. The villages of Strensall, Earswick, Haxby and Huntington within the Foss Corridor have presented drainage board with serious capacity issues together with localised flooding along with Naburn and Elvington where issues can be profound. The spatial and developmental aspirations may be inhibited without recourse to capacity and infrastructure issues. This may also be applicable to the proposed Whinthorpe site. Approve SS1 and SS2 but it would be preferable to reiterate the flood risk management issues in SS4. Supportive of the development of local or site specific policy documents.	190/13960	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Comment - the enhancement of wildlife habitats and encouragement of biodiversity should be a primary purpose of the green belt in line with York's ambitions for greener credentials.	529/16687	
	Objection - equal weight should be given to all green belt purposes identified in the National Planning Policy Framework. The plan proposes to take out 5% of green belt land which seems rather excessive for a basically rural area. More weight needs to be given to all the green belt purposes in order to manage the retention of York's landscape, green infrastructure and its 'outstanding and natural environment' as identified in paragraph 2.13 – 2.25 of the plan.	657/16798	
	Comment - the enhancement of wildlife habitats and encouragement of biodiversity should be a primary purpose of the green belt in line with York's ambitions for greener credentials.	835/16911	
	Support- the preferred approach to the spatial strategy should be taken.	943/16949	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 5.01 Continued	Support - support the preferred approach to the role of York's green belt. It is very important that this is done with sensitivity to York's landscape character.	1109/17178	
	Support - broadly supportive of the spatial strategy.	1337/17282	Halifax Estates
	Comment - it would be helpful to have some cross reference to the study being undertaken to assess the potential for re use of upper floors in the city centre, which might help to alleviate some of the pressure on housing land and therefore lead to fewer safeguarded areas having to be identified.	1491/17446	National Trust
	Support - support the aspirations contained within York's spatial strategy.	1514/17468	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Support- support the balanced approach which identifies spatial principles.	1668/15026	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Support/Objection - support the general principles set out in relation to the spatial strategy however previously developed land, such as Elvington Airfield, should not be identified as a candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation without a detailed assessment of the impact that this would have on the unique economic role and potential housing delivery role it has to offer the city.	1736/9829	Oakgate Group PLC
	Support - broadly support the approach taken to the role of York's green belt and the safeguarding of land.	6335/16001	Fairness & Equality Board