

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Comment – there should be a housing trajectory within the documents to provide details of potential housing delivery.	46/12586	Heslington Village Trust
	Comment – there should be a housing trajectory within the documents to provide details of potential housing delivery.	48/12595	Heslington Parish Council
	Objection – do not agree with preferred approach to phasing and delivery. Option 2, guided phasing, to be market led is not the most appropriate option. Agrees with Option 4, providing local level policy to guide phasing of development, development only once strategic site Supplementary Planning Document adopted.	1665/12953	York Environment Forum
	Objection – there is no allowance or provision for any residential development that may come forward on windfall sites within the plan period. These are highly likely and accord with national strategic objectives of achieving sustainable development and need to meet housing demand.	1785/9863	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
	Comment – the housing target required to make up the backlog of the provision of affordable homes should be the priority and these should be realistically close to areas of employment. More speculative growth is less desirable.	2416/6601	
	Comment – if the green belt is to be conserved, then there is only one possible direction remaining that is upwards. Tower blocks are not appreciated any more, but mid-rise housing (five floors maximum) is gaining popularity. Mid-rise increases the population density, thus favouring many public services, especially public transport. Build up, build cheap, build quick.	4281/11099	
	Objection – do not support the use of the 2011 based Sub National Population Projections to justify the housing figure. These figures are based on trends during a sustained period of recession in a time of undersupply of new homes, restricted access to mortgage finance and during a period where York had no adopted plan. The figures only projected forward to 2021 and could act as a barrier to the delivery of new homes and the economic growth aspirations of the Council.	6351/17630	Gladedale Estates
	Objection – no economic justification for the number of houses proposed.	6434/17460	
	Comment – having no windfall allowance is short sighted. Already there are sites coming forward that could not have been foreseen and a windfall allowance would reduce the need to allocate green fields to meet housing targets.	6516/16329	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – a housing supply buffer of 5% is considered the most appropriate to promote a bigger choice of sites for developers given that all sites for the next 5 year period are identified, potentially leading to soaring land prices. By adding a bit on will not significantly change this situation, so the lowest option has been chosen. In terms of phasing a combination of option 3 (provide local level policy, hierarchy of	6518/16394	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development sites) and option 4 (provide local level policy, development only once strategic sites Supplementary Planning Documents adopted) is preferred. The preferred option is likely to bring forward green field sites before brownfield sites.		
General Continued	Objection – housing growth should be at 850 new houses per annum or less with a 5% buffer. Completely reject Option 2 that purports to be market led but will mean national developers will be allowed to develop green field sites first rather than more economically challenging brown field sites.	6519/16468	Cllr Jenny Brooks

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth	Support – supportive of level of housing growth proposed	6/11644	Ryedale District Council
	Support – sustainable patterns of development proposed by the plan within York sub-area will reduce unnecessary development pressure beyond the greenbelt boundary.	10/11661	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – object to 21,936 proposed dwellings in plan period at 1090 per year. Supports conclusion in Arup report that 850 dwellings per year meets needs of economic and population growth. There is no credible strategy in the Plan to meet a target to provide 5,500 affordable homes during same period. Growth should be ‘realistic’ (National Planning Policy Framework) – delivering 1,090 additional homes per year will be challenging. There is no coherent strategy in the Plan to explain how this step change will take place considering low completion rate in recent years. Adopting more realistic housing aspirations would eliminate the perceived requirement of a new settlement at Whinthorpe in good agricultural Greenbelt land.	47/12581	CPRE (York and Selby District)
	Objection – the Plan proposes 22,000 additional homes to 2030 this assumes the population of York will increase by 50,000 compared to expert forecast population growth to 2026 of some 20,000 and actual growth from 2001-11 of 17,000. Plan figure of 1,200 houses per year compares with expert forecasts of less than 900 per annum being required over the same period and an average build rate of less than 700 homes per annum over the last 12 years, half of which were during economic boom.	57/12614	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – concerned that the growth figures may be overstated. The 2011 census figures also indicate a lower level of growth than previously forecast. This lower level of forecast growth is further corroborated by the interim 2011 based Sub national Population projections for the city.	59/12644	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – where is no need to provide a 15% buffer over and above the identified requirement. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework applies only to a 5 year supply – this adds an unnecessary buffer to an already excessive requirement.	62/12702	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – option 1 of the Arup report i.e. baseline of 850 dwellings per annum seems to be supported by the best objective evidence rather than Option 2 (1,090 dwellings). Arup appraisal suggests Option 1 is safest choice as other options require inadequately grounded assumptions about demographic trends, economic growth, affordable housing provision and deliverability. Members would prefer to see a lower level of housing provision but recognise the need for growth over the longer term. Arup makes it clear that basing housing growth on need to address backlog of affordable housing is risky and likely to have far reaching environmental and other consequences.	65/12729	Heworth Without Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection - latest Census figures when available should be used as such the data on which the Plan is based should be regarded as tentative at best and unreliable at worst. Over estimation of housing growth along with a policy to encourage house building to reduce house prices and more affordable homes may create negative equity. New suburban areas and new towns built within the greenbelt based on unrealistic growth assumptions is an irresponsible and improvident policy. Adjustments to the ratio of brownfield to greenbelt allocation will meet our foreseeable needs.	65/12729	Heworth Without Parish Council Continued
	Objection – the huge increase in our housing and therefore population is going to irreparably destroy the community of Huntington.	67/12735	Huntington Parish Council
	Objection – too ambitious in housing growth assumptions. Question the sustainability of building over 1,000 houses per year and the inflexible link between new jobs and new homes giving rise to erroneous infrastructure estimates.	74/12748	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – the proposed housing growth is required to support the inflated economic growth. The Arup Report confirmed growth figures are unrealistic and a figure of closer to 800 per annum would be more appropriate. The Local Plan should adopt a figure of less than 800 per annum and increased use of brownfield land taking pressure of need for Clifton gate development.	75/12756	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – the whole plan is driven by an excessive amount of housing growth at 1090 per annum. Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works does not have the capacity to deal with the demands of the Plan.	77/12765	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – concerns about the scale of proposed economic growth and associated housing developments especially on Greenfield locations and presently un-adopted but widely recognised Green Belt.	79/12785	Wheldrake Parish Council
	Objection – the housing target has been inflated and has lead to significant green field sites being allocated for new settlements on Green Belt land.	101/14237	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – previously agreed target of 850 houses per annum to 1,250 based on attracting more employers to York, significantly higher than regional and national trends. 850 dwellings per annum would provide a choice of housing for those with jobs in York and would meet the present and projected affordable housing need.	136/12871	Skelton Village Trust
	Objection – the annual housing target proposed in the local plan does not meet an objectively assessed needs test. Until the economic recession York performed well against regional targets set. Brownfield development has dominated housing supply. The Council’s evidence base does not provide sufficient evidence to support 1090 houses pa or a 15% buffer – this figure should be clarified through the Assessment of Evidence of Housing Requirements in York report (May 2013). The evidence base	144/12884	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>supporting the preferred approach would not meet the full affordable housing need, estimated to be 790 per annum in the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Reasons for not selecting higher figures in Options 3 and 4 that would meet affordable housing need were not provided.</p> <p>Comment – the Housing Requirements Report identifies that Option 2 (1,090) would need a step change in delivery given that it is higher than the 10 year average. As 92% has been achieved on brownfield sites since 1992 the completion rates could have been higher if large scale Greenfield sites had been made available.</p>		
<p>Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued</p>	<p>Comment – the Council identified four housing growth options tested by Arup. Option 1 is based on trends during sustained recession and could act as a barrier to the delivery of homes needed and the economic growth aspirations of the Council. There is a significant under-delivery of housing amongst other authorities sharing the housing market area. This under-delivery will place additional pressure upon York and its ability to achieve its economic goals and provide adequate numbers of affordable housing. It is important that York works with these other authorities to address this under supply. Objection – The council will continue to exacerbate an already large affordable housing issue using a low figure of 1,090 per annum and will not align with economic growth aspirations. The 15% buffer to provide choice and competition in the market should be increased to 20% or greater to ensure delivery is achieved in the short term. This buffer is unlikely to provide the quantum of housing required to meet York’s economic aspirations. Recommendation for the Council to plan more positively and aspire to the higher housing figures of Option 3 (1,500 dwellings) or Option 4 (2,060 dwellings) to meet economic and affordable housing needs.</p>	145/13864	Home Builders Federation
	<p>Comment – concern about the amount of housing to be delivered without the appropriate investment in the outer ring road.</p>	153/14986	Without Walls (York Economic Partnership Board)
	<p>Comment – wonder where in the planned sites, windfall opportunities are to be considered (currently unknown opportunities that always arise at some average rate over the years). These may have implications for viability of other lower priority sites and hence a knock o implication for the community.</p>	178/13891	York Council for Voluntary Service
	<p>Support – welcome the recognition of link between economic and housing growth and support the intention to make provision for 1090 dwellings per annum with a 15% buffer. This is the minimum requirement necessary to meet the backlog of housing need and the requirements of the City.</p>	187/13912	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	<p>Comment – York needs more housing for all not just affordable. Just increasing the</p>	189/13957	The Helmsley Group Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	supply does not mean they will be built. Unless apartments are allowed without the need for affordable targets will not be met. Developers build because it is profitable to do so. Perhaps areas should be allocated only for affordable such as York Central.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – it is of great concern that such a high proportion of housing allocation is on what is currently green belt. This risks brownfield sites remaining undeveloped as they are more difficult to develop in comparison to Greenfield sites. Windfalls should be included in the calculations taking pressure off the need to build on the green belt. Whilst accepting the desirability of providing housing for people working in York – many of the housing allocations are ideally placed for people commuting to Leeds.	192/14000	
	Objection – based upon the sites put forward as Strategic Allocations, Option 2 (which reflects economic ambitions and new housing development commensurate with this level of employment growth) seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character of the historic City. It may be possible that this level of growth can be accommodated. However, this is not currently demonstrated by some of the areas put forward in the Plan.	238/14070	English Heritage
	Support – support housing provision figure of 1,090 dwellings pa as minimum requirement	304/14174 431/16535	Shirethorn Ltd Shepherd Homes Ltd
	Objection – the housing target of 1,090 is questioned as to whether it is sufficient to meet the economic growth aspirations of the Council. The persistent record of under delivery of housing means the Council should be looking at a 20% buffer not 15% as currently proposed. This would have the effect of creating a range of between 1,090 and 1,362 dwellings per annum or 19,620 to 24,516 over the period 2012 to 2030.	432/16546	Church Commissioners for England
	Objection – don't accept the need for the higher housing figure chosen by the Council. The appropriate trend based position for York of 850 dwellings per annum throughout the plan (as predicted by the study) is surely the target to aim at. Housing growth should be restricted to the Option 1 baseline. Larger growth is unsustainable, particularly in villages outside the city centre due to the increased traffic congestion it would create and pressure on overstretched village facilities and drainage/sewerage.	433/16556	
	Support – supportive of the commitment to provide at least 21,936 dwellings over the plan period.	434/16572	Associated British Foods plc
	Objection – there has been a persistent under delivery of housing since 2007, therefore a 20% buffer should be provided. 15% buffer is not qualified in policy. If a 20% buffer is applied to an annual target of 1,090 homes then 1,308 dwellings should be supplied each year (or 22,886 across the plan period) The sites allocated in the Local Plan do not meet this need.	451/16600	Linden Homes North & Miller Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	<p>Support – agree with the 15% buffer over and above the target to support delivery and choice and range of sites</p> <p>Object – there are significant negative impacts which would result from adopting low levels of housing growth and these must be recognised, not least on housing affordability and increased house prices by a lack of supply. A low level of housing growth would not meet housing needs, economic growth aspirations and lead to unsustainable patterns of travel with people having to travel further distances between home and work.</p> <p>Comment – factors to consider which influence the level of growth adopted: Population and household projections – natural population growth, net migration and trend towards reduced household sizes; Affordability – indications of housing affordability suggest the need for higher levels of housing growth; Economic needs – strong and essential need to support economic growth. The delivery of housing supports a vibrant economy; Infrastructure requirements – delivery of new housing will support infrastructure projects through Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy; and availability of land – the low level of housing growth should not be governed by the availability of land within the city. Sufficient previously developed land together with green field land of minimal sensitivity is available to support strong levels of housing growth.</p>	452/16607	Miller Homes Ltd
	Support – the proposals for housing are ambitious and necessary. The correct target has been chosen to trade between appropriately affordable and quality housing and the negative ecological impact.	525/16633	
	Objection – serious questioning of housing target and its justification. Reject 1,090 houses pa and 15% buffer and replace with 850 and 10%.	527/16650	
	Objection – a high housing target should be pursued to meet the real level of housing need to ensure the council are planning for economic recovery. To ensure the housing targets are achievable it is important for a greater number of less constrained sites to be allocated for housing delivery in the short term.	528/16667	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – unrealistic housing targets, vastly overambitious and completely unsustainable. Calculation of need is not convincing, projected availability of 15,000 new jobs is unrealistic. Does not speculate on what industries will need to expand or be created to supply these jobs. The requirement is not properly defined and its feasibility is not explored. Currently a third of York based commuters are travelling to Leeds to work. There is a danger of excessive building of houses in York will transform the city into a dormitory town for Leeds – contrary to reductions to carbon dioxide	529/16678	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	emissions ambitions.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	<p>Support – the Local Plan considers various growth rates and assumptions and in this context it would appear that the various options for satisfying the housing need have been objectively assessed and therefore the Local Plan in this regard has been positively prepared. Growth is proposed over and above the previous Regional Spatial Strategy rates and is welcomed. The Local Plan has an integrated approach to employment creation and housing provision and seeks to address problems of commuting into York. Support identification of Strategic Sites to meet the development need of the district. However, not convinced that providing less than the objectively assessed housing need is justified.</p> <p>Objection – the proposed housing requirement will not address the backlog of affordable housing and it is evident the housing requirement should be revised upwards in order to tackle this current backlog.</p> <p>Comment – concerns that the housing requirement does not meet the full housing needs of the district and the reasons for this has not been adequately explained.</p>	534/16704	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – the option proposed does not meet the full needs for market and affordable housing as identified in the Arup Housing Requirements Document. A higher growth option, Option 3, which would deliver 1,500 dwellings per annum, is required to be National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) compliant. York has a persistent under delivery of housing and should provide a 20% buffer and should clearly identify suitable and available sites for the first 5 years as set out in NPPF.	536/16726	KeyLand Developments Ltd
	<p>Support – the decision to adopt a positive and proactive position in relation to the quantum of land proposed for residential development is supported particularly the annual requirement of 1,090 completions per year.</p> <p>Comment – it will be necessary for the next version of the Local plan to justify this target following a reduction in one component of the requirement (the latest 2011 census based household formation rates)</p>	540/16728	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection – analysis based on past trends is flawed. York has not been able to deliver a growth pattern which would reflect demand of employment land or housing. The housing target for new addition should be higher such as per Option 3 (1,500) and the number and total area of housing allocations should be increased.	544/16777	
	Objection – The plan to build 20000+ homes in the York area is unacceptable as the local infrastructure will be unable to cope, run off will exacerbate flood risk and the environmental impact on the Green Belt cannot be justified.	560/16795	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p>Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued</p>	<p>Objection – The 2008 based Sub-national Population Projections do not reflect appropriate levels of population projection. The 2011 based interim Sub-national Household Projections to justify the 850 figure are not supported as they are based on trends during the worst recession since the 1930s in a period of significant under supply of houses, restricted access to mortgage finance and during a period when York had no adopted local plan – the 2011 Sub-National Household Projections only project to 2021 and do not provide figures through the Plan period to 2030. The 2008 based household projections point to a level of housing above the Local Plan figure with 1339 additional households projected annually during the Plan period. The Councils preferred option is 1090 new dwellings per annum this would not fully deal with the backlog of need for affordable housing within the city. The ‘What Households Where’ website, an independent resource presenting Government population and household projections, identifies a net annual average of 1,270 new homes per annum in York – the Plan is 160 dwellings per annum short of this requirement. Policy H1 provides an additional buffer of 15% taking the annual target to 1,250 – the buffer is used to provide choice and completion in the market. Object to this buffer and would prefer the annual target to be in excess of 12,500 per annum. Recommend that the Council ensure enough flexibility is factored into the Plan to ensure the supply is supplemented by development ready sites to ensure it achieves its housing target. The Council does not provide an objective assessment of the full needs for market and affordable housing as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Comment – Because there is no guarantee that windfall sites will come forward in sufficient numbers to enable the Council to meet its planned objectives it should not rely on such sites in the future. Indeed it needs to demonstrate a supply of specific, available and deliverable sites. There is no evidence that windfalls will increase in numbers from this source. Welcome the Council’s recognition that the previous target of 800 dwellings per annum, identified in the Core Strategy, was too low. The Local Plan and the Arup Housing Requirements in York: Assessment of the Evidence on Housing Requirements in York (May 2013) are silent on whether past delivery failures, since the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), have been properly accounted for in setting the new housing requirement – believe the new housing requirement will not account for past under performance. There has been a persistent under delivery of houses in York since adoption of the RSS. The shortfall was a function of restrictive housing supply policies rather than market conditions and should be included in the housing target. In the context of the NPPF persistent under delivery justifies inclusion of a</p>	<p>659/15075</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	20% buffer in the identification of deliverable supply. The 20% must be attributed to the backlog which should be added to the future requirement. The Council should seek to ensure a minimum 5 year (plus an additional buffer of 20%) supply of deliverable sites across City of York. The shortfall in housing delivery should be made up within the first 5 years of the Plan.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the Council have exceeded the housing requirement and allocated land for an additional supply of 15% over the full plan period. The Local Plan has, therefore, allocated an excessive amount of green belt land. For 1,771 dwellings more than it needed to. The Local Plan does not make provision for windfalls despite evidence that demonstrates that York has consistently delivered windfalls. Previously the Core Strategy the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (September 2011) noted that windfalls amounting to 168 per year for 18 and a half years could be justified based on actual average windfalls of 367 per year from 2001 to 2011. The Local Plan has, therefore, allocated an excessive amount of green belt land for 2,940 dwellings more than it need to. The annual housing target of 1,090 dwellings is not justified. The setting of an inflated unachievable target of 1090 dwellings per annum is clearly aimed at flooding York with cheap green belt land to maximise the affordable housing take. Existing stalled sites will be held back and cause a displacement of housing in locations which should only be developed after existing land allocations have been built out.	668/16806	
	Objection – housing numbers are too high and should be revised downwards as they are both unrealistic and undeliverable.	670/16811	
	Comment – support the debate on housing growth in York. Welcome the removal of a stepped approach to the housing target as this would simply store up delivery issues for later in the plan period. Objection – do not support the use of sub-national household projections to justify the 850 figure. The 2011 based figures are based on trends during a sustained recession in a time of undersupply of new homes, restricted access to mortgage finance and during a time when York had no adopted plan. The 2011 figures only provide projections until 2021 – they do not provide a basis for the 9 remaining years of York’s Plan. These interim figures could act as a barrier to the delivery of the homes needed and the economic growth aspirations of the council. The figure of 1,090 net new homes per annum is insufficiently positive if the Council s to achieve their own economic aspirations. Recommend that the Council plan more positively and aspires to a higher housing figure more comparable with option 3 (1,500) – not only to ensure the Council achieves its economic aspirations but also go some way to tackling affordable housing	673/16845	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	requirements within the district.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – see response 11	737/16882	
	Objection – if it is really necessary to build 22,000 new houses why not build a new town complete with necessary infrastructure of services, drains, roads etc. This to be located at least 10 miles away from York.	741/16887	
	Objection – see response 11	796/16893	
	Objection – the overall housing targets are vastly over ambitious and completely unsustainable. The calculation of need is not convincing it relies on a forecast creation of jobs (1000 per annum) to justify housing numbers but does not explain how the jobs will be created. The projected availability of 15,000 jobs is unrealistic. The city does not have the infrastructure to enable delivery of the housing target. There would be potentially 10,000 more cars on the roads which are already too congested causing unacceptable delays. This would deter prospective employers considering the city and discourage tourism, important to the regional economy. The purpose of the Green Belt is set out. It includes preserving the setting and special character of the historic town. This is inconsistent with the housing plan and with the targets for wind farms. The purpose is also to prevent urban sprawl, conservation and enhancement of York’s biodiversity and natural environment inconsistent with the housing plan. Eutrophication (excessive richness in nutrients) caused by the deposition of dog faeces on urban grassland sites is an increasing problem. This would be exacerbated by the influx of new residents.	835/16899	
	Objection – the housing targets are inappropriate for York and unachievable. For most local areas the targeted housing levels put forward by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) annual allocation 2008-26 have been adopted. The RSS allocation for York is 850. The average number of completions over the last 6 years is 724 dwellings indication that a target of 850 is much more likely to be achieved than 1250. 850 houses pa is in line with the Sensitivity Test in the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the overall level of population growth set out in the 2010 based Sub-national Population Projections. The SHMA judged that other factors need to be borne in mind including infrastructure constraints and the important issue of character and setting of the city. Given this information a level of 850 houses per annum is a much more sensible, sustainable and achievable objective.	863/16930	
	Comment – concerns that the housing shortage has been considerably exacerbated by the University pushing its responsibility to house its students on to the private sector which has duly obliged.	865/16935	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – during the past few years of recession York has prospered, unlike its neighbours, 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 brown field sites which are fast becoming an increasing eyesore within the city.	994/17012	
	Objection – the plans for thousands of new homes on the edge of York will threaten the very fibre of the green belt. The target is too high and large developments on green field sites will destroy York’s character. Much of York would be changed out of all recognition if thousands of homes are built on fields. The Councils plans are unsustainable. Local infrastructure is already under strain – adding tens of thousands of homes could mean tens of thousands more cars on our already over-congested roads. The Council must reduce its figures to a more sustainable and manageable level.	995/17021	
	Objection – the Local 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.	1049/17045	
	Comment – disappointed no allowance has been made for windfall sites.	1109/17188	
	Objection – the reasoning for using the quantum of 1,090 house pa is not fully justified and could result in an undersupply of market, and particularly affordable, housing contrary to the objectives of national planning policy.	1140/17075	
	Objection – concerns regarding building so many new houses and bringing so many more people to live in the area. More people, more cars, more rubbish, more health care, more social care, more schools, more employment, more pollution, more concrete means more flooding. Why do we need to expand so drastically and spoil the character of our beautiful city and surrounding countryside? Will the tourists still come? Where would we be without them?	1232/17133	
	Comment – the Council is pursuing a development strategy of around 1,150 dwellings per annum based upon an economic growth model – suggest this target should be progressed as a minimum.	1301/17246	Diocese of Ripon and Leeds
	Support – welcomes the Council revisiting the housing growth debate within York and the recognition that the previous target of 800 dwellings per annum in the withdrawn Core Strategy was insufficient. Option 2 of 1090 dwellings per annum would provide the scale of housing growth to support the employment growth forecast in the City of	1337/17285	Halifax Estates

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (2013). It would provide the choice for those who may take up new jobs to reside in York rather than commute into the district. The 15% buffer will provide choice and competition in the market.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Support – welcome the Councils intention to increase the housing target beyond that set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Objection – question whether 1,090 dwellings per annum is sufficient to meet the identified housing need. Note that the figure is intended to meet the scale of housing growth to support the employment growth forecast, but is it sufficient to address the identified affordable housing requirement? Should identify specific means to deliver the identified affordable housing need (790 per annum) if the Plan is to be found sound. There is an over reliance on a new settlement to deliver the housing requirement and the number of Strategic Sites identified in the Local Plan – allocations will represent 50% Of the supply. It is not clear how the Council will deliver the annual housing requirement on the basis of the identified strategy. If the annual housing requirement is not delivered this may lead to a situation of ‘planning by appeal’ if the Council cannot provide evidence of a five year housing supply.	1346/17304	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
	Objection – the proposal to build 1090 homes per annum throughout the lifetime of the Plan are of a scale much too high to be workable for the historic City of York and its surrounding communities. Housing targets are based on grossly inaccurate calculations of need and unrealistic assumptions on potential future economic growth and job creation in York. Because the targets are so high they will have potential disastrous by causing immense strain on local infrastructure and detrimental impact on York’s character and rural setting. Unsustainable and inappropriate housing targets could put York’s future economic prospects at severe risk. The National Planning Policy Framework states Local Plans should be ‘aspirational but realistic’ the draft Local Plan fulfils the former but completely ignores the latter. The driving force behind the calculation of ‘need’ for the number of homes proposed is not the potential population growth but the 1000 jobs the Council are proposing to create each year – this is highly unlikely to be achievable. The Plan proposes 22,000 new homes of which 16,000 have been proposed on York’s established green belt – this represents a severe intrusion onto what has been for many years an integral part of the City’s identity and character. Development at the scale proposed will impact on schools and health services, whilst flood risk will be increase as a cumulative effect of surface water run off from development will increase the load in our waterways and existing drainage and sewerage infrastructure.	1355/17315	Mr J Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – we need housing but not this much.	1392/17346	
	Objection – before any new housing development there must be creation of jobs and infrastructure to support it. Simply building new houses within the existing infrastructure and in the current economic climate is ludicrous.	1394/17351	
	Support – the Council have taken a realistic and sensible approach regarding housing and the allocation of land to accommodate the much needed growth and housing for York. Comment – the council has identified a target of 1090 units per annum equating to 21,936 over the plan period – the Council will need to incorporate a buffer of 15% which increases the annual requirement to 1250 dwellings to counter the growing deficit.	1400/17373	The Wilberforce Trust
	Comment – accept the need for additional sustainable housing in York. Support – support commitment to housing development on brownfield sites as a priority Objection – believe the needs should be revised to be realistic and sustainable for the City’s infrastructure and not exceed a fair contribution to meet the national need. Concerned that the growth figures might be overstated.	1457/17402	
	Comment – unclear how the studies to assess the potential for re-use of upper floors in the city centre will be taken into account and how these will influence the policy approach.	1491/17448	National Trust
	Objection – do not support the use of the 2011 based Sub-National Population Projections to justify a 850 figure in Option 1. The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment informs the affordable housing requirement within York of 790 pa over the Plan period. The Council recognise the preferred housing target of 1090 pa will only make a ‘moderate impact’ upon this requirement. The Council will continue to exacerbate an already large affordable housing issue by using this lower figure of 1090. This figure is insufficiently positive if the Council is to achieve their own economic aspirations. Recommend Option 3 (1,500 pa) to meet economic and affordable housing requirements.	1514/17476	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Support – welcome overall approach to housing growth, recognising the need for urban extensions and the need to safeguard land for long-term development. Comment – York’s housing supply has been dominated by development on Previously Developed Land (PDL) and delivery rates have been significantly affected by the recession. Higher build rates could have been achieved if large scale Greenfield sites had been supported through the planning system during this period, given they are	1523/17499	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>generally less constrained and more deliverable than PDL. Objection – with regard to the 15% buffer no evidence is provided to justify this percentage. This figure should be clarified through the Assessment of the Evidence of Housing Requirements in York report (2013). No detailed justification is provided for selecting the lower growth in Option 2 (compared to the higher options provided) and the reasons why Options 3 and 4 which would meet affordable housing needs were not selected. A higher growth option meeting the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing should be selected. Request Option 4 is pursued to ensure that the City’s full housing needs are met as required by National Planning Policy Framework.</p>		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	<p>Objection – The approach to housing growth is not sustainable and recommend that a target of 850 dwellings per annum be set</p>	1589/17565	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	<p>Objection - Concerned at volume of housing developments proposed and ability of infrastructure to cope, particularly transport.</p>	1605/127	
	<p>Objection – Paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework states safeguarded land should be provided to assure Green Belt boundaries ‘wee beyond the plan period’. The quantum of land being safeguarded and the uncertainty over delivery 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 before the end of the plan period. In light of the uncertainty in respect of a number of consented and proposed strategic sites there is a clear need for additional sites which can be implemented early in the plan. The council has opted to support Option 2 in providing 1090 dwellings per annum with an additional 15% buffer. This approach is overly conservative for a number of reasons: The analysis by Arup relies on 2011 based interim Sub-National Household Projections. These take account of subdued levels of housing during recessionary periods; Affordable housing need has been assessed at 790 per annum, the Council acknowledge this will only give a ‘modest boost’ to affordable housing supply over the plan period. Increased land supply would increase the prospect of achieving increased affordable housing; and in respect of overall housing figures there is a need for flexibility in the figures to allow for delay and under provision within the strategic sites. The 15% proposed buffer is insufficient to overcome this uncertainty.</p>	1661/9944	Linden Homes
	<p>Support – the various options for satisfying the housing need have been objectively assessed and therefore the Local Plan in this regard has been positively prepared and is supported.</p>	1663/9962	DPP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection – option 2 for housing growth will only make a moderate boost to affordable housing across the plan period. As the backlog of affordable housing is not being met by policy H it is evident that the Local Plan housing requirement should be revised upwards in order to seek to tackle the current backlog.</p> <p>Comment – growth is proposed over and above the previous Regional Spatial Strategy rates and is welcomed. It is also welcomed that the Plan has an integrated approach to employment creation and housing provision and that the Plan seeks to address problems of commuting into York. Support the identification of strategic sites to meet the development needs of the district but have concerns that the housing requirement does not meet the housing needs of the district and the reasons for this has not been adequately explained.</p>		
<p>Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued</p>	<p>Objection – question the decision to go for Option 2, 1090 dwellings per annum and feel that Option 1 a baseline of 850 dwellings would be more appropriate. The housing buffer of 15% is too high and makes an already unrealistic target even more unrealistic given economic (and other) considerations.</p>	1665/12951	York Environment Forum
	<p>Objection – there is a lack of clarity within the Plan as to the details of the plan period in terms of a start and finish date. Ask that a set plan period is chosen and that this is consistent throughout the document. It is unclear from the supporting text as to where the 15% buffer (for an additional land supply for choice and flexibility) has been derived from. Reserve the right to comment on this until we have seen the evidence base behind this. Object to the proposed housing target of 1090 dpa and consider it should be 1250 (excluding the buffer) as per previous representations made to the 2011 Core Strategy Submission (Publication). Not convinced that all housing sites can deliver the numbers quoted in H1. Concerned whether the Council have identified a sufficient amount of land to deliver the housing required over the plan period. Need to be flexible for the safeguarded land to come forward during the plan period should circumstances change such as delivery timescales or amendments to site capacities.</p> <p>Support – Welcome the footnote to policy H1 with the recognition that the new settlement will not be built out over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Comment – believe more housing sites will be required if York is to deliver the level of housing required over the plan period. This could be achieved by incorporating more of the safeguarded land within their adjacent allocations.</p>	1668/15034	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	<p>Objection – the scale of housing proposed through the Local Plan is arbitrarily low. The proposed requirement is not based on meeting the full, objectively assessed development requirements and should not be found sound at Examination. It is</p>	1705/9771	Gladman Developments

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>unclear if the Council have considered the implications of failing to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing. This is covered in detail within the supporting report 'Assessment of Future Housing Requirements in York' prepared by Development Economics. Conclusions of which are: York's economic development strategy recognises that one of the key constraints on meeting growth ambitions of York is that current levels of housing supply do not meet current demand; The proposed increase in housing supply compared to RSS figures is to an extent offset by the under delivery of housing delivery between 2006 and 2011; Concerned that 2011 based Sub-National Household Projections have been overly influenced by short term issues affecting the economy and housing market; There is a danger of using trend based projections as a guide to future policy; The Local Plan must provide for sufficient new housing to ensure that future availability of workers and their skills will not be a constraint to the local areas business base; To make up the back log of affordable housing need the average annual rate of provision would need to be 2060 per annum; the Council's range of 1090 – 1250 represents a substantial under provision against the requirement for housing in particular that driven by economic growth; The three Framework drivers of housing need can be summarised as (1) Demographic – 984 dpa based on balanced review of the most recent household projections as well as the 2008 based projections (2) Economic – 1200 dpa to allow for net increase in employment anticipated to occur in York, plus an allowance for additional housing needed to accommodate workers retiring over the plan period. (3) Affordable – 2060 pa based on findings of the 2011 SHMA and subsequent work by Arup and the Council and balancing the three drivers of housing need a housing delivery target of a minimum of 1500 dwellings per annum would provide balance between fully meeting demographic and economic drivers.</p>		
<p>Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued</p>	<p>Objection – Object to the large housing numbers proposed. Part of the attraction of York is that it is a small city. Existing large suburbs already cause traffic problems in the city; this will only worsen should 20,000 additional homes be built. Accept new homes need to be provided, however, the proposed number of new homes is far too great and is not sustainable and will adversely impact on York's residents quality of life.</p>	1743/9841	
	<p>Support – the Local Plan considers various growth rates and assumptions and in this context it would appear that the various options for satisfying the housing need have been objectively assessed and therefore the Local Plan in this regard has been positively prepared and is supported. Growth is proposed over and above the previous Regional Spatial Strategy rates and this is welcomed. Also welcomed that the Local</p>	1801/9882	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Plan has an integrated approach to employment creation and housing provision and that it seeks to address the problems of commuting into York.</p> <p>Objection – option 2 housing target will not address the backlog in affordable housing need or fully meet identified requirement going forward. The approach to the level of affordable housing is therefore inadequate. As the backlog of affordable housing is not being met in H1 it is evident that the Local Plan housing requirement should be revised upwards in order to seek to tackle the current backlog. Not convinced that providing less than the objectively assessed housing need is justified.</p> <p>Comment – a 15% buffer will ensure that there is choice and competition in the housing market. York is an historic city and meeting its objectively assessed need of 2060 dwellings pa might not be achievable or practical. There is no real discussion as to why the objectively assessed need. Rather than a discussion as to why the need cannot be met the Local Plan refers to the challenges in building the lower proposed growth rate of 1090 dpa. The Plan needs to explain why it cannot meet its objectively assessed housing requirement.</p>		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection - housing projected on a rate of expansion far higher than anticipated for similar cities elsewhere in the UK.	1884/3	
	Comment – the scale of development must be appropriate and within reason for example 750 houses per year.	1914/110	
	Objection – the plan allows for far too many houses to be built. The requirement for houses is based on a projected population growth for York that is unrealistic, unsustainable and undesirable if the character of the city is going to be altered in any way.	1959/206	
	Objection – the proposed level of house building in York would seem to be excessive. Job creation on which this plan depends is less than robust. This addition to York’s population is too high. Infrastructure will not be able to cope.	1980/232	
	Comment – appreciate the need for additional housing within the City of York (including Copmanthorpe) in order to boost the local economy and meet the increased housing needs of the local population.	2003/6479	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed increased housing developments in York especially impact relating to flooding and drainage, increase traffic and health care provision.	2004/590	
	Comment – some new (housing) development is appropriate.	2006/6481	
	Objection – object to proposals for building thousands of houses on green belt land when crops could be produced. No thought has been made to services such as	2054/927	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sewerage, traffic, schools, doctors or hospitals.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – every piece of green belt we have should be protected	2124/6511	
	Comment – it does not matter about the green belt, it matters that people are houses, close to their family and friends.	2418/6696	
	Comment – additional homes will put pressure on water supply and drainage issues	2451/6728	
	Objection – with the City constantly increasing in size and population fail to see how facilities and services can increase accordingly. York is expanding and making the quality of life of current residents worse in the process.	2457/6735	
	Objection – no reference is made in the policy for house building to the number of sustainable houses required.	2460/6737	
	Objection – there are too many houses proposed, green belt land should not be built on. Road systems will not be able to cope adequately.	2470/6750	
	Objection – building appears the flavour of the month being pushed as our saviour for jobs and the economy this being only short term. House building on the scale suggested will create 21 st Century ghettos filled with immigrants.	2512/6788	
	Comment – puzzled by the expected need for so many new housing sites especially with brownfield sites such as Rowntree’s, Terry’s, Gas Works sites. Keep development within the ring road.	2513/6796	
	Objection – the city does not have the infrastructure to support al the proposed new houses	2521/6805	
	Objection - the option of 850 houses pa is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 pa 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	2546/6833	
	Objection – why the need for 22000 extra homes? According to the ARUP reports the population growth in York between 2010 and 2030 is ultimately driven by international migration into the authority. A scenario looks at 36000 migrants to York requiring 23536 houses – where are all the migrants at present on which these figures are based? Possibly based on the increase in ‘temporary migrants’ such as students and temporary workers in hotels? Demand for property in York is falling (there are now 753 homes available for rent in York – right-move 23/06/13) and existing development sites for both employment and housing have remained derelict for years (Terry’s Nestle, Vickers, Sessions, British Sugar and Carriage Works)	2549/6845	
Objection – the proposal of 21936 new homes in 15 years equates to around 37 ha of land each year and assumes a population increase of 22%. Demographic studies show	2673/7078		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the existing population is already past child bearing age and will slowly die out over the same period. There is therefore an explicit assumption that 50% of the population of York by 2030 will be inward migrants.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection- the underlying basis & analysis of housing numbers is incorrect and based on hugely inflated expectations.	2678/7102	
	Comment – a high housing target level should be pursued to meet the real level of need, to ensure the Council are planning for economic recovery.	2769/7328	
	Objection – without major road improvements the increase in traffic generated by new housing will create a nightmare situation for local people.	2784/7376	
	Objection – York needs more housing but a target of 1090 per annum is not necessary as this number has never been built in York in previous years. The option of 850 houses is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 per annum are required. Achieving 1090 can only be done through 36,000 people moving to the area such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city. Development of brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	3001/7825	
	Objection – York needs more housing but a target of 1090 pa is not necessary as this number has never been built in York in previous years. The option of 850 houses pa is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 pa 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. Development of brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	3002/7829	
	Objection – opposed to 22,000 new homes are proposed mostly in the existing green belt	3034/7882	
	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. Believe that when considering the economic climate growth levels have been set too high.	3056/7910	
	Objection – object to the City of York’s draft proposals to build new homes on the green belt putting increased demand on local amenities and infrastructure.	3060/7918	
Objection – there should be limited housing schemes in some parts of the city which	3111/8016		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	need to be on brownfield sites, possibly close to the A64 that provides better access to the city and West Yorkshire. Where will people work, transport improvements required before houses are built and effects on schools and health services should be addressed.		
Para 10.03	Support – welcome the removal of stepped approach to housing target as this would simply store up delivery issues for later in the plan.	6351/17629	Gladedale Estates

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the option of 850 houses pa is an absolute maximum, or less than 850 pa should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year, achieving 1090 can only be done through 36000 people moving into the area such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the City.	3207/8252	
	Objection –submits that the Council has misunderstood the requirement of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is for a 5% buffer for the 5 year rolling supply of land which is to be moved forward from later in the plan period. Based on the Council's figure of 1090 the rolling 5 year supply will require 5450 dwellings. Should the buffer be used it would be replaced by the initially allocated dwellings which could not be delivered during the relevant 5 year period. The provision of 1090 dwellings per annum over 17.5 years requires an allocation of 19075 homes – if it is necessary to add a final 5 year buffer of 817 (5% of 5 year target) the total allocation would fall to 19892 which is a reduction of 2044. From the options based on Arup work, the Council have selected a figure of 1090 per annum – any figure above 850 per annum is an unnecessarily high figure unless a very ambitious wish list of employment growth can be achieved. While the option of 850 does this the option of 1090 would only be required to meet a subjectively assessed need based on unjustifiably optimistic desires for economic growth. A housing target of 850 per annum (14875 over 17.5 years) meets NPPF requirements – if an additional buffer of is required for the final 5 year rolling land supply at the end of the Plan a further 637 houses would allow a 15% buffer for this. This would equate to a total of 15512 housing requirement not the 21936 in the Plan.	3222/8287	
	Objection – the housing target of 22000 new builds is outrageous and based on questionable assessments. Of the figures offered, the lowest, 850 per annum is probably still too high.	3242/8306	
	Objection – proposals of 22000 new houses in 15 years is sheer lunacy. The totals in the Plan are totally undeliverable. It is a crime to consider building on the so called 'green belt' – thee are plenty of brownfield sites available but developers don't like them as they are too costly to build over.	3246/8328	
	Comment - the option of 850 houses per annum is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 pa 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	3359/8615	
	Objection – object to the Local Plan aspiration of building 22000 houses, particularly as the majority would be built on accepted green belt land.	3509/9427	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – no justification in population growth terms for the need of 22000 more houses.	3511/9439	
	Comment – does the Council believe that York’s infrastructure would be able to cope with the Whinthorpe new town as well as all the other development proposed around the city?	3532/9479	
	Objection – the proposals for 22000 extra homes is not regarded as desirable or necessary with an increase of about 25% on the existing number of dwellings. The effects on the roads and other local services would be very detrimental without a commensurate increase in provision.	3588/9554	
	Objection – see response 11	3737/16919	
	Objection – see response 11. Proposed number of houses is not deliverable and sustainable.	3884/10425	
	Objection – disturbed by the proposals to build such large numbers of houses on green belt land around York – question the efficacy of the schemes particularly with regard to the actual need for such a large number.	3893/10435	
	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.	4039/10687	
	Objection – why has the Council changed the estimated number of houses to be built from 800-122 to 22000? Even if the economy is expected to increase by 1000 jobs per annum the Arup report indicates that only about 800 homes are needed. Our growth must be at a controlled level that can be sustained.	4040/11757	
	Objection – the alternative for 850 new dwellings per annum would be more than adequate based on the statistics for future growth.	4110/10808	
	Objection - the option of 850 houses per annum is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 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	4134/10844	
	Objection – disagree with the plans for the development of York especially the number of houses planned to be built and their location. The overall total is far too large assuming far too many people will be moving into the area. The planned number of houses far exceeds the need and will change the character of York. Population trends suggest around 800 homes per annum are needed	4174/10902	
	Objection – appreciate the need for more homes but this needs to be at a much smaller scale when they are planned in areas that are struggling with their present facilities.	4200/10937	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Support – support the minimum housing target of 1250 dwellings per annum. Comment - Justification of delivery rates and housing capacities on large sites needs carrying out.	4355/11603	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Objection – the approach preferred in the Local Plan is not considered to provide a robust or sound methodology to address the existing and forecast housing requirement for the City. This option does not meet the full needs for market and affordable housing as identified in the Arup Report. A higher growth option is required to be National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) compliant. A reduced buffer of 15% throughout the Plan period is not likely to result in a realistic prospect of achieving the planning supply. York has a record of persistent under delivery of housing and therefore should provide a 20% buffer and should clearly identify suitable and available sites for the first 5 years as set out in NPPF.	4363/11741	Gregory Property Developments (Haxby) Ltd & Biorad
	Objection – it is totally unsustainable to allow such a huge development of 22000 houses to be built over 17 years with 16000 to be built on green belt land, meaning 2000 acres of green belt would be built on which is totally unacceptable. The unique character and rural setting of York should be protected	4468/11479	
	Objection – to build 22000 houses will completely alter the character of York. It will be detrimental to the city which does not have the necessary infrastructure	4490/11506	
	Objection – see response 11	4651/11779	
		4652/11785	
		4653/11791	
	Objection – York should be growing organically not via an explosion of 22000 new homes, some 1000 per year more than York is currently building. 16000 of which would cause a loss of 1400 acres of green belt land resulting in massive urban expansion. The proposals fail to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of York's countryside and surroundings.	4654/11797	
	Objection – see response 11	4655/11803	
		4656/11809	
		4657/11815	
		4658/11821	
	Objection – see response 11	4659/11827	
4660/11833			
4661/11839			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – see response 11	4662/11845	
		4663/11851	
	Objection – see response 11	4664/11863	
		4665/11857	
		4666/11868	
		4667/11874	
		4668/11880	
		4669/11886	
		4670/11891	
		4672/11900	
		4673/11906	
		4674/11912	
		4675/11917	
		4676/11923	
		4677/11929	
		4678/11935	
		4679/11941	
		4680/11947	
		4682/11960	
		4683/11966	
	4684/11972		
	Objection – the suburban sprawl proposed will destroy the character and feel of the city. The option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum – less than 850 should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 pa 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. The council’s own independent report says the city requires only 17000 homes not 22000.	4721/14225	
	Objection – how will building 22000 extra houses preserve the ‘unique historic character of York’? An independent report by ARUP suggested building 16-17000 houses – why the extra 5-6000?	4738/14267	
	Objection – no more than 850 houses per year should be built – development of all brownfield sites should be maximised before any greenbelt land is considered. The option of 850 houses pa is an absolute maximum or Less than 850 houses a year should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 per annum are required.	4777/14275	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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. Development of brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt land is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – of course we need new homes but this number does seem 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 delivered to accommodate this number of households.	4780/14277	
	Objection – there is no reasonable basis for the premise that 1000 jobs per annum can be created in York. Consequently there is no justification for the scale of housing proposed. York Council has got its projections wrong.	4797/12096	
	Objection – absolutely disastrous for York’s long term future/character.	4812/12127	
	Objection – no social or economic reason in York for a huge increase in housing. Roads will be unable to cope with the associated increase in traffic. Loss of farmland and woodland to accommodate housing. York is a unique and historic city not to be turned into an urban sprawl.	4816/14287	
	Objection – reservations with the quality of Call in Sites allocations for housing and commercial development planned to be developed on York’s green belt, nature conservation areas, regional, district sites and local green corridors.	4819/14290	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection - Hungate should be added to Policy H1 (the scale of housing growth) and included within the list of strategic sites that provide the most significant residential element components within the plan period.	5167/12903	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
	Support – accept there is a need for additional sustainable housing in York Comment – Concerned that the growth figures might be overstated.	5178/12344	
	Support – welcome the overall approach to housing growth recognising the need for urban extensions and the need to safeguard land for long term development. The evidence base does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate why Option 2 is the most appropriate option. Regarding the 15% buffer no evidence is provided to justify how this percentage has been determined. The evidence base supporting the preferred approach would not meet the full affordable housing need. No justification is provided for selecting the lower growth option 2 and reasons why 3 and 4 that would meet the affordable need were not selected. The housing requirements report identifies option 2 would require a stepped change in delivery given that it is higher than the 10 year average completion rate. York’s housing supply has been dominated by development	5205/12468	Linden Homes North

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on Previously Developed Land and delivery rates have been significantly affected by the recession. Higher build rates could have been achieved if large scale Greenfield sites had been supported through the planning system.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the proposed Strategic Housing Sites are far too large. The A1237 and A64 By Pass have problems coping with traffic at present times. The sheer size of proposed housing sites will spoil the rural feel that the City's outskirts have at present time.	5225/12518	
	Objection – the proposal to build so many new houses seems unrealistic and unsustainable and seems to be based on flawed assumptions and extrapolation. Whilst building new homes will provide employment and training during the building stage there are no guarantee of jobs for the occupants. Housing Growth should be less than 850pa.	5228/12533	
	Comment – dispute the huge housing numbers which we are told are necessary – recent studies have reduced the projected numbers needed and the Council should revise targets accordingly.	5234/12547	
	Comment – the housing and employment figures quoted are unrealistic and unobtainable.	5238/12570	
	Support - welcome the overall approach to housing growth recognising the need for urban extensions and the need to safeguard land for long term development. Comment - York's housing supply has been dominated by development on Previously Developed Land and delivery rates have been significantly affected by the recession. Higher build rates could have been achieved if large scale Greenfield sites had been supported through the planning system. The evidence base does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate why option 2 is the most appropriate option. Regarding the 15% buffer no evidence is provided to justify hw this percentage has been determined. The housing requirements report identifies option 2 would require a stepped change in delivery given that it is higher than the 10 year average completion rate. It is considered that completion rates could have been higher if large scale Greenfield sites had been available.	5245/14335	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Objection – the Local Plan proposes housing of a level that would lead to chronic overdevelopment of the area and demand on already struggling infrastructure of the city. How can the council approve building of 22000 more homes when ones we have are empty?	5554/13019	
	Objection – the number of proposed new houses is too great. The proposals to build on what is effectively green belt will have an adverse effect on the whole area.	5555/13024	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – no convincing case for the number of homes proposed (22000) – such extensive development will change the character of the city for ever.	5557/13032	
	Objection – object to the proposals relating to the provision of land for house building. The Plan provides for 1250 houses per annum capable of accommodating 41000 people. This is a gross overprovision. The proposal seems to be generated by affordable housing need, surely it should be providing the appropriate number of houses the city is actually likely to need.	5570/13054	
	Objection – do not accept that the number of new houses proposed is correct. Population has increased significantly in York over the last decade – in a large part due to the expansion of the two Universities. Further expansion on the same scale is unlikely. Government policy is also changing to limit immigration. Even if the Council maintains the level of housing suggested is necessary the proposed use of protected green belt is frankly a travesty.	5585/13088	
	Objection – the 1090 preferred option along with a further 15% growth to 1250 homes per annum is unsustainable and built on unrealistic estimates for jobs growth. Should reconsider these unsustainable and potentially damaging targets in favour of a more achievable one of 850 home per annum.	5599/13135	
	Objection – the proposed scale of expansion of house building would destroy York’s unique character and the sites suggested would aggravate the traffic problems.	5601/13145	
	Objection – object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to build 22000 new homes. There is no justification for the stated aim to construct 1200 dwellings per annum other than as a cynical means of achieving the targets for the creation of ‘affordable housing’. There are a number of brownfield sites which should be considered and there are proposals to encourage conversion of upper floors of city centre shops into dwellings which in itself could create significant numbers of housing units.	5604/13153	
	Objection – the scale of development proposed is completely unsustainable and entirely inappropriate. Find it inconceivable that the level of development proposed does not have the guarantees of investment in the required infrastructure. The green belt is clearly under threat and is required to protect the character and setting of our City and to prevent urban sprawl.	5673/13359	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed number of houses that are suggested to be built. 22000 is too many for York’s economy to support. Building 22000 new homes will not benefit the local population and will simply go to those outside the city.	5684/13391	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – object to the number of 22000 new houses across York. This is far too many for a historic city with fundamentally fixed central roads contained within and immediately around the city walls.	5701/13431	
	Objection – where is the evidence to substantiate the need for the overall housing target since it does not appear to have the support of the opposition parties who both think that the figures are over ambitious/too high? Does York have a much greater housing need than other towns – believe not?	5711/13457	
	Objection – no compelling case has been presented that an extra 22000 homes are required. Don't see sufficient new employment growth to off set existing job losses. Disgusting that 16000 of the 22000 homes are proposed to be built on York's remarkable and precious green belt. There are so many areas around the city that are clearly derelict and in need of demolition. The council has not properly considered the brownfield opportunities and has not performed its duty adequately.	5720/13482	
	Objection – the large house building policy will have no effect on providing cheaper housing because the houses will be priced at market rates for York.	5750/13570	
	Objection – having read the evidence documents the evidence backing up the need for 1090 homes pa in York appears very flimsy indeed. This target is clearly unachievable and only deliverable in a time of significant economic growth.	5751/13574	
	Objection – the option to build 850 houses per annum is a maximum – less than 850 house pa should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 homes a year are required. Achieving 1090 can only be done through international migration of 36000 workers according to the councils evidence. Such expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the city.	5752/13575	
	Objection –question the need in York for the number of houses to be built – where are all the people these are intended for? Is this to make York a commuter centre for Leeds/Bradford/London?	5753/13583	
	Objection – the proposed housing target for York is over ambitious – given the number of current sites with permission where no building has taken place it is not convincing that there needs to be quite so much expansion into the green belt.	5754/13586	
	Objection – concerned that the Council has not looked hard enough for alternative development land so the compromise to the green belt is spread. The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates a need for 850 house per annum and Arup confirmed this need. The Local Plan, therefore, indicates a significant over provision.	5779/13672	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the Plan appears to be driven by an assumption that we need to build more houses in order to get more affordable homes though unable to find any reference to justify the proposed levels of house building in the evidence base.	5796/9541	
	Objection – too many houses proposed that will bring in Leeds Commuters and not help York housing.	5799/15014	
	Comment – it is clear that the Council is unlikely to deliver the annual housing requirement on the basis of the identified strategy – seeing that 50% of the supply comes from Strategic Sites identified in the Plan. If the annual housing requirement is not delivered then there is a good chance the Council will not be able to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply within only a couple of years of the Plan being adopted.	6046/15477	
	Comment – support the Council in identifying strategic housing allocations to match the scale of housing growth set out in Policy H1 but do not support the identification of a new settlement at Whinthorpe.	6062/15515	ID Planning
	Objection – see response 11.	6064/15521	
		6065/15527	
	Objection – the proposal that there is a need or, in fact, a desire to build in excess of 1100 homes pa is unrealistic. Looking at the trend forecast for the growth of York it is inconceivable that York will achieve growth to merit this sort of number. The consequences of this scale of development are that it is unsustainable and will increase pressures on a road network which is already creaking in numerous places. If there is an oversupply 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 for sustainability.	6135/15582	
	Support – the Local Plan considers various growth rates and assumptions and in this context it would appear that the various options for satisfying the housing need have been objectively assessed and therefore the Local Plan in this regard has been positively prepared. Growth is proposed over and above the previous RSS rates and is welcomed. The Local Plan has an integrated approach to employment creation and housing provision and seeks to address problems of commuting into York. Support identification of Strategic Sites to meet the development need of the district. However, not convinced that providing less than the objectively assessed housing need is justified. Objection – the proposed housing requirement will not address the backlog of affordable housing and it is evident the housing requirement should be revised upwards in order to tackle this current backlog.	6160/15669	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Comment – concerns that the housing requirement does not meet the full housing needs of the district and the reasons for this has not been adequately explained.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the housing numbers proposed are far too many to be sustainable given the road capacity, jobs available and infrastructure. The brownfield sites should be developed before green belt is used.	6169/15691	
	Objection – Housing numbers and economic growth are not realistic and should be lowered to ensure that York remains a compact historic city. The housing quota should be lower than 850 dwellings per annum.	6284/15884	
	Comment – if the overall housing numbers are considered to be insufficient then further allocations or extensions of existing allocations will be required to meet the Plan objectives.	6327/17649	
	Objection – based on the Local Plans own evidence base it is clear that the proposed housing requirement set out in policy H1 will not address the backlog of affordable housing. York is a historic City and meeting its objectively assessed need of 2060 dwellings per annum might not be achievable or practical. There is no real discussion as to why the City cannot achieve their objectively assessed housing need. The Plan needs to explain why it cannot meet its objectively assessed housing requirement.	6349/16039	Linden Homes North
	Objection – preferred option provides the second lowest number of dwellings per annum at 1090. The Arup study identifies this figure would not deal with the backlog of need for affordable housing in York. Recommend that the Council plan more positively and aspires to a higher housing figure more comparable with option 3 (1500 dwellings per annum).	6351/17632	Gladedale Estates
	Support – support the Council in identifying strategic housing allocations but consider it is essential that an assessment is undertaken to ensure they are deliverable.	6357/16059	Ainscough Strategic Land
	Comment – the Council is pursuing a development strategy of around 1150 dwellings per annum based upon an economic growth model. This target should be progressed as a minimum.	6362/17229	
	Support – the Plan adopts an ambitious approach to the allocation of land for residential purposes by setting a target of 22000 new homes. This approach is supported.	6364/17710	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – the strategy to build 22000 new homes is fundamentally flawed as the infrastructure issue has not been addressed. Employment opportunities, other than the University, are lacking with fewer other firms expanding. Infrastructure ignored include expansion plans for York District Hospital, existing roads and parking facilities, schools, refuse collections and disposals and fire stations etc. The development of this	6423/16143	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure would require considerable capital expenditure and it is dubious that the Council could afford this.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection - the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum – less than 850 should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 per annum 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. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6477/16199	
	Objection - the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum – less than 850 should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 per annum 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. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6484/16224	
	Objection - the option of 850 houses a year is an absolute maximum – less than 850 should be built. Population trends suggest no more than 800 per annum 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. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before green belt is used. The current plan releases green belt land too early and stalls development of brownfield sites.	6485/16215	
	Objection – see response 11	6505/16256 6506/16262	
	Objection – do not think the preferred approach to housing growth is appropriate as; over 20000 dwellings at an average of 1090 pa is unsupported by any reliable statistical evidence regarding current or future population, housing and employment trends; York’s employment has declined from peak years from 2003-11 by 13000 (or 11%) The first call on any new jobs can therefore be filled by people already in York. Housing number predictions should be guided by the Office of National Statistics with much lower population prediction; Housing need should be based on a mix of population and employment growth. Council reports show a population growth of 10% and an increase in dwellings of 24.4%, representing more than twice the number of houses to be built than there will be population to fill them; and completions in the last five years have averaged 463 per annum. There is no coherent strategy in place to bridge the gap between this figure and the 1090 in the Plan. Housing growth should be at 850 new houses per annum with a 5% buffer. Completely reject Option 2 that	6508/17669	City Of York Council Conservative Group

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	purports to be market led but will mean national developers will be allowed to develop green field sites first rather than more economically challenging brown field sites.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection – the pressure to build houses on Greenfield sites is increased by the 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. Therefore, the local plan should adopt a growth figure of less than 800 new homes per year. By adopting the traditional economic growth target more brownfield site space should be available for housing.	6510/16285	Cllr Joseph D Watt
	Objection – the housing growth proposals seem to border on the reckless. Such growth, even if considered desirable, is unlikely to be deliverable. With around 4000 York residents on the housing waiting list and figures for new family formation only producing a net modest increased demand, it is unclear why the Council wants to build 22000 more homes. Most new homes will be built on Greenfield sites. The Council clearly assumes many of the new jobs will be filled by inward migrants many from other parts of the world. The Arup report says ‘population growth in York between 2010 and 2030 is ultimately driven by the scale of international migration into the authority’. The document takes no account of windfalls – there is no presumption against inclusion of windfalls in government guidance although it does say that a special case must be made. In the case of York a windfall allocation was made in the submission agreed in 2011. A special case for inclusion should be made for York based on recent and historical trends. Given the number of small sites identified for development, but not included in the Councils totals it would seem reasonable to allow a windfall input of 200 per annum for the first five years of the plan period dropping to 150 per annum for the subsequent 15 years.	6517/16351	York Central Liberal Democrats
	Objection – do not support the scale of housing growth. A figure of 21936 or 1250 new dwellings per annum is far too high to support sustainable development in York. The Plan does not provide adequate evidence to justify this figure and a totally different approach should be taken based on a far lower figure probably based around 500-600 per annum based on a proper Environmental Capacity Study to establish appropriate parameters for growth in a very special small historic city such as York. Comment – Providing more affordable housing in York is indeed a laudable aspiration and is supported. However, it is questionable what level of impact this approach is likely to have on the housing waiting list. Nonetheless, this policy will deliver a limited amount of new build affordable housing with the possibility of a slightly higher number	6518/16387	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of completions than we have had in the last five years – although not necessarily a great many more. An assessment of the Plan has to weigh this outcome against the negative impacts of over-development proposed and alongside the other options for delivering affordable housing that are available.		
Policy H1 The Scale of Housing Growth Continued	Objection - do not think the preferred approach to housing growth is appropriate as over 20000 dwellings at an average of 1090 per annum is unsupported by any reliable statistical evidence regarding current or future population, housing and employment trends Housing growth should be at 850 new houses per annum or less with a 5% buffer. Completely reject Option 2 that purports to be market led but will mean national developers will be allowed to develop green field sites first rather than more economically challenging brown field sites.	6519/16467	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	Objection – the forecast population growth for York that is the basis for the vast land take for housing allocations is far too high when the rapid growth of the last decade is taken into account. The future growth of York should be re-based down to natural change levels for the period of the Local Plan. Do not accept that a vast increase in housing stock in York will increase affordability for local people – using London as an example the more housing that is built the more people will come to occupy it with no impact on affordability.	6521/16495	Cllr Mark Warters
	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, despite changes to legislation that now allows such inclusion.	7313/17761	Cllr N Ayre
	Objection – whilst acknowledge the need for more housing in York, believe the figure of 22,000 homes to be too high and the loss of over 1000 acres of green belt land to	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
 Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be unsustainable.		
	Comment – 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)
Site ST1 British Sugar	<p>Objection- site adjacent to sites of biodiversity importance. Not enough to mitigate the effects, but must be well reasoned in regards to sustainability and the effect on wider environment.</p>	90/12833	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	<p>Support- supports the inclusion of British Sugar/Manor School as a strategic housing allocation. The 998 dwellings must be referenced as a guide and thereby provide for inter-alia a higher yield through master planning and planning application process. Support the estimated phasing of the site over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Objection- Object to the site boundary. The boundary should include the former British sugar sports ground and the former Manor School playing field (these should be removed from open space designation). This is consistent with the site boundary included in the Core Strategy Submission. The site size should be 42 Hectares (ha) approximately. The precise nature, quantum and location of this open space provision should be determined through the master planning and planning application stage rather than being defined within the LP allocation. The failure to include the parcels of land mentioned above within the site boundary will not assist a comprehensive and holistic approach to the regeneration of the site. Object to the inclusion of and specific identification of the location of potential new bridges on the proposals map. The location of any potential new bridges should be determined through the master planning and planning applications stage. Object to the identification of the location of proposed improvements to cycle network. This should be determined through the master planning and planning applications stage. Object to identification of location for a new railway station or halt. It is premature for these proposals as they do not have confirmed funding. This should be determined through the master planning and planning applications stage. Object to the location of potential new retail hub. Concern that retail provision will not be viable due to restricted accessibility and lack of main road frontage. The strategic allocation should not pre judge the most appropriate location for such facilities- this should be determined through the master planning stage. Until further site specific viability work is done the estimated yield of sites must be identified as a guideline that can be exceeded where appropriate rather than a maximum or ceiling figure. Based on a site boundary of approx 42 ha an estimated yield of 1176 units is appropriate. The estimated yield should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Comment- the proposed mix of private housing should respond to the demands of the market, whilst the provision of affordable housing should rightly respond to the needs as assessed in the evidence base, or submissions made through the development</p>	434/16568	Associated British Foods plc

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	management process. The redevelopment of the site will need to make provision for the open space needs of future residents- this should be done at the master planning and planning application process. It is anticipated that most of the vehicle traffic associated with this site would use one of the following routes rather than the adjacent residential areas: A59 westbound, A50 eastbound and Millfield lane. The site will not result in traffic having a detrimental impact on adjacent residential areas due to the availability of appropriate routes in the area. Any potential impact would be assessed and considered within the Transport assessment in support of any future planning application and appropriate mitigation measures provided.		
Site ST1 British Sugar Continued	Comment – delivery in year one is unlikely as the site does not yet have outline permission, is not attached to a developer and will require a long lead in time. Consider that it would be more realistic to identify the site as delivering housing from year 6 onwards. Should not rely too heavily on complex brownfield sites like ST1 in maintaining a 5 year housing supply and should instead rely on less complex and available sites that can be delivered now.	659/15071	Persimmon Homes
	Objection – will have a significant impact on traffic volumes on the A59, the outer ring road and Millfield Lane. Serious consideration should be given to the re-opening of Low Poppleton Lane. Reopening this route will allow residents of Poppleton and the new proposed development to access Boroughbridge Road without having to cross the outer ring road at the A59 roundabout.	1583/17547	
	Objection - Under Environmental Assets, the Local Plan states that the Council has defined Green Corridors which are shown in figure 5.5 and in figure 17.1. Both diagrams show a Green District Corridor covering the Sugar Beet / Manor School site (site ST1). The Local Plan states that it is important that any future development does not have an adverse effect on green corridors. Ask how can these developments be implemented without affecting the designated and illustrated Green Corridors?	1589/17552	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – recognise the need to create new housing as part of the local plan and consider the proposal to develop ST1 is an appropriate development. Comment – development of ST1 will increase traffic to the Millfield Road at the junction with the ring road passing the main road. There is currently a barrier across the Millfield Road junction with Lower Poppleton Lane that allows public transport use but restricts private vehicles. Concerned that if the development is accessed at the location depicted on the plans the functionality of this barrier would be circumnavigated by the new development. The Local Plan should only be adopted if the line of barrier is relocated to separate the new development from Millfield Lane	1599/9927	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	roundabout. Appropriate traffic management processes need to be considered. Retention of the existing open space served by the sports ground will provide an important amenity area for such a large scale development.		
Site ST1 British Sugar Continued	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6602	
	Objection- concern about development along the A59 approach to the city. Further housing in this site will make this road even more difficult to negotiate.	2655/7032	
	Objection- ST1 would suggest that these areas are better suited to employment uses rather than housing.	2673/7083	
	Comment- 900 houses to be built off Millfield Lane sounds good. Children’s safety at Manor School important.	2848/7583	
	Support- a preferred option for housing is ST1.	2929/7656	
	Objection – too many houses proposed including site ST1, ST2 and H36. There isn’t the road capacity or local facilities to support such development.	3022/7863	
	Objection – see response 9. The proposal will overwhelm the existing infrastructure. The village will be consumed and will loose its character. Will make travel worse in York, it is already difficult. The schools cannot cope.	4097/4792	
	Objection – concerned about the impact of ST1. Having had a conversation with one of the Council’s road engineers with regards to ST1, they made it clear that the bollards on Millfield Lane would remain in place and seemed to indicate that traffic from these two major developments, which will ultimately total 1,306 houses, will all gain access to the A59 via the A1237. Unless it is your intention to ensure access to the A59 via Plantation Drive and/or Ouse Acres, then the traffic demands on the A1237 will be excessive and will impact on us as residents of Poppleton. At present the A1237/A59 roundabout is the cause of tailbacks in all directions and therefore you can obviously understand that we don't want even more congestion in this area.	4392/11379	
	Objection - will have a significant impact on the area by linking the existing small scale housing on the A59 by providing a solid urban landscape to the roundabout at the A59 and ring road roundabout. The proposal will create no discernible gap between the village and the existing city conurbation substantially undermining the relationship of the village to the city. A more appropriate development would be to retain a substantial proportion of this area as Green belt to mirror the fields opposite the A59, with the sports ground remaining open ground. Reference made to the provisions of the Poppleton Village Design Statement.	5332/14993	
Support – all development should follow a brownfield first principle and avoid development on the green belt. ST1 offers an opportunity for significant sustainable	5412/14688		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	inner city redevelopment unmatched in the UK. Developers should be encouraged to make the most of this land to develop attractive and innovative housing in this highly desirable location.		
Site ST1 British Sugar Continued	Objection – concerned that along with ST2 and H36 the development of ST1 the amount of housing concentrated within a small area will have a significant detrimental impact on the semi rural character of the area, causing considerable problems with regard to demand for places at local schools and put strain on the local GP practice.	5499/14870	
	Objection – the proposed housing on areas to the north and west of York, including ST1 is a density of housing that the local area cannot sustain. Too many houses in such a small area of land. Pressure on already full schools and the outer ring road.	5705/13440	
	Support – support for the development of brownfield sites such as ST1.	5786/13698	
	Objection – together with other housing sites in the immediate area strongly object to ST1, will increase traffic which is already a concern, will represent over development of what is currently a highly sought after village and the impact on house prices. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on schools that the higher numbers will bring.	5829/13805	
	Comment – would like additional land, currently playing fields, to the north west of the proposed access road to be considered for additional housing allocation.	6507/16276	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane	Comment- guidance should be applied to site, particularly flood risk to strategic housing sites see response for details.	3/11727	Environment Agency
	Objection- the proposal to build 308 homes will reduce Green Corridor/Green Belt. Some of the land should be reserved for leisure purposes and sixth form for Manor academy or infant school. This along with the development of British Sugar land will alter irretrievably the character of the village.	78/12783	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Comment – ST2 is not within the main built up area as present as implied in Policy SS3. Objection – ST2 has historically been in the green belt performing green belt functions, it prevents coalescence of settlements and contributing to the setting of York. Even more important given the gradual erosion of the green belt in the vicinity of the A59. The urban boundary along Westview Close is very clearly defined along the historic parish boundary between Knapton and Upper Poppleton. The area balances the green belt on the opposite side of the A59 preserving the important green finger/corridor up to this urban edge which is particularly important for the setting and special character of York. It is what most visitors to the city experience so it is essential to keep them attractive. There is inadequate high infrastructure. There will be pressure on local primary and secondary schools. An alternative suggestion would be to retain ST2 as green belt and release more land elsewhere for housing. Could provide the recreation/sports/open space for ST1. Could also provide the necessary educational facilities for ST1. The impact of these alternatives would be far less harmful.	192/14001	
	Objection – paragraph 17.11 clearly states that under utilisation of playing pitches should not be considered as an opportunity to dispose of sites, this has not been applied to ST2. Sport England requires further detail on this justification for this allocation (in relation to its last use for sport) and until that is provided will object to its allocation.	349/14196	Sport England
	Comment- request that they are consulted upon the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document for the former civil service sports ground in order to ensure that development of the site does not adversely impact upon the proposals for the site. Any impacts arising from the future development of the site should be mitigated on site wherever possible.	434/16574	Associated British Foods plc
	Support- the site represents a sustainable location to accommodate some of the city's housing growth.	452/16610	Miller Homes Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be in conflict with the historic character of York as they represent intrusions into the open countryside, rather than connection to or towards existing outlying settlements.	544/16767	
	Objection- see response 9	801/3704	
	Objection – see response 9.	895/3614	
	Objection- to the proposal to build site at the suggested volume. Rural development should be less than 30 dwellings per hectare.	969/16994	
	Objection – see response 9.	977/3845	
	Objection- where are the schools, doctor’s surgeries for these people? The ring road whether duelled or not cannot take all these extra people as well as the colossal development at Clifton. This will spoil the character of York. Must protect this lovely city from infill and save our green spaces.	1217/17122	
	Objection – see response 9. Objection is based in concern for the semi rural community being lost in urban sprawl. Unconvinced by the arguments for such a large amount of housing in the area and are very worried about increased traffic in and through the villages, services grid locked on the A59 and ring road, the pressure on Ousebank and Manor Schools plus the threats to wildlife and other environmental impacts. Is economic growth the only thing that matters?	1231/17126	
	Objection – see response 9. In relation to land between Westview Close and Sports Field on Boroughbridge Road the green belt needs to be clearly defined. Grave mistakes were made with York Boundary changes and the last local plan when residents were not informed of the proposed changes. Consequently the last local plan was put on hold leaving Westview Close and others as not clearly designated as green belt land as was clearly defined in the Harrogate District Council plan.	1579/17527	
	Objection – see response 9. Would like to support the maintenance of the greenbelt in its entirety, including the land opposite Westview Close.	1580/17537	
	Objection – will have a significant impact on traffic volumes on the A59, the outer ring road and Millfield Lane. Serious consideration should be given to the re-opening of Low Poppleton Lane. Reopening this route will allow residents of Poppleton and the new proposed development to access Boroughbridge Road without having to cross the outer ring road at the A59 roundabout.	1583/17548	
Objection – see response 9. Considered that the area is already over populated considering air pollution from the tip near Rufforth and sewage plant at Rawcliffe. These problems need rectifying before contemplating causing more. Narrow roads throughout the area are a major factor also.	1585/3652		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – see response 9. Shame this facility was ever lost. Needs to be developed but 308 houses? What about infrastructure and impact on surroundings, loss of natural break between city and village.	1588/4117	
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection - Under Environmental Assets, the Local Plan states that the Council has defined Green Corridors which are shown in figure 5.5 and in figure 17.1. Both diagrams show a Green District Corridor covering the former civil service sports ground (site ST2). The Local Plan states that it is important that any future development does not have an adverse effect on green corridors. Ask how can these developments be implemented without affecting the designated and illustrated Green Corridors? ST2 is on Boroughbridge Road, (A59) not Millfield Lane and does not include the fields surrounding the Sports Ground. The whole area is Draft Green Belt designated and has been accepted as such since it was part of the West Riding of Yorkshire in the 1970s is not connected to or part of the main built-up area. Object to the Settlement Boundary moving to include this area and request that the Settlement Boundary is retained along the old York City boundary. What facilities and services are to be provided for 308 houses? Do not consider that this proposal will give any benefit to the local community. It will cause disruption in the road network, already overloaded, cause traffic problems on Millfield Lane and create access and egress problems due to lack of public transport. Cannot understand how the site will relate to surrounding area. Consider that it will destroy valuable farmland and will interrupt key views from outskirts of York and from village communities. Do not believe that occupiers of these properties will socialise or engage in local community actions. The site will become another Poppleton Park with its residents not mixing with any other village community (except at the school gate). Suggest that this area becomes Open Space for site ST1. No existing travel options are available at present and will need to be specifically created. Generally there are poor transport services and links.	1589/17553	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – see response 9.	1597/3901	
	Objection – will have a significant impact on the area by linking the existing small scale housing on the A59 by providing a solid urban landscape to the roundabout at the A59 and ring road roundabout. The proposal will create no discernible gap between the village and the existing city conurbation substantially undermining the relationship of the village to the city. A more appropriate development would be to retain a substantial proportion of this area as Green belt to mirror the fields opposite the A59, with the sports ground remaining open ground. Reference made to the provisions of the Poppleton Village Design Statement.	1599/9926	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – see Response 9	1891/7807	
		2009/6493	
	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6603	
	Objection – see Response 9	2550/6852	
		2575/3519	
		2580/6911	
		2600/3526	
	Objection – see Response 9	2601/3535	
	Objection – see Response 9	2603/3540	
		2604/3546	
		2606/3558	
	Objection- concern about development along the A59 approach to the city.	2655/7033	
	Objection- would suggest that these areas are better suited to employment uses rather than housing.	2673/7084	
	Objection- 300 properties at the Civil Service sounds like disaster- all would exit on the manic A59.	2848/7584	
	Objection – see Response 9	2855/3596	
		2856/3605	
		2857/3623	
		2858/3627	
		2859/3636	
	Objection –see Response 9	2860/3643	
	2861/3661		
	2862/3670		
	2863/3679		
	2864/3686		
	2865/3695		
	2869/3733		
	2870/3739		
	2871/3745		
	2872/4532		
	2873/3752		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection– see Response 9	2874/3761	
		2875/3770	
		2876/3779	
		2877/3788	
		2878/3797	
		2879/3806	
		2880/3815	
		2881/4538	
		2882/3827	
		2883/3836	
		2884/3852	
		2885/3861	
		2886/3875	
		2887/3883	
		2888/3892	
		2890/3914	
		2891/3923	
		2892/3929	
		2893/3938	
		2894/3947	
	2895/3956		
	2896/3965		
	2897/3974		
	2911/4135		
	2912/4145		
	Support- a preferred option for housing is ST2.	2929/7657	
	Objection – See Response 9	3004/7837	
	Objection – See Response 9. Too many houses proposed including site ST1, ST2 and H36. There isn't the road capacity or local facilities to support such development.	3022/7857	
	Objection – See Response 9	3029/4159	
		3030/4167	
		3032/4175	
		3037/4183	
		3038/4190	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – See Response 9	3040/4204	
		3042/4219	
		3043/7891	
		3044/4228	
		3045/4234	
	Objection- for housing allocation on former civil service sports ground.	3099/7988	
	Objection – strongly object to proposals for housing allocation on the former civil service sports ground on Millfield Lane.	3209/8266	
	Objection – see Response 9	3248/4236	
		3249/4245	
		3271/4252	
		3278/8420	
		3284/4262	
		3285/4271	
		3287/4280	
	Objection – see Response 9	3384/8685	
		3419/4286	
		3423/4295	
		3441/8802	
		3443/8813	
	Objection – objects to encroachment on land already understood to be designated Green Belt and the proposal to build 308 houses on the former civil service sports ground. The site has a long history of green belt designation and fulfils the criteria to preserve the setting and character of the city and to prevent coalescence between the city and its surrounding villages. It helps to maintain the village identity status of Upper Poppleton and thus prevents urban sprawl. Any development of the site should be for recreational or sports facility only thereby retaining green open space.	3447/8830	
	Objection – See Response 9	3468/8928	
	3472/8936		
	3473/8945		
	3474/8954		
	3475/8964		
	3479/8972		
	3481/8980		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – See Response 9	3482/8990	
		3483/8999	
		3484/9010	
		3485/9019	
		3486/9029	
		3487/9039	
		3488/9048	
		3490/9058	
		3491/9067	
		3492/9076	
		3493/9085	
		3495/9103	
		3502/9112	
		3503/9122	
		3504/9132	
		3505/9141	
	Objection – See Response 9	3506/9150	
		3550/9163	
		3555/9183	
		3556/9192	
		3557/9201	
		3559/9215	
		3560/9224	
		3561/9232	
		3562/9241	
		3563/9248	
		3564/9257	
	3565/9265		
	3566/9274		
	3567/9283		
	3568/9293		
Comment – although there is no objection to the development of ST2 concerned at overdevelopment of sites and the impact on the road network and schools. The A1237 and A59 are already busy. Rumoured that access will be from Millfield Lane which will	3623/9310		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cause traffic jams at the A1237 roundabout.		
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Support – housing is needed, support the allocations for this site.	3628/9328	
	Objection – see Response 9	3629/9334	
		3630/9340	
		3633/9352	
		3634/9358	
		3637/9368	
		3638/9377	
		3639/9384	
		3640/9393	
		3641/9400	
		3642/9409	
		3677/9418	
		3728/10035	
		Objection – see Response 9	3730/10050
	3731/10060		
	3735/10072		
	3738/10085		
	3741/10101		
	3742/10111		
	3743/10121		
	3745/5798		
	3746/10131		
	Comment – traffic issues horrendous with 600+ new vehicles.	3797/10230	
	Objection – see Response 9	3911/4598	
		3942/4625	
		3946/4634	
3947/4643			
3966/10545			
Objection – whilst the need to address the shortage of homes in York is understood it is considered that the extent of this development to be excessive. The number of houses should be reduced significant. The land forms part of the green corridor/green belt which is essential to preserve the identity of Poppleton as a village and not a suburb of York. Would be better if the number of houses was reduced and some of the	3976/10576		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	land was safeguarded for future use as a sixth form for Manor School or used for leisure purposes to support the new community in the area.		
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – see Response 9	4055/4678	
	Comment – one of the least bad options for transport.	4077/4711	
	Objection – see Response 9	4078/4720	
		4079/4729	
		4080/4738	
		4082/4747	
		4084/4757	
		4085/5813	
	Objection – see Response 9	4087/4767	
		4088/4775	
		4097/4789	
		4103/4797	
		4111/4817	
	Objection – 308 houses should not be built on the site, some reasonable development would be welcome especially for growing needs of pensioners e.g. retirement homes/sheltered accommodation.	4143/10857	
	Objection – see Response 9	4145/4857	
4191/4890			
Comment – if development is granted builders should have to redevelop children’s play area to support new housing and improve the area.	4198/10925		
Objection – land between Westview Close and civil service sports field is the only open space left. Roads are already gridlocked with traffic. A further 300 houses proposed will crate havoc.	4315/11197		
Objection – see Response 9	4386/11358		
Objection – concerned about the impact of ST2. Having had a conversation with one of the Council’s road engineers with regards to ST2, they made it clear that the bollards on Millfield Lane would remain in place and seemed to indicate that traffic from these two major developments, which will ultimately total 1,306 houses, will all gain access to the A59 via the A1237. Unless it is your intention to ensure access to the A59 via Plantation Drive and/or Ouse Acres, then the traffic demands on the A1237 will be excessive and will impact on us as residents of Poppleton. At present	4392/11380		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the A1237/A59 roundabout is the cause of tailbacks in all directions and therefore you can obviously understand that we don't want even more congestion in this area.		
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – strongly object to ST2.	4416/5053	
	Objection – strongly object to ST2. 308 houses is over development and will place Poppleton services under severe and unacceptable pressure.	4419/5060	
	Objection – see Response 9	4425/5066	
		4431/5076	
		4435/5085	
		4437/5094	
		4438/5104	
	Objection – See Response 9	4440/5118	
		4441/5127	
		4442/5135	
		4443/5144	
		4463/5190	
	Support – generally support ST2 subject to screening, low density development and concerns over access are addressed. No access should be allowed onto the A50 between A1237 ring road and Beckfield Lane due to slow moving traffic/congestion problem arising from new roundabout and Park & Ride traffic. The site is visually prominent therefore should promote York. Any development along the A50 should be high quality and visually excellent. Good landscaping is required. Comment – ST2 is shown as a green corridor on Figure 17.1. By definition this suggests that the site should remain green and not be developed. Would support the policy of a green corridor along this part of the A59 provided the site is maintained open space.	4634/11763	
	Objection – see Response 9	4650/5239	
4755/5288			
4756/5298			
4759/5307			
4767/5316			
Comment - reservations about the scale of the proposed development ST2 (Former Civil Service Sports Ground) and question whether its potential impact on local schools and transport routes has been adequately considered. It would be too late to wait for a transport plan after planning permission has been granted, and then discover that	4829/12148		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the impact on the ring road, and potential rat runs, was unacceptable.		
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – considers that the old civil service sports ground could be better used for siting a primary school for the resident’s children from the Sugar Beet Site (ST1) and for allowing expansion of Manor school along with community facilities such as a health centre.	5238/12561	
	Objection – the Council should not be influenced and pressured by those buying up land to gain obscure profits.	5282/14397	
	Objection - will have a significant impact on the area by linking the existing small scale housing on the A59 by providing a solid urban landscape to the roundabout at the A59 and ring road roundabout. The proposal will create no discernible gap between the village and the existing city conurbation substantially undermining the relationship of the village to the city. A more appropriate development would be to retain a substantial proportion of this area as Green belt to mirror the fields opposite the A59, with the sports ground remaining open ground. Reference made to the provisions of the Poppleton Village Design Statement.	5332/14991	
	Objection – will destroy the separation from greater York, poses traffic problems and affects infrastructure. Represents a large increase in Poppleton’s houses, too much. Hard to see how the infrastructure will cope and how the very special nature of York will be preserved. Anticipate York changing for ever.	5408/14674	
	Objection – concerned that along with ST1 and H36 the development of ST2 the amount of housing concentrated within a small area will have a significant detrimental impact on the semi rural character of the area, causing considerable problems with regard to demand for places at local schools and put strain on the local GP practice.	5499/14871	
	Objection – object to the nature and scale of the proposals, 308 dwellings will have a very significant impact on existing infrastructure, especially as such dwelling occupants will require access and egress to/from adjacent highways either via the A59 or Millfield Lane and the A1237. Development on this scale can only be sustainable if associated infrastructure is improved at the same time. Even then increased congestion is almost guaranteed.	5620/13215	
	Objection – strongly object on the basis that a green corridor needs to be kept between the city and Poppleton.	5662/13325	
	Objection – the proposed housing on areas to the north and west of York, including ST2 is a density of housing that the local area cannot sustain. Too many houses in such a small area of land. Pressure on already full schools and the outer ring road.	5705/13441	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – object to the building of 308 houses at ST2. As well as the loss of open green space have concerns as to the ability of the ring road to cope with the increased traffic and as to where the significant number of children who would live there would be educated. Poppleton Ousebank School already has large classes with one key stage 1 year having more than the legal limit of children in it.	5729/13501	
	Objection – all though the need for additional housing is appreciated there is no way that the nearby ring road can cope with the effect of 308 more houses ,especially assuming that most households are likely to have two or even more vehicles. It is also wide open space at present and clearly so much building will destroy yet another open space. Open space is fundamental to a good standard of living and good mental health and a reason why most people love to live in and around York.	5817/13767	
	Objection – together with other housing sites in the immediate area strongly object to ST2, will increase traffic which is already a concern, will represent over development of what is currently a highly sought after village and the impact on house prices. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on schools that the higher numbers will bring.	5829/13802	
	Objection – considers that the number of houses should be reduced and half the area be safeguarded to expand Manor School which will be required to teach the additional children from the new developments in the area. Provision must be made for these families.	5882/15174	
	Objection – see response 9.	5948/6244	
	Objection – along with H36 and H45, ST2 would place a huge strain on the local services and have a negative impact on the traffic within the village.	6038/15454	
	Objection – object to the development of the site	6131/15558	
	Objection – object to the development of 308 houses on the site	6133/15574	
	Objection – see response 9. The developments in the area appear too large with potential problems arising from access and traffic issues with numerous households now having two or three cars per property.	6190/6099	
	Objection – see response 9.	6191/6107	
	Objection – see response 9. Considers that villages should remain a village as that is the reason people live here. Continued urban sprawl like this is turning the very special city of York into another Leeds.	6203/6124	
	Objection – see response 9. For Poppleton to retain its village status it is important it doesn't get swallowed up into the outskirts of York. The infrastructure is not in place with single ring road which all the extra cars will feed into. It seems that every	6206/6136	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	available green space is to be built in when there are brownfield sites available.		
Site ST2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground, Millfield Lane Continued	Objection – object to the scale of ST2 and question whether its potential impact on local schools and transport routes has been adequately considered. It would be too late to wait for a transport plan after planning permission has been granted, and then discover that the impact on the ring road and potential rat runs was unacceptable.	6360/16073	
	Objection – see response 9.	6413/6276	
	Support – considers that the housing needs of the city are great enough to warrant the allocation of ST2. Would support the maximum possible quota of affordable housing in this development.	6414/6285	
	Objection – see response 9. Too many houses for local services. Doctors, schools etc. to support. Existing catchment will have less priority for using local amenities.	6418/6295	
	Objection – fearful that ST2 along with ST8, ST19, H45 and the Park & Ride developments will together create major traffic problems for those who live in Poppleton. Object to the creation of a suburb of York rather than remaining a village.	6425/6312	
	Objection – see response 9.	6438/6356	
		6469/6398	
		6478/6413	
		6481/6419	
		6483/6427	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST3 The Grain Stores, Water Lane	Comment- guidance to be applied to site, particularly flood risk to strategic housing sites, see response for details.	3/11728	Environment Agency
	Objection- the allocation is inconsistent with development plan policy	544/16762	
	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6604	
	Support- a preferred option for housing is ST3.	2929/7658	
	Comment – along with the Clifton Gate proposals (ST14), the development of ST3 could make travelling in the area impossible.	5397/14647	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST4 Land Adjacent Hull Road And Grimston Bar	Comment- guidance to be applied to site, particularly flood risk to strategic housing sites, see response for details.	3/11729	Environment Agency
	Comment- development of ST4 will have direct or indirect impact on A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11666	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be in conflict with the historic character of York as they represent intrusions into the open countryside, rather than connection to or towards existing outlying settlements.	544/16769	
	Support - support the allocation of site ST4 for development of 211 dwellings on 7.5 gross hectares in the Local Plan. The site is deliverable (i.e. it is achievable, suitable and available) in accordance with national planning guidance.	659/15055	Persimmon Homes
	Comment - ST4 could be extended, to include a gypsy and traveller site.	1109/17224	
	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6605	
	Objection- the site raises concerns about air pollution and traffic volume. Water drainage from Kimberlow Hill onto the carriage way would need to be addressed.	2991/7771	
	Objection - the bottom of the fields behind Springfield Cottages is often flooded, surely this will not be conducive to a large building project. The springs in the fields make the water table very high. So few green spaces this side of York is would be tragic if the views people get as they approach the city from this area was all buildings. Traffic has got very busy in the last 35 years especially in the mornings and evenings. How will the roads cope with more traffic?	3367/8637	
	Objection - roads are already very congested; building more houses will increase the volume of traffic. The site is not within easy walking distance of shops so additional car journeys would be inevitable. Many parents would also transport their children to school by car because of the busy roads. The A1079 within the city boundary is currently an important green corridor into York which would be eroded by the proposed housing development. It is important to retain the open nature of the area. In addition air quality would be poor in properties and gardens near the road.	3368/15699	
	Objection - water table is very high, flooding will happen. Problems with access from the A1079 as already busy at rush hour. There is a lot of native wildlife in the area that will be disturbed. Not in contact with any other residential areas, it will be on its own. What is it going to be called? Should not be developed.	3438/8797	
	Objection - congestion will inevitably result from massive housing development planning for the east of York.	3571/9524	
Objection - the extra vehicles from ST4 next to the Park & Ride will add to the traffic problems around Grimston roundabout. The access on to main roads	4018/10646		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST4 Land Adjacent Hull Road And Grimston Bar Continued	Objection – the site is on the north face of the moraine from the last ice age and has a number of springs. There is a dyke on the northern edge of the site which often overflows flooding the adjacent land. During the construction of the A64 bypass items of archaeological interest were found. The land rises north to south and any development would destroy the view of the city from both the A64 and A1079 which are both elevated. Access and egress onto/from the A1079 would be both difficult and dangerous. The site is some distance from shops and other services. Although the Park & Ride site is near this means crossing a very busy dual carriageway.	4157/10872	
	Objection – along with ST6, ST4 will increase the volume of traffic in the area, which is already at gridlock at times during the working day. It will also erode further into the green belt in this area. This particular section of the A1079 is the only short section of green belt which the traveller in York meets and which on one side provides a screen for the Park & Ride.	4303/11164	
	Objection – this land on the northern slope of Kimberlow Hill comprises part of the rural landscape which meets visitors arriving at York via the eastern approach. Provides an agreeable welcoming prospect effecting a gradual change from countryside to an urban environment. Especially valuable as the land on the opposite side of Hull Road is built up and has an industrial road leading off it. York is a tourist destination which makes a major contribution to the economy which is to be encouraged rather than discouraged by an unattractive approach. The hill provides a natural break between the Heslington East campus and the part of the city to the north. Extensive tree planting as part of the Queens Jubilee celebration. It would be a mistake to detract from this landscape by covering the lower slopes with housing. Would be contrary to the Council’s stated green belt objectives. Would lead to additional traffic on Hull road which already exceeds the roads capacity at peak periods. Once green belt land is lost is can never be recovered nor can it be replaced. This small piece of land is invaluable and should be left clear of development.	4327/11228	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	Objection – alongside the east campus university development this has the effect of having removed 600 hectares of open greenbelt and high grade farmland in close proximity in the past 5 years. This is in no way sustainable development. And incidentally has all been on a single land owner’s estate.	5152/12287	
	Objection – strongly question of encouraging the building of up to 6,000 dwellings which would access the A1237 as the road will not become a dual carriage way due to financial constraints. If the planners expect developers to fund large road improvements then these sites will remain undeveloped until the regulations are	5520/14932	Campaign For Real Democracy

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	changed.		
Site ST4 Land Adjacent Hull Road And Grimston Bar Continued	Objection - object to proposals to develop this site. The site is high quality agricultural land which together with the boundary hedges forms a green gateway into the City. Does not agree with the theory that this site should be developed to accommodate students. The University of York has substantial land on its campus which should be used for this purpose. Extra traffic generated would have in combination with other proposals ST6, ST7 and ST15 a serious effect on the local highway network and given the current overloading of the A1079 Hull Road lead to the Murton – Osbaldwick route being used even more as a main road into York. No mention is made of the current surface	6521/16498	Cllr Mark Warters

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST5 York Central	Comment- site lies in flood zone 1 and 2. Known surface water issues. Suggest no further development to take place until study to identify options and steps to be taken by the Council. Sequential approach to site layout to be taken, with development steered to areas of lowest risk. If needed, sequential and exception tests to be passed.	3/11735	Environment Agency
	Comment – the part of the site between the city walls and the railway line is an extremely sensitive area. It is essential that the height of the new buildings in and around the station are of a scale which will not harm the character or appearance of the central historic core conservation area or detract from the setting of either the Listed Buildings in and around the site or those elements which contribute to the significance of the city walls. However there may be capacity within parts of the York Central site for the development of some taller structures where it can be demonstrated that it would not harm key views across the city.	238/14054	English Heritage
	Comment – recommend that references are made to SS3 and Policy H3 to what is likely to be delivered over the phasing timeframe from the complex brownfield sites such as ST5.	659/15072	Persimmon Homes
	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6606	
	Objection- concern about development along the A59 approach to the city.	2655/7034	
	Objection- could have been used imaginatively for a major tourist and/or leisure development.	2673/7080	
	Comment – there is great scope or a larger development than the 438 dwellings proposed, up to 2,000 dwellings. This site should be a huge asset to provide housing close to the city centre.	4752/12051	
	Comment – ST5 offers an opportunity for significant sustainable inner city redevelopment unmatched in the UK. Developers should be encouraged to make the most of this land to develop attractive and innovative housing in this highly desirable location.	5412/14689	
	Comment – even if building on brownfield sites like ST5 is more technically difficult and expensive could even more be done to develop brownfield sites?	5786/13697	
	Comment – would urge the council, while it rightly pays close attention to the state of the housing an commercial letting markets, to be as proactive as possible in encouraging the development of this site in an economically, spatially and environmentally balanced manner and as a priority.	5853/15102	
Comment – from the plan seems as if the car parking near the National Railway Museum would be given over to housing which is a shame as its useful, although	6052/15495		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	better there than on green belt land.		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST6 Land East Of Grimston Bar	Comment- guidance should be applied to site, particularly flood risk to strategic housing sites see response for details.	3/11730	Environment Agency
	Comment- development will have direct or indirect impact on A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11667	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection- major issues with suitability due to traffic and drainage issues which appear to have been underestimated. Difficult to see how access arrangements to dual carriageway leading to A64/A1079/A166 interchange can be effected. Concerned about air quality in area as traffic builds up. Regular flooding occurs in the low lying fields below ST6 which contributes to Osbaldwick's flooding problems. The flood map underestimates the problem along the Beck. There is no reference to the roman road which runs across the site.	69/12739	Murton Parish Council
	Objection – the development of this site would substantially reduce the gap between the edge of the built up area and the ring road. As such it would adversely affect views towards the city and its rural setting. It would also reduce the separation of the edge of the city from the livestock centre to the south of Murton further eroding its rural setting. The development of this area seems likely to harm one of the elements which contributes to the special character and setting of York.	238/14058	English Heritage
	Comment- could ST6 not be extended?	1109/17189	
	Objection- the land rises toward the A1079 giving wonderful views to the city. Even if development were restricted to the lower end of the slope, the building of three storey properties will restrict a view of York across green fields. Development will detract from the beautiful approaches. Flooding at the bottom of these fields has always been a problem. There is a water course and a well in the field. These are home to various rare wildlife including greater crested newts. Alteration to the eco system which feeds the well will destroy this habitat. There are many rare birds visiting the site at various times. Access to the site is very restricted. The proposed entrance is a blind exit and will be very close to the main roundabout at the ring road. Traffic levels are very high. The presence of a roman road which runs down the middle of the carriageway and part across the field. To enhance the approach to York and preserve the "green fingers" the extension of this park type feel across this site will better serve York's future. The cycle path could then be put through this park.	2413/6574	
	Support- housing allocation felt to be generally acceptable.	2416/6607	
	Objection- site is inappropriate for several reasons including questionable safe access to and from the site, flooding, drainage and air pollution. Concerned that a development of 150 houses will have an adverse effect on ground water and in	2991/7772	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	consequence exacerbate flooding in fields towards Murton Way, Osbaldwick Beck and Moor Lane.		
Site ST6 Land East Of Grimston Bar Continued	Objection- the Site Selection Paper, Annex 19, states many 'common sense' reasons for this site is very restricted. Traffic levels are already very high. A number of years ago, pro developments were turned down by the highways department for this very reason? Flooding is a concern, every year the land at the bottom of this site floods. The ecosystem would be ruined- greater crested newts are to be found on this site as well as rare birds. There are also natural wells in the field and evidence of roman roads- archaeological interest. There have been near misses with cyclists who presently ride along the cycle path down Hull road. Traffic- too many vehicles- not enough access.	2998/7791	
	Objection – concerned about the scale of the development proposed on the east side of York. Cannot imagine that the existing road network would be able to cope with the demand of the extra traffic and even with improvements would still be inadequate. Seems that this side of the city is the aim target for development. Why should so much valuable agricultural land be lost to housing? Will end up as a country with no land left for farming and unable to produce enough food.	3353/8549	
	Objection – so few green spaces this side of York it would be tragic if the views people will get as they approach the city from this area was all buildings. Traffic is already very busy how on earth can the road cope with more? The fields behind Springfield Cottages are often flooded; surely this will not be conducive to a large building project. The springs in the fields make the water table very high.	3367/8638	
	Objection – roads are already very congested; building more houses will increase the volume of traffic. The site is not within easy walking distance of shops so additional car journeys would be inevitable. Many parents would also transport their children to school by car because of the busy roads. The A1079 within the city boundary is currently an important green corridor into York which would be eroded by the proposed housing development. It is important to retain the open nature of the area. Access to the site would be difficult. In addition air quality would be poor in properties and gardens near the road.	3368/15700	
	Objection – water table is very high, flooding will happen. Problems with access from the A1079 as already busy at rush hour. There is a lot of native wildlife in the area that will be disturbed. Not in contact with any other residential areas, it will be on its own. What is it going to be called? Should not be developed.	3438/8796	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST6 Land East Of Grimston Bar Continued	Objection – the access from ST6 is extra traffic for the Grimston roundabout.	4018/10647	
	Objection – along with ST4, ST6 will increase the volume of traffic in the area, which is already at gridlock at times during the working day. It will also erode further into the green belt in this area. This particular section of the A1079 is the only short section of green belt which the traveller in York meets and which on one side provides a screen for the Park & Ride.	4303/11165	
	Objection – the plan is proposing an additional 25 hectares (ha) of land to be included for development at Grimston and Murton. Taking this into account as well as the east campus university development this has the effect of having removed approximately 600ha of open greenbelt land and high grade farmland over the last five years. This is in no way sustainable development and incidentally has all been on a single land owner’s estate.	5152/12288	
	Objection - object to proposals to develop this site. The site is high quality agricultural land. As with ST4 continual loss of productive agricultural land is unsustainable with worrying cumulative effects locally and nationally for this country’s ability to feed its population. As with ST4 this is a gateway site into/out of York and is clearly visible from the A64. Development of this site is incompatible with conserving the open landscape setting of the City. The isolated nature of site means development is un-sustainable in terms of transport and access to services and development could only lead to increased traffic problems on the A 1079. As with identification of this, ST4 and ST7 without local knowledge of ground water levels how can statements be made that development of these sites be positive in minimising flood risk because of incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage techniques. The reality of development of similar sites in the vicinity – Derwenthorpe and Beckett Drive is one of adverse drainage/water logging for surrounding areas.	6521/16499	Cllr Mark Warters
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane	Comment- site lies in flood zone 1 and 2. Sequential approach to layout of site to be taken. Expect to see all development located in flood zone 1 and areas in flood zone 2 and 3 used as green/public space. Surface water guidance to be followed.	3/11736	Environment Agency
	Comment- development will have direct or indirect impact on A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11668	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	<p>Objection- majority of those from Heworth Without who responded say they do not want land east of Metcalfe lane allocated as housing. They expressed concerns about population growth, jobs, the economy and draft Green Belt as well as negative effects on large scale housing development on areas road and infrastructure network.</p> <p>Support- supportive of the intention to include open space as part of the development proposal is welcome. Members strongly oppose development of this land for reasons stated. Lack of information how this area will be served by or integrated into existing transport links. The A64 is at capacity at the point where it passes within reach of any development east of Metcalfe lane. Residents emphasise the desirability of preserving eastward views from the Parish. From the by-pass, the prospect of the Minster over low hedges and scattered trees is one of York's most iconic vistas. Central feature of Parish is Old Foss Bank which acts as a reservoir for rain and deals with run off from farm land. There is concern that the strategic flood risk assessment appears to have played no part in housing proposals for the region.</p> <p>Comment- residents abutting the proposed development would prefer a buffer of open land between existing housing and new development. This should include a widening of the green corridor along east bank of Old Foss Beck. The existing draft green belt is an important part of parish as it sustains a wide variety of wildlife.</p>	65/12730	Heworth Without Parish Council
	Objection- the development is too large for the local infrastructure even if it was strengthened. There is difficulty believing that the minor, local road network will cope with traffic from an 1800 house development. The increased use of Murton Way would have grave implications for the wider network of rural roads. There should be no access from Murton Way due to the area between Murton Way and Osbaldwick Beck being deemed worthy of historic character and setting designation and the importance of corridor 16. Additional water run off from ST7 will exacerbate flood problems through to the River Foss.	69/12740	Murton Parish Council
	Objection- not clear how ground water retention/water table in regard to flooding will be addressed.	125/12869	Meadlands Area Residents Association
	Objection – the development of this site would substantially reduce the gap between the edge of the built up area and the ring road. As such it would adversely affect views	238/14060	English Heritage

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	towards the city and its rural setting. It would also reduce the separation of the edge of the city from the livestock centre to the south of Murton further eroding its rural setting. The development of this area seems likely to harm one of the elements which contributes to the special character and setting of York.		
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued	Support- site represents a sustainable location to accommodate some of the City's housing growth and a logical extension to the New Osbaldwick development further west.	452/16611	Miller Homes Ltd
	Objection- the allocation is inconsistent with development plan policy	544/16763	
	Support- support for site.	673/16857	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Comment - when the residential developments go ahead would like to see a change to road layouts in the area. Suggest road between Stockton Lane and Monks Cross roundabout ideally joining the link road just to the east of roundabout. Once other new developments are built needs to be another road between Stockton Lane and Bad Bargain Lane and then over to Osbaldwick Lane near to Outgang? Lane area of Hull Road.	999/224	
	Objection- seems the site cannot be developed either at least within Osbaldwick due to the then leader of the council Rod Hill in 1995 promising so.	1207/17109	
	Objection – Over time Osbaldwick has become engulfed by suburban sprawl and it is now largely a suburban community. With the additional of 1,800 new homes local residents fear the character of their historic village will change irrevocably. Residents in the Meadlands area have experienced standing water in their gardens which they feel is implicitly linked to the development of the Derwenthorpe site. If development were to begin on the nearly land east of Metcalfe Lane residents could face further drainage issues. Full environmental assessments should be carried out on site before the Local Plan goes any further with the adoption process. When coupled with the 211 new homes proposed at Grimston Bar the A1079 is unlikely to cope with the additional number of cars with traffic at peak times being most affected.	1355/17324	
	Comment – the site boundary should be amended to allow vehicular access to be taken from the Osbaldwick Link Road to the south and to enable management of open space to the southern part of the site.	1668/15029	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection - staunch opposition to the Council's plan to build 1,800 new homes to the South of Heworth Without. We residents do not want to see York's Greenbelt torn apart. The building of these houses is not a realistic proposal. Where is the infrastructure coming from to support this influx of new residents? Is the Council going to ensure there are GPs surgeries, schools, and extra transport services? It may be	1907/83	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	news to Councillors but not everyone drives a car. And where are these people going to be employed? Not in York where real employment is difficult to find. Everything the Council does lately confirms my view that York Councillors are bent on destroying the unique character of the city and this crass building plan is yet another unsustainable, ill thought out attempt to destroy the charm and beauty of our city's rural setting.		
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued	Objection – traffic congestion would be appalling and strongly object to green belt land being used.	1934/154	
	Support – no objection providing consideration is given to access for traffic. A link to Stockton Lane and by pass could mean minimal disruption if improvements are made to Stockton Lane and Bad Bargain Lane.	1945/198	
	Support – in favour of ST7 and would like their land to be considered for development.	1958/246	
	Objection- infrastructure problems and impact on the green belt. Large dormitory development within the city is likely to encourage the arrival of more residents who work in Leeds but do not wish to live there. The inclusion of ST7 is predicated on expansions which are not appropriate economically or environmentally. Much greater thought needs to be given to how it is to be sustained economically or where it is likely to be located.	2416/6585	
	Objection- in a green belt site. Increase of local traffic, any traffic going into York from this development would use Bad Bargain Lane as a cut through. At present there is a very poor bus service and the local senior school is closing soon.	2546/6836	
	Objection- how is the Council going to stop flooding?	2683/7126	
	Comment- size of ST7 would have a massive impact on the existing infrastructure in Osbaldwick, Burnholme and Heworth. Such a number of houses will surely need schools, doctors and shops and most of all a good transport system. For Murton residents, the concern is that access could be from Murton Way and Outgang Lane.	2991/7773	
	Comment- would like to see it expanded to form a viable green corridor connecting the City with the environment.	3077/7951	
	Comment – unfortunate to say but ST7 will go ahead because Derwenthorpe phase 1 has already happened. Phase 2 is inevitable even though there is a lot of objection. ST7 will link into Derwenthorpe and will create a monster. Objection – ST7 needs to be scaled down. Concerns about exit traffic. Murton will feel the brunt.	3438/8798	
	Objection – would like to know what measures the council proposed to mitigate congestion on the A64 which will inevitably result from large scale development east of York. What measures are in place to ensure that current peak time problems will not	3571/9523	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be a day long issue?		
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued	Objection – proposed housing developments are inappropriate and will put immense strain on the local infrastructure in Heworth Without. There are no guarantees that any of the necessary infrastructure will follow these developments. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised before this green belt site is used. Heworth without has a unique character and ST7 will cause severe congestion and air pollution.	3603/9588	
	Objection – will totally alter the ambience of the area. The green belt is essential to provide a break in the development between the city and the surrounding villages such as Murton and Stockon on the Forest. No infrastructure is mention.	3949/10507	
	Objection – no plans it seems to address the increased congestion on the A65, the Malton road or the Hull road.	3958/10537	
	Support – supportive of the allocation of the site.	3994/11759	
	Objection – is the infrastructure around the east of York able to cope with the extra number of houses? The roads, hospitals, doctor’s surgeries, local schools in the area are already over subscribed.	4018/10645	
	Objection - consider that the assumptions made in Policy H3 about the scale of new housing development that will be delivered by ST7 within the plan period are over-optimistic. The assumed build out rates are simply too high and are unsustainable/ undeliverable, even assuming construction will take place by several builders simultaneously. It is recommended that the following revised, yet still aspirational yield assumptions are included in Policy H3 – 1,200 dwellings.	4355/11604	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Objection – the idea that Heworth Without can cope with an additional 1,800 homes on land to east of Metcalfe Lane is inappropriate. Will result in sever congestion, development on brownfield sites should be maximised before greenbelt is used. Plans are hugely ambitious and completely unsustainable. House prices will be negatively affected.	4721/12017	
	Objection – green belt land should be protected from urban sprawl, proposals are inappropriate putting a great strain on the existing amenities. Will harm the unique character of the area and will cause severe traffic congestion and air pollution in the area.	4722/14255	
	Support – there is great scope for further development on land east of Metcalf Lane and Derwenthorpe. This could be expanded east, north and south from the proposed 1,800 dwellings to 3,000-4,000 dwellings.	4752/12048	
	Objection – total lack of local facilities to support any more houses in this area. There is not even any local secondary school. This would result in more traffic to/from	5227/12522	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	adjacent schools and residential areas. The existing road infrastructure will need significant upgrading resulting in more traffic and the surround areas becoming rat runs. This is a green belt area and should not be allowed to lift and shift boundaries as the council sees fit. Local community currently enjoys this area of beauty to run, cycle, walk, exercise and for children to play. This will be destroyed and yet more countryside lost and local wildlife habitat destroyed. Additional roads joining the A64 will lead to more congestion and more pollution.		
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued	Objection – will ruin the nature of the area by hugely increasing the amount of traffic on existing roads. The suburban/semi rural nature of the area which makes it so pleasant will disappear.	5371/14581	
	Objection – will harm the unique character of the area, will cause severe traffic congestion and overload the existing facilities and infrastructure. Air quality will suffer.	5392/14636	
	Objection – should be used for a large park, woodland and allotments for the use of existing local residents in Osbaldwick.	5449/14784	
	Objection – should be protecting this open space, amenity space is sparse in Osbaldwick. Objects to plan to build further houses but have not rectified the deficiencies in open space.	5452/14792	
	Objection – will destroy the character and setting of the local area. There are plenty of brownfield sites that should be developed first. Will put a huge strain on local traffic infrastructure which would not be able to cope. Water table is too high in this area and converting green belt land to a housing state can only cause flooding.	5496/14867	
	Objection – will double the size of Heworth Without. There is no suitable road network in place to support the development. There is insufficient primary and secondary school provision as well as insufficient health facilities. There would be a significant cost in removing the current high voltage pylons and putting this service underground. Bus services to this area are poor.	5542/14962	
	Objection – utilises greenbelt land in an area that has already faced losses of such land. It would drastically diminish the unique character of Osbaldwick village. It would require either a major traffic route to be created to allow access to the A64 or create increased traffic for existing access routes (namely Malton Road and Hull Road). It would create massive demands on local services/facilities. This against a backdrop of reduced local services/facilities.	5569/13050	
	Objection – too large and should be scaled down. The implications for services, public transport and access to open space needs to be considered.	5609/13183	
	Objection – doesn't seem to be any clear vehicular access points.	5790/13714	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued	Objection – doesn't seem to be any clear vehicular access points.	5791/13717	
	Objection – strongly believes that the beautiful area will be greatly affected by ST7.	5901/15215	
	Objection – would be sad to lose the quiet peaceful area to the increased traffic, loss of wildlife habitat and increased noise pollution the level of building at ST7 would bring. Can see no plans to improve the local infrastructure.	5907/15227	
	Objection – the area is quiet residential and the idea of building new homes with the current road network and public services in the area is preposterous. Will there be compensation when house prices go down?	5931/15267	
	Objection - concern has arisen over the southern-most boundary of site ST7. No concerns over specific comments made by the technical officer in their assessment (Appendix 19 of the site selection paper) were disputed; however insufficient reason for cutting the sites southern boundary short was given. On balance we consider the merits of developing this land vastly outweigh the impact on the green corridor. This additional land could be used to provide access to the site.	6315/15964	Abode Group
	Objection – the addition of so many homes will mean more cars on the road and dangerous levels of congestion. Services will struggle to meet the needs of the population.	6374/16096	
	Objection – no evidence has been provided to estimate the likely traffic impact of ST7.	6518/16444	York Green Party
	Objection - Including this land dismisses 20 years of accepted planning policy with regard to this site. Namely its contribution to the setting of the city. These points were made in relation to the 2006 Derwenthorpe Public Inquiry when the joint developers Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust/City of York Council advanced the case that Metcalfe Lane was an enduring, defensible greenbelt boundary. With the Derwenthorpe development resulting in the loss of Osbaldwick Ward's main area of natural open space accessible to the public the provision of open space alongside ST7 is noted but would be inadequate for the proposed 1800 dwellings without taking into account the already massive shortfall in open space provision currently in Osbaldwick. Given the proposed open space associated with ST7 runs up to Osbaldwick Gypsy Caravan Site the use of this open space for the public would no doubt be constrained by the activities of the occupants of this site in terms of horses, fly tipping etc. no indication of the highway infrastructure associated with the site although earlier Local Development Framework documents did. All access points proposed earlier would give rise to traffic overload and subsequent quality of life issues for Osbaldwick, Murton and Heworth. The previously proposed traffic link off the A64 would lead to significant land take and destruction of land 'retaining a rural setting' at Murton. Once again flooding	6521/16496	Cllr Mark Warters

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and drainage issues are not addressed adequately. The Derwenthorpe estate under construction provides a clear demonstration of the adverse effects to the surrounding area when there is no local groundwater information available. Whilst the bio-diversity action plan (draft) is full of fine words and policies to protect the environment it would be hard to argue the ecological value of ST7 when previously the Council approved the significantly higher ecological Land West of Metcalfe Lane for development. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that site No. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) 57 (candidate SINC site) Osbaldwick meadow lies right in the path one of the proposed access roads off Osbaldwick Link road.</p>		
<p>Site ST7 Land East Of Metcalf Lane Continued</p>	<p>Objection – site sits in green belt which is offered full protection by RSS policy. Proposal sacrifices a significant part of York’s heritage and character at the altar of a failed affordable housing policy. Removing this land from green belt is counter to all five of the green belt objectives set out in the NPPF. No work has been done to provide evidence that the site is deliverable in terms of traffic infrastructure. Access to the site can only be achieved by new roads connecting on to three streets none of which have existing capacity or the potential to create more capacity. Each option would place significant extra traffic at junctions that are already at capacity. Traffic in the area already predicted to increase significantly with the new development at Monks Cross and could not cope with extra movements.</p> <p>Majority of the Heworth Without area remains characterised by open rural aspects and its character is visibly distinct to that of the urban area. Area is bounded by the historic stray, open farmland that forms one of the green wedges into the city and the currently unidentified green wedge around Tang Hall beck. The land clearly forms part of a distinct green wedge that characterises the city yet has not been included in the green belt appraisal. The proposals will coalesce boundaries with Osbaldwick resulting in the loss of two distinct and separate areas which is against the plan’s own policies. No assessment has been made of the environmental impact of developing this site. Land currently houses numerous species.</p> <p>Evidence base includes the view from the A64 to the Minster as one ‘which above all, capture and express the very image and essence of York’ yet the plan proposes obstructing this. Site is listed in the Core Conservation Area Appraisal as one of the city’s 26 key views. It is clear therefore that removing this land from the green belt would cause significant harm to the character setting and context of the city and would challenge the visibility of the Minster. Heritage Topic Paper states it is essential to protect the views of the Minster Tower from the Ring Road.</p>	<p>7313/17759</p>	<p>Cllr N Ayre</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>There are numerous rights of way running through the land including the Millennium Way Walk. These provide informal recreational space for residents in an area of identified deficiency of open space and also key to experiencing the setting and character of the city as highlighted in the Heritage Topic Paper.</p> <p>There has been inadequate assessment of the effect of drainage – the area suffers frequently from surface water and drainage related issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic in the vicinity of the site will have an enormous negative impact on air quality in the area. The plan’s own evidence (see submitted annex 4) concludes that sites previously submitted East of Metcalfe Lane are unsuitable for development. It is clear from evidence that this site is not deliverable in the early years of the plan.</p> <p>Poll undertaken by the parish council showed over 95% of respondents were opposed to the plans.</p> <p>Question whether capacity exists in the secondary schools to meet additional growth particularly given closure of Burnholme. Poor bus service and GP surgery has closed.</p>		
	<p>Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.</p>	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross	Comment- no further development to take place until study looking at South Beck by the Council and Internal Drainage Board is completed and required works completed. Recommendation for flood zone 1 and surface water management guidance to be followed.	3/11737	Environment Agency
	Comment- development will have direct or indirect impact on A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11670	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection- the proposal for the site will leave Huntington with very little green space let alone green belt, south of the A1237. The building of a 50% increase will create considerable strain and problems relating to the infrastructure of the area. The A1237 is routinely at a standstill and schools are already full. Drainage problems and standard water issues are on-going concerns. Comment- the quantity of new homes in the plan may not reflect the actual number that is in the eventual planning proposal. The Local Plan indicates only 17, but the actual number in the planning application is 59. The plan doesn't include for any safeguarded land, but it is trying to use all of the buildable land for any future development of recreational requirements.	67/12733	Huntington Parish Council
	Objection – the development of this site would substantially reduce the gap between the edge of the built up area and the ring road. As such it would adversely affect views towards the city and its rural setting. As currently depicted the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.	238/14055	English Heritage
	Objection – the amount of housing proposed is excessive with a lack of infrastructure, the roads are already congested. It could swamp an already large suburb and damage the natural environment.	258/14148	
	Support - support the extension to the urban area for housing at Monks Cross. Further growth in this area is suitable due to the area's sustainability credentials. The site is in close proximity to the A1237 and has frequent bus services to and from the centre of York. The site is adjacent to a proposed strategic employment site and is in close proximity to existing employment opportunities including those at Monks Cross Shopping Park.	331/14187	Monks Cross Shopping Park Trust
	Objection- number of homes is excessive and needs to be reduced- it comes on top of the large John Lewis/Marks and Spencer/ Stadium development. This will create congestion on the A1237 and have a detrimental impact on local roads. The northern section of the outer ring road is already congested. Drainage in Huntington is at its limit already. Unacceptable pressure on existing local facilities, schools, doctors etc. A	527/16651	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	huge take out of the Green Belt and a detrimental impact on Huntington’s character and environmental quality- radically changing the nature of the built/rural boundary for North Huntington. Air quality issues resulting from traffic generation. Reduce the Huntington allocation to a maximum of 400-500, located on an incremental basis to make use of existing infrastructure and services (enhanced locally).		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- it is inappropriately placed in the Green Belt and would put immense strain on local infrastructure. Could mean potentially thousands more cars contributing to congestion problems on the A64 and A1237. Proposed development is unsustainable since the infrastructure is already inadequate for current needs. The roads are congested, schools are oversubscribed and medical services are overburdened. Services for elderly and disabled residents have already declined alarmingly. Excessive development on Green Belt land which could impact upon a large area of surrounding Green Belt which is unacceptable. Serious incompatibility between the proposed development and the duty of care for the natural environment and the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	529/16679	
	Support- wholly supports proposed allocation as it reflects the policies and proposals set out in the Local Plan. Support allocation as it is available for development and it will be brought forward for housing at the earliest opportunity. There are no constraints to early delivery of site. Development is achievable. Allocation well related to urban area and site benefits from access to the local shops and services available in Huntington and Monks Cross. Site is accessible to a wider range of jobs, services and facilities and is a highly sustainable location. Site lie sin flood zone 1 and is a flat, Greenfield site.	534/16712	DPP One Ltd
	Objection- the allocation is inconsistent with development plan policy	544/16765	
	Objection- development will cause havoc on the roads, drains, air pollution etc.	741/16888	
	Objection- proposed development is inappropriately placed in the Green Belt and would undoubtedly put immense strain on the local infrastructure. Could potentially mean thousands more cars contributing to congestion problems on the A64 and A1237. Development is unsustainable, infrastructure already inadequate. Roads are congested, schools are oversubscribed and medical series overburdened. Services for elderly and disabled residents have declined. Further pressure on remaining services would be a cause of serious concern. Development within 5km of Strensall Common a designated SSSI.	835/16903	
	Objection- opposed to the site due to the scale of proposed housing and impact of over 1500 houses on the local road system, congestion and pollution and the marginalising	850/16926	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	effect on the enclave of green belt land between ST8 and A1237. Comment- how many estimated extra vehicle car movements, cars and commercial, will be generated by the development?		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection - new houses will make existing traffic congestion even worse. Object to building on green belt land. Existing schools full. Huntington cannot cope with any more housing.	1045/79	
	Objection- far too large. Ring road already congested. Development should be limited to about a quarter of this site. Also need this green lung. Area prone to flooding.	1144/17082	
	Comment- the development in this area does allow of the reinstatement of the York-Hull railway line.	1207/17111	
	Objection – if the proposals go ahead there will be a considerable effect on the local road network, particularly in light of the concerns expressed by the Highways Agency. The 2,000 homes to the north and south of Monks Cross could have a detrimental impact on the ability of the retail park to thrive and generate economic growth for the city.	1355/17325	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Support – support the allocation of ST8.	1514/17623	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Objection- how can greenbelt land be abused in such a way? How can plans be made for almost 2000 houses in Huntington without any thought to schools, doctors and traffic?	1727/9807	
	Objection – concerned about overdevelopment in Huntington. The infrastructure to support 1,000s of new homes does not accompany the plans. Schools would not be able to support the number of homes or other services such as doctors, roads etc. Proposals erode the open spaces in the area.	1846/9896	
	Objection - the proposals for Huntington are absurd. The effect on local traffic, current housing, schools, and doctors will be catastrophic. Traffic increases will be significant because of the new retail development, never mind thousands of more people living here. Covering yet more of our green belt with concrete will endanger local wildlife and greatly add to the threat of flooding. The drainage system will be unable to cope.	1897/59	
	Objection – area already liable to flooding. The roads and general infrastructure cannot take any more traffic.	1900/9905	
Objection – New Lane premises already suffer from sewerage blockages and poor drainage. More homes will add to the problem. Malton Road often gets grid locked during busy commuting periods. Adding more household traffic to the road would be crazy. What are the plans to extend surgeries, schools and even York hospital for	1919/9912		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	these extra residents?		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued Continued	Objection – traffic congestion would be appalling and very much object to greenbelt land being used.	1934/156	
	Objection - ring road won't be able to cope. Impact on local amenities. Would shops be included? Could doctors and schools cope? End of Broome Close is a large expanse of water which provides a haven for birds and great crested newts. If area is developed water would have to go somewhere and might result in flooded homes.	2277/3260	
	Objection- infrastructure problems and impact on the green belt.	2416/6586	
	Objection- new development would exacerbate existing problems (traffic, noise, congestion and pollution) even more. The local community is already facing increased congestion and pollution the new retail park will generate. Poor access road suitability from existing road network to the proposal development. The Huntington area meant to be a village is becoming built up with housing and retail. There is very little open space; this small piece of green space is a welcome and civilised distraction from the urban sprawl.	2438/6720	
	Objection –New Lane is already very busy. Traffic will increase and cause congestion. There will be extra air pollution caused. Together with the expansion of Monks Cross the area will become extremely busy and the safety of all put at risk. New houses will impact on the local schools. Do they have space? Are the new homes really needed? Is there another brownfield site more suitable? This area of greenbelt land will provide open space between the existing community and Monks Cross, something that is considered to very important to residents in order to retain its character. Drainage and sewerage systems in Huntington are often problematic. Can the new houses be efficiently included in the existing systems without additional problems?	2440/6722	
	Objection –New Lane is already very busy. Traffic will increase and cause congestion. There will be extra air pollution caused. Together with the expansion of Monks Cross the area will become extremely busy and the safety of all put at risk. New houses will impact on the local schools. Do they have space? Are the new homes really needed? Is there another brownfield site more suitable? This area of greenbelt land will provide open space between the existing community and Monks Cross, something that is considered to very important to residents in order to retain its character. Drainage and sewerage systems in Huntington are often problematic. Can the new houses be efficiently included in the existing systems without additional problems?	2441/6724	
Objection- this is greenbelt land, and there are many brownfield sites which could be used. The volume of traffic on New Lane would be greatly increased.	2584/6927		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- development will use the outer ring road which already suffers from severe congestion.	2638/6993	
	Objection- Huntington is the focus for far immense over development in terms of housing and retail vicinity. There is much more traffic on New Lane resulting from growth already.	2652/7025	
	Objection- drainage and sewerage, traffic already a problem in Huntington with no plans readily available for dealing with it.	2670/7070	
	Objection- any more housing builds will add to congestion.	2674/7086	
	Objection- proposal to build homes on the greenbelt between North Lane and Monks Cross is nothing short of madness. Roads cannot cope with traffic as it is. Local infrastructure would not cope. Need new schools, new GP surgeries, leisure facilities and none of this is mentioned in any of the plans. Who is going to live in these houses?	2725/7219	
	Objection- land has poor drainage. Where will pupils of school age go to school? One primary and comprehensive school are both oversubscribed. Strensall Road and the outer ring road both congested at peak times. The proposed infill will turn the area into another big commuter sprawl of outer York. At the very north of the proposal development is a habitat of deer, foxes, owls and many more creatures. 200/300/400 houses may well be acceptable but 1500 in one area certainly not. Understand people need houses in York but a smaller development would be more in keeping with this pleasant area.	2945/7702	
	Comment- agrees that Huntington/York needs new housing. This density far exceeds the number needed and this expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the area and environment. There is already great pressure on the road network- schools and the hospital. The local infrastructure will be compromised.	2961/7736	
	Comment- noted that more housing is needed but in the village of Huntington the infrastructure is such- school for primary is already full. Extra traffic is not adequate. Does not object to the housing proposals to Monks Cross, maybe this is where this is where a new school should be situated?	2971/7752	
	Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area. Will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	3001/7822	
	Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area. Will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	3002/7826	
Objection- land prone to flooding. Infrastructure- no proposed increase to the local	3183/8190		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	primary school, doctors or dentists. Roads- busy enough at the moment. North lane is a very narrow road with no drainage facilities or curbing. Capacity- has it been proved that there is a need for all this proposed housing. Employment- already building M&S and John Lewis which will result in more cars.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- Huntington has seen a large amount of development including housing and retail. Monks Cross including the new stadium. John Lewis and Marks & Spencer will attract a lot more traffic. The schools in the local area do not have capacity. There are other areas in the city which have not been affected by so much development. Huntington has already had its fair share and other areas should be used for extra housing.	3184/8192	
	Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area; will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. Green belt should not be used until brown field sites are fully developed over all total house building of 2000 homes in greenbelt Huntington is unrealistic. There should be no further building on New Lane. To meet any demand, new roads, new drainage, new facilities (schools, shops, leisure clubs) would be essential. When Monks Cross & stadium completed, traffic congestion is unavoidable unless new roads are built to accommodate homes, leisure and shopping.	3185/8193	
	Objection- these areas are important for wildlife and birds. The destruction of the hedgerows would remove habitat for birds. Deer and foxes in these areas have been seen. These areas important to soak away major rainfall. Increase in housing would create more traffic on already busy roads and the schools, doctors etc wouldn't be able to cope. Would be better to have development more spread and to retain the green spaces. If so many new houses are needed essentially a new village ought to be developed. These can be developed with their own schools and services so that they won't damage communities. This would mean Huntington's busy enough roads won't get worse and wont increase air pollution.	3186/8197	
	Objection- green belt land should be kept for as long as possible and use brownfield sites, as it will harm our area of Huntington and New Lane. The drainage and sewerage are quite bad now.	3187/8199	
	Objection- there are enough brown sites in York to be developed before starting building on green sites. Huntington cannot sustain 2000 more homes on green belt land. More traffic – absolute chaos. To meet reasonable demand, new drainage, new roads, new facilities, shops, leisure, schools, doctors must be implemented. Monks Cross and stadium will vastly increase traffic congestion.	3188/8202	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- development will cause more congestion, increase air pollution, cause problems with drainage and sewerage. The site of green belt north has a population of great crested newts. It is important to safeguard habitats.	3189/8204	
	Objection- a problem with this site is the drainage. It is frequently waterlogged. Traffic in the local area is already a problem. Further homes would lead to gridlock on a weekend. The impact on wildlife would be terrible. Some of the fields are ancient, dating back to medieval times, there are remains of ridge and furrow. Will all heritage be lost to development?	3191/8211	
	Objection- how will infrastructure hold up? How will local schools cope with numbers? Are the numbers correct for these areas considering all the other factors? Traffic is already struggling. Reduce number of houses and invest the rest of the money into improving infrastructure: drains, roads, and schooling.	3192/8213	
	Objection- area prone to heavy flooding during periods of heavy rain. The existing drainage system is already undersized. The roads are too narrow to accommodate the extra vehicles that will be forced onto them. The local schools are stretched; the existing doctors and dental practices are under pressure already. Where are the jobs for the influx of new people? The John Lewis/ Marks & Spencer development will bring even more traffic into Huntington. There will be a loss of green belt which seems to be the easy option of choice rather than use brownfield sites.	3193/8217	
	Objection- new lane cannot cater for more traffic. Local schools- impossible to increase intake. The clay area is prone to flooding. Leave green field sites alone after all brown field sites of which there are many.	3194/8219	
	Objection- huge amounts of traffic created. Flooding always been a concern down New Lane. Schools, doctors are going to be inundated. Unfair amount of new building in Huntington especially on green field sites when brown sites available elsewhere.	3195/8222	
	Objection- all these houses are not required, roads already crowded. Schools are full. Opposed to using green field sites.	3196/8224	
	Objection- effects on local services and community. Where will people work? The road network is far too narrow for more traffic. There is problem with drainage in this area.	3197/8227	
	Objection- are 22000 houses really needed? Is there to be a new drainage system to cope with extra sewage, new roads to cope with extra cars, probably new school. Where are the people who buy these houses going to work? All York's workforce has been terminated, rail, Nestle, Cravens, Terry's.	3198/8229	
	Objection- no mention of Land drainage Act, section 24/5 survey. Yet refer to flood events before and after this survey. Do consultants know of very widespread electric	3199/8231	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	failure and where the New Lane area drains into the Foss? Why aren't the Internal Drainage Board boundaries shown on the maps? Why does it refer to the water coming across by Tower Street, the latter would no doubt be covered by an Environment Agency scheme alongside the Ouse?		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- not convinced the large numbers given are needed or desirable, it will put much strain on the infrastructure around Monks Cross and Huntington. Disagree about building in green field land. All brownfield land should be built on first. The amount of traffic in the area will treble causing all sorts of problems.	3200/8233	
	Objection – housing on New Lane not done yet so that will create even more pressure on schools, doctors, shops and traffic. Does not appear to be any suggestion of definite plans for extra local shops. Current doctor's surgery is already taking a week to wait for an appointment. Local schools are not big enough to cater for such an influx if both New Lane and Monks Cross are developed.	3201/8235	
	Comment – development of ST8 and ST11 will cause severe congestion and impact on the drainage and sewerage which is already a problem.	3202/8238	
	Objection – getting a doctors appointment can be difficult at present without putting more demand on the system. Are there sufficient school places? Are there enough jobs in the economy in the York economy? Huntington is congested enough.	3204/8242	
	Objection – Development of ST8 and ST11 will harm the area, cause severe congestion, air pollution, and impact on drains and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. Schools and doctors are already struggling to accommodate the rising residents in the area. Where are the people coming to these houses going to work? There is no work, jobs etc in the city or surrounding area. The safety of the roads is a big worry. Huntington is a village. Impact on wildlife.	3207/8254	
	Objection – will put an overwhelming load on the drainage system and roads. The A1237 cannot cope with the current levels of traffic.	3252/8346	
	Objection – the development of ST8 and ST11 will harm the unique character of Huntington. It will cause severe congestion and impact greatly on sewerage and drainage systems.	3267/8390	
	Objection – the site is easily waterlogged and will require much drainage, this in turn will destroy habitat for wildlife. Will change the character of Huntington. There will be too great a strain on the infrastructure. Roads in Huntington may be adequate at present but further development will put a great strain on the existing system. The community facilities such as schools and health provision will be under strain.	3269/8394	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – Drainage and sewerage can be a big problem in Huntington. More roads would have to be built.	3270/8399	
	Objection – ST8 and ST11 would make Huntington a town rather than the current village. The existing schools and doctors surgeries would not cope with all the extra people. The extra traffic generated would be horrendous.	3286/8431	
	Objection – development of ST8 and ST11 will harm the unique character of the area; will cause severe traffic congestion, air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage systems which area already a major problem in Huntington.	3343/8525	
	Objection – main concern is the scale of the proposals and lack of infrastructure, including motor vehicle transport which is already congested, the sewerage system with no detail on how it will cope, drainage and flooding which is already an existing problem with no detail on how it will be dealt with, and the water table with no study or detail on the effects of pouring areas of concrete over Huntington will have on an already rising water table.	3349/8537	
	Objection – Huntington is already full. The drains are always blocked. York is as city, Huntington is not, land is green for people to look at and provide a country feel. New houses are the last thing Huntington needs.	3351/8541	
	Objection – along with ST11, object to the proposed building of 1500+ houses. Will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village and the village amenities such as doctors and schools. Will cause further congestion especially on the A1237. Should redevelop brownfield sites. New proposed development plans should include clear explanation of how these developments can be sustainable ad how they will not adversely affect the existing residents.	3352/8545	
	Objection – main objection is the impact on the drainage and sewerage in the area. Brownfield sites are available and should be used first. This green area between York and Huntington is valuable to birds and wildlife and helps absorb noise and air pollution caused by the heavy flows of traffic using Monks Cross. Houses built here would be subject to disturbance from the loudspeaker systems of the proposed stadium and the floodlights on match days. Second objection is the extra traffic that would be created. Third objection is that the proposed development seems to be excessive in the Huntington area. Whilst more housing is needed more use should be made of unused buildings and brownfield sites before green belt land is considered. Also doubts if the schools and medical facilities could cope with such a large increase in population.	3355/8561	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – along with ST11, the development of these sites will harm the unique character of the area and cause severe congestion (especially on New Lane). Will also impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a problem in Huntington.	3359/8611	
	Objection – along with ST11, these two areas cover a disproportionate area of Huntington compare to other parts of the 'city area'. They would remove all green areas from within Huntington. Huntington is already being developed and built over to a very significant degree. The transport and drainage infrastructure is already overloaded. Further development on the scale proposed is totally unrealistic. The local facilities cannot cope.	3361/8621	
	Objection – concerned that there are insufficient facilities such as schools, doctor's, roads as well as loss of substantial greenbelt. The village of Huntington will be lost in identity. The area will become too populated having more traffic delays for locals.	3366/8634	
	Objection – the infrastructure in Huntington will never cope with the scale of the proposed expansion. Schools are already full and the traffic is already at almost optimum levels.	3372/8653	
	Objection – land is largely marshy in nature and subject to flooding. Will therefore require significantly greater land preparation costs than the average. An upgraded administrative infrastructure will be needed to support the increase in population. Roads are already heavily used, no proposals to upgrade the transport capacity. Upgraded local resources for all ages will be needed such as education, medical and caring services, shopping, public and residential parking, sports and recreational facilities, policing and emergency services. Public utilities covering power, water, communications, drainage and sewerage will need major upgrade.	3373/8659	
	Objection – would be of a density much greater than the existing built area of Huntington. The whole area suffers from bad drainage and some places inefficient sewerage. There appears to be no allowance for extra school places, recreation fields, partks etc. or additional health services or local shops. Housing should not be put in such close vicinity of the A237. If this road was to be dualled – fast becoming a necessity- there would be no room to do it. The extra traffic brought by the development would bring the roads to a standstill. Pedestrian crossing of the A1237 is already difficult.	3374/8661	
	Objection – appreciate the need for some new homes but object most strongly to the proposals to include 1,569 homes towards the A1237. The proposals in the area will see the strangulation of Huntington and will be almost double its size. This will in turn severely disrupt traffic flow which is already congested. There will be a greater strain	3394/8693	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on drainage and sewerage which is already a severe problem. No mention is made to healthcare and education. Infrastructure is not able to support and maintain this level of building and subsequent population.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection- the increase in cars using the A1237 will rise dramatically. The area will become a construction site until 2030 and construction vehicles will add to the volume of traffic resulting in major disruption and the lowering of quality of life. Will also lead to a steep rise in air pollution from increased car exhaust emissions as well as massive congestion and raised health hazards.	3428/8779	
	Objection - will cause harm to the character of the area. Will further exacerbate the situation with drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem.	3461/8885	
	Objection – congestion along the A1237 will be greatly exacerbated by the additional traffic from the already expanding business and retail parks at Monks Cross and this to be added to with homes planned for the north of Huntington. Will considerably compromise a road already functioning at near capacity.	3571/9520	
	Objection – question the scale of development proposed for Huntington. New development of this scale is likely to attract many young families, so wither the development should be smaller or provision of schooling must be an integral part of the development. Would affect the sense of community and thus the well being of new and current residents. Considered vital that there is new provision for community facilities and not simply expect the current community facilities to absorb so many additional people. Concerned about the spiritual provision for any new residents and ask that any community facilities provided includes space where services could be held. Concerned about where these people will find employment. Access is a major issue. The provision of public transport within the development should be provided.	3584/9545	Church Of England Parish Of Huntington, Earswick & New Earswick
	Objection – the land is green belt designated as such to prevent urban sprawl and loss of countryside and agricultural land. Huntington is low lying and very boggy even with modern drainage. Will add to the already overcrowded ring road. Massive pollution from this will be made worse. No consideration has been given to school provision. Doctor’s practices are also full. The local bus service is poor and unreliable so people will be using their cars instead.	3594/9574	
	Objection – the planned development at ST8 is ill conceived. North Lane is no more than a country lane unable to cope with this sort of proposed development. Area is subject to flooding. Where will the additional children find education?	3799/10243	
	Objection – would be real shame. Promised that the green belt would be kept as green belt.	3838/10313	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – the planned development at ST8 is ill conceived. North Lane is no more than a country lane unable to cope with this sort of proposed development. Area is subject to flooding. Where will the additional children find education?	3842/10325	
	Objection – will harm the unique character of the area and will cause significant congestion and pollution.	3852/10346	
	Objection – the land is a problem for drainage, a great deal is clay. There are no access roads and do not want more cars in the area.	3856/10359	
	Objection - will harm the unique character of the area and will cause severe congestion and pollution, impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. Schools, hospitals and social services are already struggling to cope. More homes means more cars on the road.	3954/10522	
	Objection – will give rise to adding to the existing unacceptable congestion.	3958/10538	
	Objection – should think about sorting out the drainage and sewerage system before thinking about building anymore houses. There is already a problem with standing water and old drainage system. The roads around Huntington are too small for the volume of traffic. The school is overflowing as it is. Doctor’s surgeries wouldn’t be able to cope. There are no jobs in York and no industry at all.	3981/10587	
	Objection – ST8 and ST11 will cause severe congestion and air pollution, have an impact on drainage and sewerage (already a major problem), have an impact on medical services and overload an already poor transport system.	4003/10620	
	Objection – ST8 and ST11 will cause severe congestion and air pollution, have an impact on drainage and sewerage (already a major problem), have an impact on medical services and overload an already poor transport system.	4012/10636	
	Objection – too many houses proposed, not enough schools and the traffic will be a nightmare.	4037/10676	
	Objection – housing need is far too much for the area. Where will all the children go to school? There will be more congestion. Nursery provision will be needed. Makes more sense to maximise the use of brownfield sites first. What about access to sites for construction traffic and other large vehicles?	4044/10696	
Objection – oppose plans to use green belt land in Huntington.	4046/10708		
Objection – object to the proposed new housing at ST8. It is a Greenfield site. Object to development on green field sites until all existing brownfield sites have been developed.	4050/10719		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – who are the people and where do they come from to occupy the proposed dwellings.	4051/10721	
	Objection – the infrastructure has already been compromised, local schools are full, GP practises are over worked and unable to offer appointments to its residents, congestion of the out ring road is already causing chaos and Huntington has flooded and has sewerage problems.	4063/10741	
	Objection – unrealistic expansion resulting in quantity not quality of life. There is already pollution. Traffic and sewerage are at bursting point. Flooding is a serious problem. More houses means more people which demands more cars, schools, GPs, policing, amenities, resulting in more environmental damage, noise, pollution, traffic and over crowding.	4096/10787	
	Objection – problems with flooding in this area. The sewerage system cannot cope with the present, how can it cope with more houses. How is access to be achieved, down Broome Close? This is a narrow road as it North Moor and not fit for large numbers of vehicles. What about the wildlife, we are loosing the bee population. More thought must be given to the residents who already live here.	4098/10792	
	Objection – oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington.	4101/10802	
	Objection – north lane being narrow would be unsuitable for all traffic meaning builders and contractors plant using Broome Close for access and on completion future occupants likewise. How will local facilities cope? Appointments are not easy to come by at the local doctors, the local primary school is adequate at the present time but not much extra room for a sizeable intake as would be needed. The bus service at present is laughable.	4102/10804	
	Objection – village infrastructure cannot cope with extensive housing as it is under pressure now. Drainage and sewerage are a major problem without adding to the problem.	4130/10839	
	Objection – will cause more congestion and pollution and will alter the rural nature of Huntington.	4134/10846	
	Objection – greenbelt land must be protected, there are plenty of brownfield sites that can be used. North and east of York has been proposed to take up much of the new housing while sites to the west have been untouched. The infrastructure is totally inadequate. Traffic chaos. There are not enough schools, doctors, jobs, police, street cleaners, waste bins and road repairs. The area is prone to flooding. Impact on wildlife through loss of habitat.	4169/10897	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – Huntington is and hopefully will stay, a small community with a village feel. To add more new housing on top of existing plans is staggering. Do not need this amount of houses here. The land floods, the schools are full and the Primary School already has to use Portakabins. The Doctors and dentists are full and the traffic is horrendous. Huntington is full and cannot take anymore. Who will want to live between a cemetery and a travellers site?	4174/10904	
	Objection – will fundamentally alter Huntington. The infrastructure is inadequate. The roads will be even more congested. There is already a drainage problem. Extra housing will exacerbate the problem. Without these issues being sorted out before such development takes place the situation will be made worse. There are too many houses planned. The air quality will be made worse with the extra traffic and the removal of the open green belt land. Not convinced the houses are needed, cannot see that there will be sufficient work in the area to support the families.	4177/10907	
	Objection – don't start building on green belt land when there are plenty of brownfield sites. Too many houses for Huntington as there are very few facilities.	4192/10916	
	Objection – together with ST11, the building of 2,000 houses on the green belt is astronomical in any terms. The drainage and sewerage systems already cause problems. Huntington Village has had more than its fair share of developments and these proposals would completely spoil the character of the area. The traffic generated would be particularly unbearable.	4193/10918	
	Objection – to build so many houses is completely impractical. Schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists in the local area already cannot cope with the growing population. The hospital has severe problems with Accident and Emergency for example. The local school runs to capacity and there is no room for growth and expansion. Many dentists are too full to accept NHS patients. Facilities in the area could not cope with such an influx of population. There is already a high drainage problem in Huntington with a long history of flooding. Huntington is at huge risk of congestion with the new stadium not to mention a high increase of cars with new houses. There will be a decline in the air quality and risk of pollution. House values will decline significantly. Unclear why green belt land is being used when there are other options.	4268/11070	
	Objection – will harm the unique character of the area and will cause severe traffic congestion and air pollution.	4287/11119	
	Comment – considers it more relevant to see how the roads, drainage etc cope with the monks cross retail development and stadium before considering extra housing. Queries how the council expects to create space for the children requiring education	4290/11126	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	around the Huntington area when there are only two primary schools and one secondary full to capacity already. Extra housing will block the A1237 completely.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – new houses means more people, more cars hence more traffic. The schools will not be able to cope. Poor drainage, the area floods regularly.	4291/11131	
	Objection – development of ST8 and ST11 will harm the environment and will cause extra traffic congestion and have an adverse impact on drainage which is already a problem in Huntington. Where are the jobs and schools for the children? Are the houses intended not for York people but incomers from Leeds who will be commuting this aggravating traffic congestion?	4300/11152	
	Objection – the loss of the green belt and the scale of the new housing planned are such that the local environment will be ruined and an unbearable strain placed on amenities and services but without any benefit for Huntington residents.	4301/11156	
	Objection – ill thought out and would be a disaster for the wildlife and well being of the residents. The area already has trouble with drainage and sewerage, the land floods easily. Would cause even greater congestion and make travelling anywhere difficult. Where there is no home for wildlife there is no wildlife. The wholesale destruction of natural habitat is unacceptable. Are there any plans to build more schools or enlarge the existing ones? The area is already over developed.	4304/11166	
	Objection – considered to be completely wrong to propose building on this green belt land. It was designated green belt precisely to prevent such schemes. Also there are not sufficient schools, medical services or suitable roads to support such a plan. North lane is far too narrow for such traffic as the proposed plan would generate. The roads are often flooded in this area in wet weather. This could cause lots of trouble for future residents.	4310/11187	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed to be built in Huntington along with all the other developments is far in excess of what the local infrastructure can support. Namely traffic, schools, medical services, sewerage and all other services that will be needed.	4312/11191	
	Objection – will completely ruin a very pleasant area where there is currently a good mix of housing and farmland/open spaces. There is not the infrastructure to support the proposals. The new development ongoing at monks cross has already grid locked traffic. What standard of housing is proposed? In current market conditions will any actually be sold at all.	4338/11254	
	Objection - consider that the assumptions made in Policy H3 about the scale of new housing development that will be delivered by ST8 within the plan period is over-	4355/11605	Henry Boot Development Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	optimistic. The assumed build out rates are simply too high and are unsustainable/ undeliverable, even assuming construction will take place by several builders simultaneously. It is recommended that the following revised, yet still aspirational yield assumptions are included in Policy H3 – 1,000 dwellings.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – Huntington does not have the infrastructure to support these developments and people. Drainage is poor, roads are busy and will get more so with the new monks cross shops. Schools are full with local children having to take places at more distant schools.	4357/11288	
	Objection – what about schools in the area, the two primary schools are already dull and the secondary school has no further room for expansion. Main objection is to its size, access to the A1237/A64 and lack of infrastructure.	4467/11473	
	Comment – can the A1237 and local school cope with the housing proposed at ST8? Hops that affordable housing will be maximised. Is there adequate drainage infrastructure? Is the number 9 park and ride car park big enough for this proposed development? Will there be an adequate bus service better than the current one?	4469/11485	
	Objection – will have a devastating effect on the local area. The roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic and also cause more pollution. The drainage will also suffer and will probably end with localised flooding as the water will have nowhere to go.	4698/11989	
	Objection – the idea that Heworth Without can cope with the proposed level of housing is ludicrous and entirely inappropriate. It will result in severe congestion, adversely impact on supply of existing services/resources/infrastructure, the plans are unsustainable.	4721/12019	
	Objection – the land is always waterlogged, why build on land that houses will subside. There will be more pollution; the local schools are already full.	4730/14263	
	Objection – access roads cannot cope now. If there are family homes then it warrants a new school. There are flooding problems in the area.	4748/14268	
	Objection – completely against any housing development in the ST8 area. Surprised that ST8 has not been included in York’s Strays and Green Wedges or classified as a nature conservation site. Has seen owls, bats and wild deer on and around white horse farm. Does not believe that 1,569 dwellings is a realistic figure and needs reviewing.	4771/12065	
	Objection – will harm the character of the area which is already congested and will get worse with the new developments at monks cross with John Lewis, Marks & Spencer and the new stadium. Drainage is bad enough, the fields often flood, where will this water go if they are developed?	4777/12067	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection - along with ST11 will spoil and harm the outlook of the area. There are plenty of brownfield sites that should be used first. The impact will be huge – volume of traffic, the streets will no longer be safe for children to bike to school. The impact on air pollution and drainage which is already a major problem, doctor’s surgeries in Huntington. Wildlife will be affected massively; spoiling what is marvellous about Huntington.	4778/12069	
	Objection – main concern is the scale of the proposals and lack of infrastructure, including motor vehicle transport which is already congested, the sewerage system with no detail on how it will cope, drainage and flooding which is already an existing problem with no detail on how it will be dealt with, and the water table with no study or detail on the effects of pouring areas of concrete over Huntington will have on an already rising water table.	4791/14278	
	Objection - would advise against putting more houses in the vicinity of Monks Cross. The area will become totally clogged with traffic as it is. This problem should also be carefully looked at with regard to other possible sites for houses. Good road systems are essential.	4810/12122	
	Objection - Current proposals for increasing retail (Monks Cross) appear to take no heed or account of the existing Local Authority figures. It appears that development increases as does the capacity of the road. Would therefore object to the increase in proposed housing within this area. Will put undue pressure on the already congested northern ring road.	4813/12129	
	Objection - object strongly to the proposed building on green field sites in Huntington. All existing brownfield sites should be used first - there are plenty available. If these green belt sites are released for building, these will obviously be used first as an easy option in preference to brown field. The total number of houses proposed for these areas is massive. The infrastructure is non-existent - schools and doctors are stretched now, and there are already problems with sewerage and drainage - this would increase massively. There are concerns regarding access roads on the Lea Way - Avon Drive site. North Lane is narrow and already carries a lot of traffic, and the ring road is choked at times. Will the new traffic use the ring road, or will it have to come through the already busy village? A total of 1,569 houses on this site is untenable - it absolutely swamps the existing area. The whole character of Huntington as a village will be lost by being swamped to such a degree. The new stores at Monks Cross will bring in a terrific amount of new traffic as it is – this area cannot cope with further congestion. With all the extra traffic, there is the great possibility of unwanted	5171/12307	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accidents. Many children walk to the schools through the village.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection - 2000 homes are to be planned to be developed on New Lane and Monks cross land. Already have the largest shopping park development planned for Monks Cross without any discussion about plans for all the extra traffic and now we are looking at a further 2000 homes planned for the area with all their extra traffic movements, again with no plans to improve the roads around Monks Cross or to improve the A1237 and the A1036. Sections of the A1237 should be dualled before any new homes are built and should be at the least upgraded, before the shopping park opens.	5194/12417	
	Objection – there is congestion now, the infrastructure would not be able to cope well with this. Air quality would be adversely affected. The area would be ruined by overdevelopment. Would affect highway safety for children.	5372/14583	
	Objection – will harm the unique character of the area, will cause severe traffic congestion and will overload the existing facilities and infrastructure. Air quality will suffer with the resultant air pollution.	5392/14637	
	Objection – strongly question the strategy of encouraging the building of up to 6000 dwellings which would access the A1237. The A1237 will not become a dual carriageway due to financial constraints; if developers are expected to fund large road improvements then these sites will remain undeveloped.	5520/14933	Campaign For Real Democracy
	Objection – why is the majority of housing being concentrated around Huntington? The area is already saturated by heavy traffic. If the proposed residents of these houses are going to commute to Leeds then they should live on the south of the city. Why no house in the Naburn, Acaster Malbis, Bishopthorpe, Askham Bryan/Richard and Poppleton areas? All of which have easier access to the south bound A64. Why are you destroying the greenbelt?	5528/14943	
	Objection – concerned about new housing on the A1237 due to the extra amount of traffic it will bring. The traffic is already backed up at the evening rush hour. Also, how are children going to get across the roads to go to school and will this put a strain on the local schools?	5533/14954	
	Objection – the A1237 cannot cope with existing traffic and new housing estates will introduce even more congestion. Not against building on the greenbelt however any development in this location must be accompanied by an enhancement of the northern ring road. Failure to do this will introduce great inefficiencies in travelling time and increase pollution for those who do not travel in and out of the city centre each day.	5544/14971	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – should not be developed as proposed as Huntington’s character is already being eroded and this development would destroy what little is left of its village community spirit. The existing infrastructure could not cope with housing expansion on this scale.	5601/13147	
	Objection – too large and should be scaled down. The implications for services, public transport and access to open space needs to be considered.	5609/13184	
	Objection – suggests that Huntington has already expanded to its limits. There should be no more expansion. The effect on traffic and drainage with Monks Cross 2 has not yet been experienced and further development will be intolerable. The primary school is already full.	5610/13187	
	Objection – 2,000 houses in Huntington is too many and traffic would be even more of a nightmare than it is at present.	5632/13255	
	Objection – would not like their view replacing with a housing estate when there are more suitable brownfield and derelict sites available. At present traffic in the area is poor when the shopping centre is open. Where is the proposed entrance going to be? Existing drainage is poor and will not cope. Which school will the new resident’s children go to? Or is another new school on the agenda?	5657/13305	
	Objection – disagree with the proposal to take green belt land for development. It is finally coming into play to protect Huntington from urban sprawl but the proposals for ST8 and ST11 simply ignore the long term future planning that created them. The number of houses proposed is excessive. The infrastructure in Huntington, the schools, doctors, the drainage and the sewerage will not be able to cope with many more homes. The drainage problem in particular is serious.	5659/13311	
	Objection – why are you building over Greenfield sites when there are brownfield sites standing derelict? An appalling use of land resources. 2,000 new homes is too much for Huntington to cope with. Where are the new schools and hospitals that will be needed? How will the ring road possibly cope with the extra traffic?	5661/13319	
	Objection – How can Huntington cope with this massive influx of new residents, the schools are not big enough, the health facilities are not big enough, the roads cannot cope with the extra volumes of traffic. The massive impact on the drainage system. ST8 and ST11 will have a massive negative impact on the area with air pollution, traffic congestion, over stretched health and education facilities.	5669/13343	
	Objection – the percentage of green belt land proposed to be used at Huntington is ridiculous, nearly all the green belt there is. There are many brownfield sites available. Infrastructure will not cope with the proposed development.	5675/13374	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	<p>Objection - seems certain there will be an increased number of short car journeys between ST8 and ST11 to the large retailers at ST18. Public transport is unlikely to prevent such an increase. The roads are already congested; concerned that little or no thought has been given to the impact substantially increased traffic volume will have on the road system in Huntington. Does not understand how York's green infrastructure will be conserved or enhanced by eroding monk stray with ST8 or how this will strengthen the network of strays. The size of ST8 damages monk stray and invites urban sprawl that will make York a less not more attractive place to live.</p>	5678/13382	
	<p>Objection – the proposed developments in Huntington and the suburban sprawl it entails will destroy what is left of the rural character of Huntington. Plans are over ambitious and unsustainable as they will undoubtedly put a great strain on existing amenities in the area. Where are the additional infrastructure proposals identified to support the additional housing? The arterial road systems in the area are incapable of dealing with the additional traffic that will be generated. Huntington is well known to have a very high water table and the fields on which the houses are to be built regularly suffer from standing water during periods of heavy rain. How is this issue to be addressed?</p>	5711/13455	
	<p>Objection – it is impractical and at best over sized. Must assume that such a strategic development is intended to encourage update by inward moving families, assumes it carries with it the burden of supporting increased capacity on the local roads and in the local schools. The traffic increase resulting from the combination of the proposed housing and the near by developments at the monks cross retail and business sites mean that traffic congestion will become uncontrollable. All the schools in the immediate locale are already over subscribed. The area to be concreted over already suffers adverse effects after periods of continued rainfall. Huntington is known to have a high water table. Where will the rainfall go once the green fields have been concreted over?</p>	5788/13708	
	<p>Objection – the area is already heavily saturated with few green spaces. Residential streets are now used as cut thoughts from monks cross. More residents feeding onto these roads will make it impossible for those living in those streets, together with the extra traffic enticed to the new monks cross retail development. Local first time buyers trying to get on the housing ladder should be given priority of nay housing built in the area.</p>	5789/13709	
	<p>Objection – concerned about the detrimental effect this over development will have on the village of Huntington and York. Drainage and sewerage is already a high problem</p>	5841/13819	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and fears this will increase to a much higher level with the building of more houses. It is an outrage to even consider destroying this wildlife oasis. Doctor's surgeries already struggle to accommodate patients. The hospital is fit to burst. Schools are struggling with the number of children in the classrooms. The York by pass is virtually grid locked at certain times of the day.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – the infrastructure is not in place to cope with the amount of housing proposed. The whole of Huntington would need a complete overall of the drainage system to withstand the extra housing. More schools will be needed. Road congestion is already very heavy and set to get heavier with the new shopping development at monks cross, extra housing would increase this.	5847/13840	
	Objection – totally opposed to any further development of green belt land around Huntington, brownfield sites should be developed. The development of ST8 is unrealistic and will destroy the character of Huntington, destroy trees and hedgerows, will cause server congestion and if Broome Close is opened up this will become a rat run for cars and increase pollution. There are already issues with drainage and sewerage. Schools and Hospitals are already at capacity and will not cope with the additional people.	5857/15116	
	Objection – object to proposals to build up to 2,000 new homes in monks cross and along new lane, largely because of the huge scale of the development and the resulting increase in traffic that it will bring.	5892/15194	
	Comment – people need homes but also the necessary facilities. The congestion on the ring road around Monks Cross is a menace. Roads need attention first. School places need to be made available before children arrive. Doctors and Transport are just two other facilities which will be stretched.	5894/15199	
	Objection – totally against any future developments in or around Huntington. There is no call for all the new housing in such a large scale around York.	6025/15425	
	Support – the move to develop at Clifton, Haxby, Wigginton and Monks Cross seems a more coherent plan for development, particularly as the four new railway stations are intended to serve these areas.	6121/15544	
	Objection – greenfield site with insufficient infrastructure. There is not sufficient space and resources available at the local primary school. Unless new schools are provided would increase the requirement for cross York school round for parents resulting in increased traffic along the local roads and York outer bypass. Roads in the area already suffer from serious congestion.	6175/15707	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – the local roads and outer ring road can not take the extra amount of traffic. There will have to be major alterations to junctions on North Lane and traffic would have to be restricted to 20mph in all areas. Pathways to Monks Cross shopping areas must be put in place to allow access to shopping without using cars or bus transport. Open spaces need to be put in for parks etc. Roundabouts are too small and not very effective, don't want a rat run down Broome Close and don't like large traffic build up in early afternoons.	6219/15759	
	Objection – A1237 is horrendous already. Proposed development would increase the traffic on the A1237. Could extend the current proposed development off the A64 (Whinthorpe) by the sum of the ST14, ST9 and ST8.	6286/15889	
	Objection – the addition of so many homes will mean more cars on the roads and dangerous levels of congestion, especially in the triangle of the Oakgate Shopping Development, Monks Cross North and Bad Bargain Lane.	6374/16097	
	Objection – at present the roads very quickly get congested but there is no guarantee that any of the roads will be upgraded so there will be massive expansion of traffic congestion and increased pollution. The local primary school is already at maximum capacity with no chance of expansion. What measures will be put in place to prevent flooding? What measures have been guaranteed to improve all the local infrastructure, including sewerage and drainage. The area already suffers from poor bus service. Have all brownfield sites been developed before considering green belt land. Can the local health facilities including the hospital cope with the increased numbers. The proposals will destroy the whole character and attraction of York.	6392/16133	
	Objection – flooding and drainage has been a worsening problem in Huntington these problems have had a major impact on sporting life in the village with many football matches having to be postponed due to excess water on the playing fields. The ever increasing concrete jungle will further affect these drainage problems. The roads cannot cope with the increase. Fears that a serious accident(s) may well occur due to the increased numbers of cars.	6427/16148	Huntington Rovers Football Club
	Objection – will generate more vehicles in and around Huntington. The infrastructure of the village can not sustain the planned developments, especially drainage of surface water and sewerage. The concrete jungle keeps on increasing, a once rural village is being spoilt by over development. Can the local schools, health centres and roads cope? Will the planned developments affect the value of existing properties?	6428/16150	
	Objection – the development of brownfield sites should be maximised first. Bringing large numbers of people into the area will overpower the two primary schools. Where	6437/16155	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will these people work? Jobs first.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – Broome Close is already used a cut through by people coming off the A1237. The nature of the close can make it quite dangerous should two vehicles meet. The primary and secondary school are already at full capacity. It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment. Can York District Hospital really cope with an increase in population?	6449/16174	
	Objection – The wildlife is appreciated in the area with dears, fox, different birds and crested newts. Great shame to the environment to build on these fields. The field does have a flooding problem but this brings all sorts of wildlife to it. Presume that development of this scale would have a whole new infrastructure with new shops, pubs, school. Libraries, doctors, parks etc. The existing infrastructure would not hope. If Broome Close is extended then the cul-de-sac will be lost where children currently play in the street.	6471/16193	
	Objection – oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington. Will harm the unique character of the area, and cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	6477/16201	
	Objection – access is very important. Sole access through Broom Close would mean a great deal of traffic through a narrow road. Some open space should be left as at the moment there area has a lot of wild life. The large oak tree at the end of the road much be protected. The area does not have the necessary shops, schools etc to support a gigantic rise in population. There will be even more traffic.	6479/16203	
	Objection – the roads will not cope with extra traffic	6482/6422	
	Objection – already have a drainage problem. Traffic to monks cross especially on a weekend is manic. More houses will make it worse. Will harm the unique character of the area. Oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington.	6484/16207	
	Objection – already have drainage problems, with monks cross in the area there is a lot of traffic. Will harm the unique character of the area. Will cause air pollution. Oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington.	6485/16210	
	Objection – will swallow up more of the countryside and the infrastructure is not there to support it.	6491/16217	
	Objection – oppose the use of green belt land in and around Huntington. Aware of the need for affordable housing but does not believe that allowing developers to build on valuable green belt is the answer. Developers crowd it with low quality housing for maximum profit, stretching local infrastructure beyond its capacity. Not only do the local community loose the open space, vies and the well being, yet more habitats for	6496/16231	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	birds and mammals is lost.		
Site ST8 Land North Of Monks Cross Continued	Objection – unsustainable for housing numbers in Huntington to increase by the scale proposed. The roads are already congested. There are current frequent problems with drainage and sewerage. Would remove almost all the green belt in Huntington and fundamentally change the character of the area. Places too many houses in one part of award which already has a particular problem of access, infrastructure, including roads and schools and particularly drainage and sewerage. Existing brownfield sites which are as yet undeveloped should be developed first.	6513/16299	Cllrs K, C & H Orrell, Runciman & Hyman
	Objection – no evidence has been provided to estimate the likely traffic impact of ST8.	6518/16445	York Green Party
	Objection – oppose building 2000 houses in Huntington and New Earswick Ward.	Petition 1	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby	<p>Comment- no further development to take place until study looking at Westfield Beck is completed and required works completed in order to mitigate fluvial and surface water flooding. Flood zone 1 and surface water management to be followed. This especially important as site drains into Foss which is major source of flooding and has interaction with Ouse and relies upon management of Foss Barrier and associated pumps.</p>	3/11738	Environment Agency
	<p>Objection- concern about how a massive increase of residents in Haxby will impact on the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton. Building for 747 houses suggests the need for additional roads either west onto Wigginton Road or east onto Towthorpe Road A64 or both. Concern that additional traffic generated by development will result in the annual mean Nitrogen Dioxide objective being exceeded at the junction of Wigginton Road and the northern ring road which is already an Air Quality Management area.</p> <p>Comment- any plans to provide another primary school on the new development, as local schools are very full request assurances that the provision of health services expand with the proposed development around York. Provision required on the new development for shopping, parking, leisure and community services due to current shopping area being congested. Encouragement needs to be given to employers to provide light industrial opportunities to encourage new residents to work in Haxby.</p>	63/12721	Haxby Town Council
	<p>Objection- access to proposed development is via B roads, neither of which is suitable for high volumes of traffic. The condition of single carriageway throughout Haxby and Wigginton is poor and congested which will add to existing problems of congestion and could lead to an increased accident potential if population levels increase. Increased development will exacerbate the long term flooding problem in the area. Future plans must include for light industrial opportunities and companies should be encouraged to look at the area as an opportunity to develop. Wigginton has no available land to increase the amenity of allotments which have a waiting list of 15. There is a current need to increase number of allotments and open play space. It is necessary to increase library facilities should there be an increase in households. It is essential to invest in sports facilities if the number of households is to increase. There is an urgent need to improve and increase the number of safe cycle paths and routes throughout the area. The increase in households in Haxby will severely impact Wigginton by increased volume of traffic on an already congested single carriageway ring road, and the S1237 and the B1363 which will now dissect any Clifton Moor ST14 development from Wigginton.</p>	80/12789	Wigginton Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Comment- there will be an estimated increase of 1000 vehicles in Haxby and Wigginton without consideration of the Clifton Moor development. There is increasingly limited parking at the shopping complex and main thoroughfare in Wigginton and as a consequence in parallel side road in Haxby. On road parking creates congestion in both Haxby and Wigginton and could lead to accident potential. Proposed housing lacks detail in types and sizes. It is essential that development will provide a range of housing including social housing. There must be affordable housing to match income levels. An increase in population will result in further unreliable further public transport. To cope with demand the existing public transport system needs to be overhauled. Should the train halt become reality, the local infrastructure in inadequate to cope with parking and access.</p>		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	<p>Objection- site adjacent to sites of biodiversity importance and it is not enough to just mitigate the effects; it must be well reasoned in terms of sustainability and the wider effect on natural environment.</p>	90/12834	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	<p>Objection- the expansion plans are far too excessive for the Haxby area.</p>	497/16627	
	<p>Support- wholly support the allocation as it accords with good practice and reflects the policies and proposals set out elsewhere in the Local Plan. The site is available for development and it will be brought forward for housing at the earliest opportunity. Comment- alternative boundary for ST9- parcel of land adjacent to the urban area and the rear gardens of Oaken Grove and Cyprus Grove which should be included in the allocation.</p>	534/16716	DPP One Ltd
	<p>Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be in conflict with the historic character of York as they represent intrusions into the open countryside, rather than connection to or towards existing outlying settlements.</p>	544/16768	
	<p>Objection- horrified at the proposal to potentially build 1617 houses in two phases on green belt land. Put significant strain on an already creaking infrastructure. Concern over the lack of drainage and sewerage infrastructure, the increased amount of cars would lead to already congested roads being at a stand still, already a shortage of school places- no provision for the increased need for primary and secondary places, no green space mentioned and where are all the people who are going to buy these houses going to come from? There is a need for an extension to the Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery. The character and history of Haxby is of a village community, not as part of a cities urban sprawl. Part of the charm of York is its rural villages and this should not be destroyed.</p>	549/16781	
	<p>Objection- Haxby and Wigginton are already suffering from over development. Roads</p>	551/16788	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	are regularly gridlocked. To consider building a further 800 homes to the north is ill conceived. The town cannot absorb a fraction of 2000 residents and 1200 cars. The infrastructure of roads, sewerage and general amenities cannot cope. The plan is completely unsustainable and unsuitable.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- transport infrastructure will be totally inadequate of the proposal goes ahead.	730/16878	
	Objection- quality of semi rural village and local community is at serious risk. Question the actual need for so many houses. Don't spoil green belt land.	837/16922	
	Objection- concern if the building of new homes as proposed were to proceed, about the effects on schools, doctor's and community facilities. Congestion on York's roads is intolerable. Serious thinking about all these infrastructure facilities must be given equal emphasis as the whole proposal itself.	904/16939	
	Support – supportive of the use of land at Usher Lane, Haxby as a housing allocation.	1301/17247	Diocese of Ripon and Leeds
	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton suffer with flooding and surface water issues relating to drainage and sewerage systems. Increases in cumulative surface water runoff from minor developments is likely to have a further impact on this.	1355/17327	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – infrastructure is not in place for more homes and traffic. There should be new roads, and school and a large amount of recreational space would be required.	1392/17342	
	Objection – little information regarding access, drainage, sewerage and other consequences this development will have on the village.	1509/17463	
	Support – represents a 'deliverable site' for future residential development. See response for detailed comments on the site. Comment – boundary should be amended to ensure that an underutilised area of space to the south west of the site is brought into the new neighbourhood.	1668/15030	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection - development will have impact on local schools and increase traffic on Usher Lane a key school route.	1890/40	
	Objection – more houses in Wigginton or Haxby will increase traffic on already congested roads.	1908/84	
	Objection – there is little thought given to access.	1947/217	
	Objection – too many houses are planned, need more details regarding access, flood risk area, impact on infrastructure, land is needed to extend the cemetery, increase in traffic.	1948/220	
Objection - proposal to build 747 new houses on 60 acres out of green belt unsustainable and unacceptable. Roads in and around Haxby and Wigginton are	2128/932		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	disintegrating. This will make it worse. Outer ring road not currently coping with present volume of traffic.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment - problems in driving in Usher Lane as used for parking. Insufficient parking in car parks in village.	2280/3264	
	Objection - facilities in village already fully employed by existing population. Village infrastructure will be massively overloaded. Increased pollution and effect on A1237. Wrong to forfeit green belt land in this way. York is the attractive city it is, partly because it is surrounded by green belt.	2334/3282	
	Objection - villages have retained a rural feel, development on this scale will change that. In green belt. Will put huge strain on infrastructure and local services. Encroachment into countryside on this scale leads to loss of habitat for flora and fauna.	2342/3295	
	Objection - should not consider building on green belt. No requirement or need when plenty of brown field sites to develop. Insufficient jobs or infrastructure to support proposal.	2343/3297	
	Objection- what will be the detailed or proposed mix of these properties? Those affordable homes by type and those by type for sale? What are the construction times and phrases? Is any development earmarked for social housing/housing allocation, if so what proportion/type? What additional social and community infrastructure is considered to enable and sustainability support a potential expansion in our local population? Is there any truth that immigrants will be relocated from London to this site? Are these developments on current green belt land?	2345/6527	
	Objection- the infrastructure will not be able to cope. The traffic down this road will not be bad enough now.	2359/6549	
	Objection- the infrastructure will not be able to cope. The traffic down this road will not be bad enough now.	2360/6551	
	Objection- proposal totally inappropriate on the green belt and will raise immense strain on the local infrastructure.	2411/6569	
	Objection – risk of flooding, surface water issues,	2417/6689	
	Objection- development 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. The proposal will put a strain on all resources. The current schools, transport links etc. could not support this development.	2419/6698	
Objection- huge increase of traffic at peak times. An increase in traffic using Usher Lane and trying to get onto Station Road will bring the whole area to a stand still and vastly increase air pollution. Haxby is bordered by two railway crossings, and the ring	2421/6703		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	road. There is a lack of schools. Transport links to York (public) and at best not good. We need housing affordable for locals not the number proposed and a far better area would be to the south of Wigginton where the access to the ring road could be made far better.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – impact of traffic on York road, impact on car parks in Haxby, need for extensions to the infrastructure, including the schools and health centre.	2423/6706	
	Objection- already overcrowding in the village leading to problems for residents regarding parking. There is congestion on the roads, which will add to increased congestion on the northern ring road. Waiting lists exist for primary schools in the village. There are a lot of patients registered with the surgery and I doubt the practice will be able to cope with many more. Have doctors been consulted?	2456/6730	
	Objection- building on green belt area in Haxby. Saturated as it is. The street cleaners cannot cope with this part of Haxby as it is. More maintenance will be needed and where is the money coming from? Life is going to less than peaceful as more traffic uses Usher Lane and Oaken Grove.	2461/6739	
	Objection- can the council justify the proposed development? The council is already facing budget cuts. These are affecting provision of local services and will continue to do so to an ever increasing extent. There is less and less chance of being able to provide all the infrastructure and services which will be required. Unconvinced there is a need for new housing in such proportions as is proposed.	2473/6760	
	Objection- the present sewerage and surface water infrastructure in Haxby and Wigginton is only adequate during conditions of light rain. Any further development without radical enhancement of infrastructure will only reduce permeability further and exacerbate the situation for all. Opposed to development until a credible infrastructure plan is developed with YW and a time frame cast in stone. There are times at present when it becomes difficult to enter or depart Haxby/ Wigginton due to inadequate road infrastructure. The proposed number of houses will also require a health centre, provision of additional schooling and shops as present facilities are operating near or at capacity. Sewerage and surface water drainage is grossly inadequate and roads cannot cope with existing traffic. Opposed to development until present inadequacies are rectified and credible plans for infrastructure are in place.	2477/6762	
	Objection- why such a large development? More congestion, noise and air pollution.	2484/6770	
	Objection- there is insufficient infrastructure to cater for roads and shops, doctors and dentists. There could be a problem with drainage. There will be more people walking down the road (Hawthorne Avenue) to the shops causing unnecessary noise and	2485/4549	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pollution of cars. The development is on green belt land. Haxby and Wigginton are full and no one wishes it to be any bigger and become part of an urban sprawl/ the land to the north is open productive farmland with pleasant walks in it. Green belt land must be protected. The land itself is waterlogged and is not suitable for building. The drains could not cope. Infrastructure is not included in plans i.e. roads/shops/dentists/doctors and overall facilities.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- Haxby and Wigginton are two co-joined villages with shared resources. These resources are fine for the current population.	2538/6827	
	Objection- surface water flooding in the Haxby area is a problem. If development north of Haxby takes place a major new drainage system will be required. All the extra water would add to the flooding problems down river. Sewage system in Usher Park is in a very poor state. Who will pay to increase capacity of York Sewage works- how will this effect pollution in the river? Could the new development suffer from power cuts throughout the year as the new estate north of Strensall already does? Is the Council going to pay to rebuild the schools that were reduced? Where are all the people living in the extra planed 1651 homes going to work, and how will they be able to travel out of Haxby on already congested roads? Bus transport- the service to Haxby is excellent, but will this service will experience delays to the point it could become unusable at peak times due to the vast increase in traffic the population rise in Haxby will bring. Cycle and walking- this could be the only viable way to travel out of Haxby at peak times.	2549/6847	
	Objection- the plan is not considered to be sustainable within local infrastructure. It will destroy the beauty and character of the rural setting. The greenbelt is there to protect the setting for the benefit of the surrounding area. Drainage is a key issue and previous developments were turned down because of this. Another key issue is the amount of traffic that would be generated. It is difficult to get out of side roads into main stream of traffic and the ring road is already heavily congested. Will there be enough employment around the area? What about schooling? Schools already working at capacity.	2553/6868	
	Objection- too many houses/affordable houses. Not enough provision of additional schools and shops. Pressure on secondary school places. Pressure on traffic- no guarantee that the rail franchise will open Haxby rail station. Cannot cope with the traffic as it is, especially the ring road. These homes would not be for the people of Haxby, but for residents who would travel back to places like Leeds for their jobs. The proposed buildings are neither wanted nor needed by the people of Haxby and	2585/6930	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Wigginton. It will destroy the village feel. Do not have the infrastructure to cope. Haxby floods, the drainage system is appalling. Concerns over what will happen in the future when a place is needed at Joseph Rowntree School which is already at capacity. News that Haxby station has been delayed again, but the Council seem certain Haxby and Strensall station will reopen to cater for the additional volumes.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- present primary school full. Access- parking, increase congestion at peak times, heavy plant access over years of build. Bus service- re routing present bus service will increase travelling time therefore people less likely to use the service. The station will only work if fares are affordable and appropriate bus service to station.	2586/6936	
	Objection- Haxby does not need more houses as the sewage system is already at breaking point. The schools are filled and the surgery in haxby already 23000 patients and is stretched.	2619/6962	
	Objection- development will use the outer ring road which already suffers from severe congestion. Traffic from new development will cause congestion. Roads (York Road Haxby, New Earswick) pass through built up areas and road improvements are not possible. Air pollution from traffic. With population increase, there will need to be an extension of the cemetery and land in this area has to be preserved for this purpose and not used for housing. Parking in Haxby at present is a problem. Additional parking space is difficult to find as Haxby village us a built up conservation area. Present facilities in Haxby cold not cope with 45% increase in population and recreation land would not be adequate.	2638/6994	
	Objection- there is a bog and would need extensive drainage. Access to this area is by two narrow country lanes and two estate drives. Schools for both primary and secondary students- existing schools could not cope with the influx.	2643/7007	
	Objection- the community will not sustain such a large growth. Roads are already over stretched and how would schools cope?	2651/7023	
	Objection- 747 new houses in the green belt land between moor lane and usher lane. A huge number of houses are on a small plot. At peak times there could be over a thousand people out of a small area with few roads. York road is very busy at peak times. More buses and routes would be required. Rail links with Leeds, Harrogate and Scarborough will need to be improved. Haxby and Wigginton infrastructure of drainage and sewerage, utilities and health care cannot absorb the number of people proposed. Is the Council expecting to improve things like the library, health centre, roads and road safety due to the number of children and schools around? It will spoil the village feel. Cannot understand how the Council feel it would be possible for this number of	2664/7055	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	people to get to work either in York, Harrogate or Scarborough.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- the whole infrastructure of Haxby cannot support the proposed 45% population growth. Currently a village bordering on a town in size and that is how it should stay. More housing needed but not to this scale. Where is all the extra traffic going? Haxby needs an upgrade on the drainage system. If this isn't done increased problems with very poor drainage. Haxby cannot be maintained with its present population, how can it possibly support the proposed extra residents. Need more rural services.	2668/7811	
	Objection- who are the people that need 1651 houses to be built? There are no jobs or schools for them. Over 3000 more cars trying to get out of Haxby on roads that are already congested. The roads cannot take this sheer amount of people, neither can shops nor facilities. The drainage on the land behind Usher Park Road is atrocious. In the field where 870 homes are proposed is a row of electricity pylons. There is no housing shortage in York; York would not need extra if it wasn't for the predicted number of "international migrants". The plan for houses in Haxby is not sustainable, as well as losing the protected Green Belt. It should be left as Green Belt and conserved.	2672/7072	
	Objection- proposals will place extreme demands on town's infrastructure. Issues will include: increased traffic, delays in traffic movement, reduced air quality, availability of primary school places, inadequate parking and facilities, increased problems with existing poor drainage.	2684/7130	
	Objection- proposals will place extreme demands on town's infrastructure. Issues will include: increased traffic, delays in traffic movement, reduced air quality, availability of primary school places, inadequate parking and facilities, increased problems with existing poor drainage.	2685/7134	
	Objection- the plan to build hundreds more houses on the green belt around Haxby is ridiculous and unacceptable. The traffic congestion is horrific and especially concerning access to the ring road. Parking around Haxby is extremely limited. The road conditions are very bad now, with potholes remaining unrepaired. The medical facilities are at present struggling to cope. Schooling will also become a problem.	2729/7232	
	Objection- housing development is not only unsustainable but would wreck the local community of Haxby.	2739/7256	
	Comment- what strategies have been put in place to support this development e.g. Transport; schools and other vital services?	2756/7282	
	Objection- it would put undue pressure on the area's infrastructure.	2759/7293	
	Objection- demands on infrastructure. Drainage problems are becoming more	2766/7311	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	common. Traffic causes huge bottlenecks. Facilities such as health centre are already running at full capacity with little room for expansion. Increases in numbers of families with children would put pressure on schools which cannot quickly be coped with.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- all brownfield sites should be developed before encroaching on green belt. An increase of approximately 45% in the population would destroy the area. There is very poor drainage in the area. There will be a shortage of school places. There is inadequate parking in Haxby at present. Provision would need to be made for another Health centre.	2775/7343	
	Objection- the 747 homes planned are to be built on an area of damp/wet land. Area prone to flooding. Building on this sodden land will increase problems with surface water and drainage.	2797/7423	
	Comment- the proposals will have an extensive effect on existing facilities. The drainage and sewerage arrangements struggle now so reassurances would be necessary that facilities would be developed to deal with waste adequately. The amount of extra traffic is a concern. There is a need to ensure additional school places are provided plus the safety concerns of more children using York Road to Joseph Rowntree school and there is concern over the provision of additional healthcare facilities.	2799/7430	
	Objection- it must be done in such a way that the drains and road systems are built in advance of the houses. Haxby already has huge problems with traffic to and from York. The drainage barely copes now in downpour. The system is at its maximum.	2828/7496	
	Objection- the basic infrastructure is not in place to sustain this level of development and an increase in Haxby/Wigginton's size will change the feel of the place. York road would become gridlocked. Traffic volume and pollution will negatively impact on the safety of the children attending. Not enough education places to support increase in demand. Ambulance response times will be affected. Increased risk of accidents. GP and health services won't be able to cope.	2850/7590	
	Objection- proposed development is too big- too many new houses. Inadequate local facilities to cope with the projected increase in population. Lack of open space in haxby and Wigginton. Local drainage is already poor. All available brownfield sites in York should be utilised before expanding the size of Haxby. Local roads will not be able to cope with the likely increase in traffic. Haxby railway station will need to be opened as a matter of priority.	2937/7676	
	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. Haxby high street will surely	2940/7685	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	become congested. To accommodate an increase in population there needs to be further facilities such as schools, shops, leisure and medical facilities/services. 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.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- Haxby cannot take any more traffic along York Road. A school bus would help. Do not want traffic to be gridlocked. Alternative, available sites are at Poppleton Lane and the area where the Sugar Beet factory were.	2960/7735	
	Objection- please no more houses, Poppleton has many more spaces suitable along Millfield Lane that would be ideal for development and close to new Park & Ride.	2978/7758	
	Objection – lack of parking, schools full to capacity, very congested roads.	3017/7852	
	Objection – there should be no development until the local infrastructure can demonstrate it can cope with this level of expansion.	3024/7865	
	Objection – Increased demands on the infrastructure and amenities, increased congestion on the A1237.	3060/7920	
	Objection – impact on local infrastructure, increase in traffic.	3061/7921	
	Objection – impact on local infrastructure including local schools, drainage and telecommunications.	3065/7933	
	Objection – Brown field land should be identified first; in fact on local services, loss of a primary school in the past, impact on wildlife in the nearby fields, parking and traffic will be overwhelmed.	3067/7939	
	Objection – The greenbelt should be protected, increase in traffic.	3068/7940	
	Objection – greenbelt should be protected, increase in traffic, stretched local services and amenities, impact on drainage/sewerage system.	3086/7967	
	Objection – roads are already heavily congested, risk of flooding, primary school is full.	3102/7998	
	Objection – Poor drainage, lack of parking spaces, roads are heavily congested, primary school is full.	3103/7999	
	Objection – impact on local services and amenities, roads are congested and not enough parking.	3127/8055	
	Objection – the local cohesive community will be damaged.	3130/8058	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope with such an increase, parking is already difficult, poor drainage, brownfield sites should be developed first.	3145/8094	
Objection – too much affordable housing, here and elsewhere across the city is proposed.	3180/8179		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment – it is extremely important to improve the local infrastructure, already flooding issues, roads in poor state of repair, improvements to public transport should be considered.	3210/8272	
	Objection – should be withdrawn until true ownership can be established, the historical importance considered and the suitability for building agreed. Comment – the infrastructure needs to be carefully constructed and mistakes recognised and rectified where necessary, including improvements to the parking for the town centre, increase of school places and improvements to sewerage/drainage system.	3214/8280	
	Objection – greenbelt location on agricultural land, needs to be major expansion of the sewerage infrastructure network across north of the city before any building takes place.	3254/8357	
	Comment – the imbalance of the lack of recreational land should be addressed before any further building takes places, significant areas of Haxby suffer from flooding, overloaded sewerage system, increase in traffic, Strensall Common would be threatened, greenbelt location.	3256/8362	
	Objection – the town infrastructure is just about managing with the populations, increase would put great strain on the infrastructure, narrow and congested roads, existing problems with surface water and sewerage, desperate need for green spaces, parking is poor, lack of education places.	3257/8369	
	Objection – impact on wildlife and natural meadowland will be great, local services already overloaded, poor drainage.	3272/8405	
	Objection – greenbelt location, town is already over-developed, lacking in open spaces, oversubscribed local services and existing drainage problems.	3273/8407	
	Objection – roads, schools and health centre is over subscribed, greenbelt location.	3319/8501	
	Objection – lack of facilities in Haxby, access road is heavily congested, secondary school, health centre, parking, drainage and sewerage system would be oversubscribed, ring road is already congested.	3344/8529	
	Objection – there is a need to provide sufficient infrastructure to support additional population.	3346/8532	
	Objection – all brownfield sites should be used before any Greenfield sites are considered. Haxby cannot cope with existing levels of traffic and parking.	3354/8557	
	Objection – the infrastructure in this area is already oversubscribed.	3370/8646	
Objection – issues with parking, local services, including the medical services, volume of traffic.	3382/8679		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Brownfield sites should be used first, issues with parking, availability of medical appointments and limited school places.	3403/8717	
	Objection – Infrastructure is already oversubscribed, including parking, school places and drainage.	3404/8718	
	Objection – congestion on the ring road, recognised footpaths will be lost, issues with flooding and surface water.	3407/8720	
	Objection – loss of green places, congested roads, safety issue of extra traffic, capacity at the primary and secondary school, issues with drainage, congested ring road, greenbelt location.	3418/8739	
	Objection – increase in traffic, limited parking, issues with drainage, lack of school places and medical appointments.	3420/8740	
	Objection – Urban sprawl, greenbelt location.	3428/8778	
	Objection – increase in population will put extreme pressure on services and infrastructure, poor drainage, preference for brownfield sites.	3444/8819	
	Objection – Greenbelt location, drainage issues, brownfield sites should be considered first.	3520/9452	
	Objection – increase of traffic, lack of parking, restricted parking, community integration issues.	3521/9455	
	Objection – inadequate roads, lack of school places,	3522/9457	
	Objection – lack of primary school places, insufficient parking, need for expansion of the cemetery	3543/9501	
	Objection – Brownfield sites should be considered first, bus service is inadequate, lack of parking, lack of primary school places.	3544/9503	
	Objection – greenbelt location, brownfield sites should be considered first, lack of primary school places.	3546/9508	
	Objection – greenbelt location, local infrastructure cannot cope.	3593/9572	
	Objection – sewerage and drainage system needs repair, need for more doctor’s surgeries, busy and congested roads.	3602/9586	
	Objection – will put significant pressure on roads, increased pollution, loss of habitats for wildlife, greenbelt land, and pressure on existing services and amenities, increase on parking, Brownfield sites should be developed first.	3606/9593	
Objection – meet the infrastructure requirements for the existing village before going ahead with this site.	3617/9622		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, impact on sewerage and drainage system, Increase congestion on roads, need for extra parking in the town centre.	3619/9625	
	Objection - pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, impact on bus services and routes, improvement needed to ring road.	3620/9631	
	Objection – pressure on existing services and amenities, pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, increase in pollution, impact on sewerage and drainage system, need form for recreational green spaces.	3632/9644	
	Objection - impact on sewerage and drainage system, pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, need for extra parking in the town centre, risk of flooding, Increase congestion on roads.	3651/9663	
	Objection – pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, Increase congestion on roads, impact on sewerage and drainage system.	3656/9670	
	Objection – impact on sewerage and drainage system, pressure on existing services and amenities, including school places and medical appointments, increase congestion on roads.	3683/9710	
	Objection - increase congestion on roads, greenbelt location.	3700/9751	
	Objection – increase in traffic, more health centres are required.	3708/9990	
	Objection – increase of traffic, drainage issues.	3719/10007	
	Objection – increase in traffic, development out of scale with the village.	3729/10040	
	Objection – increase in traffic, issues with drainage, impact on health services.	3773/10185	
	Objection – pressure on drainage, increased rat-running, Greenbelt location.	3779/10193	
	Objection – traffic congestion, drainage issues.	3780/10197	
	Objection – impact on infrastructure, reduced air quality, poor drainage, lack of parking.	3793/10213	
	Objection – impact on infrastructure, reduced air quality, poor drainage, lack of parking.	3794/10217	
	Objection – Poor drainage, roads need improvement and repair, schools and medical services need improving, and brownfield sites should be prioritised.	3800/10247	
Objection – Increase in traffic, improvement to retail, enlargement to cemetery, poor drainage.	3850/10336		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment – Poor drainage, increase in the water table.	3851/10341	
	Objection – larch way is a cul-de-sac, greenbelt location, increase in traffic, rat-running, extra primary and secondary school places needed, improvements to local services and amenities needed, impact on environment and wildlife, greenbelt location.	3854/10354	
	Objection – improvement needed to road network.	3857/10361	
	Objection – present infrastructure cannot cope, outer ring road already congested, impact of housing influx on local schools, drainage is inadequate, brownfield sites should be used first, greenbelt location, not enough parking.	3859/10371	
	Objection – pressure for place in local schools, increase in traffic and parking places demand.	3865/10381	
	Objection – extreme demand placed on local infrastructure, need to extend cemetery, need for extra recreational land, need for allotments, inadequate parking, severe drainage issues.	3867/10388	
	Objection - extreme demand placed on local infrastructure, need to extend cemetery, need for extra recreational land, need for allotments, inadequate parking, severe drainage issues.	3868/10390	
	Objection – impact on local facilities and services, issues with drainage, increase in traffic.	3872/10403	
	Objection- impact on infrastructure, added congestion, poor access, more recreational spaces needed.	3925/10461	
	Objection – impact on village character, greenbelt location, severe drainage problem, risk of flooding, lack of existing services and amenities, road congestion.	3931/10466	
	Objection – drainage cannot cope, similar development have been rejected in the past, usher lane is extremely busy, environmental impact, lack of school places, need for more parking and play areas.	3950/4649	
	Objection – Greenbelt land, Brownfield land should be developed first, ring road congested, impact on facilities and services, poor parking in the village.	3956/10531	
	Objection – schools are at capacity, parking is poor, level crossing leads to traffic issues, need more playing fields, drainage and sewerage issues.	3967/10558	
	Objection – existing roads will be gridlocked, drainage issues, infrastructure, services, need for additional parking.	3982/10591	
Objection – too many houses proposed; increased traffic and congestion, impact on existing public services, drainage issues.	3984/10595		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – current infrastructure and facilities are over whelmed.	3987/10598	
	Objection – pressure on the infrastructure including school places and doctors, issues with drainage, risk of flooding.	4002/10616	
	Objection – overcrowded roads.	4011/10632	
	Comment – Should only be 50 homes built on this site.	4016/10642	
	Objection – too many additional houses which will overload the infrastructure and create traffic hazards.	4028/10657	
	Objection – impact on drainage and water table, loss of greenbelt, lack of school places.	4043/10692	
	Objection – increase in traffic, the railway line must be utilised.	4048/10713	
	Objection – congested roads, impact on drains and sewers, not enough parking, lack of school places and doctor’s appointments, targets seem very ambitious.	4066/10746	
	Objection – there needs to be infrastructure proposals to support development, congestion on the ring road.	4112/10814	
	Objection – hazard of construction traffic, infrastructure cannot support, poor access, lack of parking, greenbelt location.	4129/10835	
	Objection – development would swamp existing amenities, roads are inadequate, better sites include land between York road and landings lane.	4149/10859	
	Objection – traffic increase, medical facilities, school places, leisure areas, infrastructure such as water and power.	4151/10864	
	Objection – put immense strain on the local infrastructure, increase in crime and anti-social behaviour.	4158/10874	
	Objection – local infrastructure needs upgrading.	4159/10880	
	Objection – congestion, lack of parking spaces, brownfield sites should be developed first.	4199/10931	
	Objection – Issues with drainage, education spaces, congestion, limited parking, recreational activities and spaces, health provision, pollution, brownfield land should be developed first.	4200/10933	
	Objection – greenbelt location, loss of animal habitats, increase in traffic and pollution, poor drainage, lack of school places, poor parking provision.	4201/10939	
Objection – traffic congestion and air quality, lack of school places, drainage and sewerage issues, poor medical practice provision.	4216/10964		
Objection – greenbelt location, strain on current infrastructure.	4230/10989		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – issues of drainage and sewerage, greenbelt location, improvements needed to the infrastructure, pylons on the site,	4253/11063	
	Objection – increased congestion and traffic, pressure of existing facilities and amenities, building will be problematic for existing residents.	4282/11100	
	Objection – numbers are not justified.	4283/11103	
	Objection – greenbelt location, extension needed to cemetery, increase in traffic, infrastructure is inadequate, including schools and medical facilities, ridge and furrow landscape, site of a permanent bog and Roman villa, unstable ground and high water table, ancient woodlands and rights of way.	4285/11113	
	Objection – Greenbelt location, parking is limited, flood risk, infrastructure cannot cope, increased pollution.	4294/11137	
	Objection – congestion, drainage and sewerage, poor parking, affect the character of the village.	4296/11140	
	Objection – drainage and sewerage, electrical supply is limited, cemetery needs expanding, lack of medical facilities.	4297/11142	
	Objection – Drainage and sewerage, increase in traffic, limited school and medical places.	4298/11147	
	Objection – Drainage, increase in vehicles, high standard of facilities will be lost, pressure on medical facilities and schools.	4306/11181	
	Objection – present infrastructure is not good enough, drainage system cannot cope, roads are inadequate, parking is very limited, shore of recreational land, primary schools are at capacity, brownfield sites, including the former Vickers factory should be considered first.	4311/11190	
	Objection – development would place excessive pressure on existing infrastructure, congested ring road.	4313/11194	
	Objection - Extreme demands on the infrastructure, risk to cyclists, narrow access, poor drainage.	4317/11200	
		4321/11211	
		4322/11215	
	Objection - Extreme demands on the infrastructure, risk to cyclists, narrow access, poor drainage.	4323/11219	
Objection – Flood risk, drainage and sewerage issues, lack of capacity for primary and secondary school place, narrow road, unsuitable for construction traffic, congested ring road, emergency services cannot cope, increase in pollution.	4332/11246		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection - Flood risk, drainage and sewerage issues, lack of capacity for primary and secondary school place, narrow road, unsuitable for construction traffic, congested ring road, emergency services cannot cope, increase in pollution.	4333/11248	
	Objection – development will create a second town, greenbelt location, issues with drainage and sewerage, removal of mature trees, needs to be improvement to existing infrastructure, residential roads are unsuitable for construction traffic.	4359/11298	
	Objection – town has outgrown its services and amenities, more dwellings would be catastrophic.	4371/11325	
	Objection – drainage, roads, schools and health service is at capacity.	4379/11340	
	Objection – negative impact on the environment, mature trees and wildlife habitats will be lost, pressure on existing local services and amenities, roads need improvement.	4385/11353	
	Objection – drainage is at capacity, traffic congestion, increase in pollution, impact on existing services, impact on property values, loss of the greenbelt, traffic safety.	4396/11390	
	Objection – infrastructure is at capacity, including schools, medical facilities and drains.	4397/11609	
	Objection – flooding and drainage issues, schools and health facilities at capacity.	4410/11419	
	Objection – greenbelt location, schools and roads at capacity.	4420/11443	
	Objection- impact on character of the village, infrastructure needs improving, fewer houses should be proposed, and brownfield sites should be developed first.	4421/11444	
	Objection – green areas should be retained for people to enjoy, important for health and wellbeing, roads will become gridlocked, and Haxby needs more parking, shops, extra sewerage and schools.	4427/11451	
	Objection – Flood risk, traffic congestion, greenbelt location, brownfield sites should be developed first, overloaded sewerage system.	4455/11464	
	Objection – the infrastructure needs improving and paying for, a new school will be required, no thought given to financing this or the impact on quality of life, greenbelt location.	4465/11469	
	Objection- congested roads, schools are full to capacity, medical services are at capacity, more parking is needed, ring road needs upgrading to dual carriageway.	4475/11491	
	Objection – local road system need upgrading, expansion of parking facilities, drainage and sewerage system needs improving.	4481/11494	
Objection – access is difficult, drainage is inadequate, and primary schools are full. A site meeting is needed to discuss alternative options.	4482/11500		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – infrastructure is inadequate, greenbelt location, pressure on existing services and amenities, brownfield sites should be considered first, roads are not suitable for construction traffic.	4491/11513	
	Objection – poor drainage, pressure on local primary schools, flood risk, increased traffic, poor air quality and increased pollution.	4492/11517	
	Objection – oversubscribed schools, drainage issues, poor access, poor cycle lane provision, increased congestion, and more recreational green space is needed in Haxby.	4687/14216	
	Objection – services such as medical, educational, sewerage, drainage, recreational and shops are over subscribed, increase in traffic, destroying of habitats,	4688/14220	
	Objection – inadequate infrastructure, congested roads, over subscribed drainage and sewers, fields are medieval ridge and furrow rich in wildlife, there is little regard for open space and amenities, limited bus services.	4690/11979	
	Objection – increased traffic, drainage and sewerage system at its limit, a new school would be needed, local services and facilities would need improving.	4701/11992	
	Objection – developments need to be supported by properly planned infrastructure.	4702/11994	
	Objection- brownfield sites should be developed first, poor drainage, disruption on the roads.	4714/12004	
	Objection – local facilities and services cannot cope, housing should be accessed from the ring road, on the other side of the railway,.	4717/12007	
	Objection – need the necessary facilities such as schools, health centres, roads, drainage, and emergency service access.	4724/12022	
	Objection – infrastructure is under massive strain, traffic congested, flood risk.	4797/14282	
	Objection – Green belt location, unsuitable due to drainage system, congested roads, lack school places and medical services, need for more recreational spaces, risk of flooding, increase in pollution, need for extra parking.	4817/12134	
	Objection – The infrastructure cannot cope with extra development, surface water drainage and sewerage disposal is over subscribed.	4822/14211	
	Objection – drainage system is struggling, insufficient school places, lack of recreation places, increase in traffic congestion, require an increase in parking.	4826/12142	
	Objection – Greenbelt location, drainage system, congested roads, not enough school, lack of recreation places, increase in pollution, lack of parking.	4831/12153	
Objection – Sewerage network cannot cope, increase in traffic, lack of school places.	4832/12154		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – little car parking facilities, roads are congested, drainage is poor, sewerage system backs up, primary schools are full, town lacks a rector.	5112/12222	
	Objection – the city does not have the resources to upgrade the infrastructure to support new development.	5139/12255	
	Objection – traffic congestion, cycle lane is not extensive enough, schools are at capacity.	5158/12289	
	Objection – all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be greenbelt. Building more houses will encourage an influx of people, rather than provide homes for local people.	5223/12494	
	Objection – local infrastructure is over loaded, impact on local character, increased congestion.	5260/14352	
	Objection – Infrastructure cannot support this, character of the area will be eroded, increased pollution, school and doctor’s surgeries are full, insufficient parking, development is too large scale.	5266/14367	
	Objection – Infrastructure cannot support this proposal.	5270/14368	
	Objection – Increase traffic, strained infrastructure.	5271/14369	
	Objection – Traffic congestion, more parking is needed in the town centre.	5272/14373	
	Objection – additional demand on infrastructure, roads, health services, schools and drainage system cannot cope, greenbelt locations too far from York city centre.	5273/14374	
	Objection – greenbelt location, infrastructure cannot cope with expansion, increased traffic, narrow, poor access roads.	5274/14375	
	Objection – road infrastructure is over loaded, implications for schools, health services.	5276/14384	
	Objection – need to address the lack of infrastructure, new schools, more shops and parking.	5277/14387	
	Objection – Parking and drainage issues.	5281/14393	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope with number of houses proposed, unsuitable recreational facilities.	5286/14407	
	Objection – local parking, recreational facilities, and transport and education infrastructure cannot support growth.	5288/14410	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be used first.	5289/14415	
	Objection – over loaded sewerage issues, increased traffic.	5290/14412	
	Objection – increased traffic, pollution, road safety implications, and not enough school places.	5291/14419	
Objection – increase in traffic and congestion.	5298/14444		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – lack of car parking, poor access, and drainage issues.	5302/14454	
	Objection – infrastructure is already at capacity, no clear plans to demonstrate how infrastructure will be improved.	5304/14462	
	Objection – No additional infrastructure shown.	5305/14463	
	Objection – current infrastructure is struggling, roads are congested, flood risk.	5307/14465	
	Objection – current infrastructure cannot cope, drainage issues, health services over subscribed, poor public transport services, other major housing sites such as Hungate are still not finished yet,	5308/14468	
	Objection – infrastructure is not in place to support this development, school places and traffic congestion.	5310/14471	
	Objection – congested roads, flooding and drainage issues, lack of school places.	5311/14472	
	Objection – Added congestion, noise and people, local shops will not be able to meet demand.	5312/14473	
	Objection – increased traffic, poor access, better served locations should be identified.	5315/14480	
	Objection – Increase in traffic, flooding and drainage issues.	5316/14483	
	Objection – schools and drainage at capacity, roads already congested, infrastructure and roads need to be improved and expanded, Greenbelt location.	5318/14485	
	Objection – drainage and flooding issue, significant improvements needed to infrastructure.	5320/14487	
	Objection – necessary infrastructure needs putting in place before development, pressure on school places, traffic density, air quality, drainage, parking, brownfield sites should be used first.	5322/14493	
	Support – newcomers should be welcomed and homes for future generations.	5323/14494	
	Objection – place extreme and unacceptable demands on the infrastructure, including primary schools, parking, drainage, sewerage system.	5324/14495	
	Objection – negative impact on the environment, education provision.	5326/14499	
	Objection – the volume of housing is out of proportion with the quality of the local infrastructure.	5327/14501	
	Objection – impact on the infrastructure, increased traffic, poor air quality, school places, poor drainage, and brown field sites should be used first.	5329/14502	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope with additional housing, including schools, health services, and drainage and air quality.	5330/14505	
Objection – increase in traffic, gas, water, electricity and sewerage systems cannot cope with additional supply, improvements in all facilities need completing first.	5331/14508		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – traffic congestion, parking and access to public facilities, schooling.	5333/14512	
	Objection – not enough shops, school facilities, open spaces, increased traffic.	5334/14515	
	Objection – Drainage issues, traffic flow, medical services, inadequate parking.	5340/14523	
	Objection – there needs to be expansion to the cemetery, more allotments, recreational space, and school investment.	5343/14533	
	Objection – Result in server traffic congestion, pollution, noise, road safety issues, character of village would be affected, poor drains and water pressure.	5346/14537	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not in place to cope with expansion, inadequate parking, extreme pressure on infrastructure and services.	5361/14562	
	Objection – Inadequate services and travel infrastructure, narrow, poor access roads, impact on people’s standard of living.	5362/14565	
	Objection – Lack of facilities.	5363/14568	
	Objection – traffic is heavy and congested, extreme pressure on childcare and school places in the area, lack of parking.	5364/14569	
	Objection – Strain on local schools and medical services, increase in traffic,	5368/14575	
	Objection – impact on air quality and increase in pollution, development is too large in scale, impact on environment.	5372/14584	
	Objection – increase in traffic and congestion, increase in pollution, pressure on existing services, lack of parking.	5378/14598	
	Objection – improvements need to be made to transport facilities, roads, cycle paths and bus services. Lack of parking, there should be more allotments, drainage, recreation land and school places.	5379/14599	
	Objections – prime agricultural land, damaging to wildlife and habitats, roads are busy and congested, issue with existing drainage, schools are over subscribed and cannot be expanded.	5381/14602	
	Objection – schools, healthcare and roads are over subscribed, increase in pollution, narrow, unsuitable access roads.	5383/14607	
	Objection – severe traffic problems, drainage issues and lack of school places.	5384/14610	
	Objection – severe road congestion, issues with drainage, waste of agricultural land.	5388/14623	
Objection – needs to improvement to existing infrastructure and transports for residents, extra school places are needed.	5399/14651		
Objection – need more primary school places, investment in infrastructure including ring road and parking, recreational land.	5400/14656		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – infrastructure is stretched, including drainage, sewers, schools, roads, health services.	5404/14663	
	Objection – infrastructure is stretched, including drainage, sewers, schools, roads, health services.	5405/14665	
	Comment – previous applications declined, need assurances of the road lay out and play arrangements for children will not be disrupted.	5411/14684	
	Objection – the ring road must be duelled before any expansion, at least one more primary school will be required as well as health services and parking.	5413/14697	
	Objection – parking and traffic flow is congested already, lack of school places and leisure facilities.	5418/14710	
	Objection – should be no more additional building until improvements are made to the ring road. Inadequate parking in Haxby.	5420/14720	
	Objection – expansion in the 1980s has stretched the local amenities and infrastructure already, air pollution and congestion need addressing, inadequate drainage, need to improve primary schools, parking, recreational facilities, library, allotments and policing.	5428/14752	
	Objection – issues already with parking and traffic, roads at capacity, including ring road.	5433/14760	
	Objection –greenbelt location, overwhelm current infrastructure including roads, drainage, schools and health facilities.	5444/14778	
	Objection – drainage issues, increased traffic, public transport issues, available employment locally.	5446/14781	
	Objection – greenbelt location, protection of green corridors, increased congestion, insufficient school and health care places.	5465/14809	
	Objection – traffic and infrastructure issues, lack of parking, need for a new school, brownfield sites should be considered.	5471/14820	
	Objection – already over populated, drainage issues, lack of school places, should create a new town instead.	5477/14831	
	Objection – greenbelt location, impact on the community, loss of wildlife and habitats, not many homes proposed, lack of parking, poor access.	5481/14835	
	Objection – major housing sites should be located close to strategic employment sites.	5485/14842	
Objection – the outer ring road cannot support traffic now, population has not grown to the level that needs this number of homes.	5488/14850		
Objection – plans take no account of extra burden of people and homes on	5491/14854		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure and social element of the local area, green belt location.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – Poor transport links, no pavements or cycle routes along Wigginton Road, poor access on ring road, further education and medical facilities will need to be provided.	5501/14874	
	Objection – poor access to the ring road.	5503/14881	
	Objection – increase in traffic and congestion, more school places needed, drainage issues, flood risk, wildlife and habitats will be lost.	5517/14924	
	Objection – Significantly more traffic, northern ring road/A1237 must be enhanced.	5544/14972	
	Objection – Need for more parking, narrow roads, undeveloped brownfield sites are available.	5545/14974	
	Objection – greenbelt location, narrow residential roads, sewerage system issues, poor access to village, questions needs and capability of infrastructure,	5549/14981	
	Objection – adversely change the character of Haxby, poor drainage and sewerage, lack of parking in the village, poor access roads.	5557/13037	
	Objection – roads are congested, affect air quality, need extensive improvements to the infrastructure including the roads.	5561/13043	
	Objection – roads are congested with poor access to existing bus routes for new residents, need extra cycle lanes, primary school places.	5568/13049	
	Objection – increase in residents will place extreme pressure on the infrastructure and already congested roads. New housing should be spread out more evenly rather than concentrated in one area.	5574/13062	
	Objection – increase in traffic and inadequate parking.	5581/13077	
	Objection – there should be more infill rather than a concentration of housing placing extreme pressure on the infrastructure of Haxby.	5582/13080	
	Objection – poor access, doctors, health services and schools cannot cope with influx, impact on the village character, impact on house prices.	5583/13082	
	Objection – drainage issues, need for extra education places, poor level of parking, poor and congested access roads, impact on community atmosphere.	5585/13091	
	Objection – need for improvement to the local facilities and services, including school places, parking. Impact on wildlife and habitats, power lines cross this site, have the potentially health impact been assessed?	5587/13095	
Objection – Poor and congested access roads.	5588/13100		
Objection – poor, narrow access roads, drainage issues, impact from building over large areas of countryside.	5590/13109		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – overwhelm the infrastructure, surface water drainage system, sewerage system and schools, services are already stretched.	5591/13111	
	Objection – detrimental to Haxby, increase in congestion, air pollution, limited primary school places, drainage issues, brownfield land should be used first.	5594/13123	
	Objection – infrastructure must be in place before development begins and all other brownfield sites have been utilised, traffic volumes will become unacceptable.	5596/13125	
	Objection – infrastructure, including drainage, parking, education and health facilities’ and flooding are at capacity. Poor and congested access roads.	5597/13126	
	Objection – traffic congestion, need for extra parking, and need for doctors, dentist and school places, sewerage and drainage need updating.	5600/13141	
	Objection – congested roads, need for more school places, haxby will become a commuter town.	5605/13157	
	Objection – impact on drainage, access to the ring road, school places, and healthcare facilities.	5607/13164	
	Objection – impact on drainage, access to the ring road, school places, and healthcare facilities.	5608/13167	
	Objection – improvements need to be made to road system, hospital provision and drainage system.	5611/13190	
	Objection – improvements need to be made to road system, hospital provision and drainage system.	5612/13191	
	Objection – poor access routes, lack of parking, school places, loss of green space, loss of community.	5613/13192	
	Objection – there needs to be improvements to the infrastructure especially the drainage and flooding.	5615/13196	
	Comment – the local infrastructure is not good and such large areas of development is questionable.	5617/13203	
	Objection – impact on congestion, inadequate parking in Haxby, green and play spaces being lost, increase in noise and pollution.	5618/13209	
	Objection – impact on congestion, inadequate parking in Haxby, green and play spaces being lost, increase in noise and pollution.	5619/13211	
	Objection – poor access roads, congestion, little car parking, school and health services at capacity.	5621/13218	
	Objection – Impact on congestion and drainage system, need for more school places.	5625/13236	
Objection – Potential traffic congestion, need for more cycle routes/lanes, more school	5626/13239		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and health services are needed in the village.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – inadequate drainage, surface water flooding, there should be no development until infrastructure is in place to support it.	5627/13242	
	Objection – village facilities at full capacity, need for more parking , better roads, improved transport links, healthcare and education facilities need improving.	5635/13265	
	Objection – poor drainage, access roads, need for more school places.	5647/13283	
	Comment – need for a train station to prevent roads from becoming gridlocked.	5651/13290	
	Objection – traffic volume is at its limit, needs to more access roads to Haxby.	5654/13298	
	Comment – concerns over healthcare and educational provision, local transport system. Need to ensure housing is not too dense and a school is provided.	5658/13309	
	Objection – Parking is an issue, road congestion, impact on character of the village, loss of rural land, need for more shops.	5664/13330	
	Objection - Impact on congestion and need for more school places.	5670/13345	
	Objection – Will destroy the character and environment of the local community and will exacerbate parking, traffic, poor drainage and poor air quality problems.	5672/13350	
	Objection – Building on 60 hectares of Green Belt, inappropriate and unsustainable. Will put strain on existing amenities. Without huge investment in infrastructure Haxby will be unable to cope. Potential for increase in crime and anti-social behaviour. Construction traffic will create congestion.	5673/13360	
	Objection – Loss of Green Belt. Roads and infrastructure in Haxby already at maximum capacity. It is ill thought out to plan housing without any planned upgrading of roads and schools	5676/13375	
	Objection – Loss of habitats. Basic infrastructure in Haxby, including drainage, already struggles.	5685/13394	
	Objection – Area of Green Belt should be protected and believe more suitable sites are available elsewhere. New school(s), nursery and medical centre would be required to make the development sustainable.	5688/13405	
	Objection – Increased congestion (on A1237) plus numerous issues relating to local transport network (see response). Also pressure on local schools.	5690/13411	
Objection – Development will change the village nature of Haxby. Impact on parking and congestion.	5692/13413		
Objection – Greater risk of accidents. People living in the development will be forced to use their cars as it will not be within easy walking distance. The development is too	5695/13417		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	large for the infrastructure of the village. Adverse impact on parking, congestion, air quality and flooding. Development on Green Belt. Also pressure on local schools and potential lack of land to expand graveyard.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection - Excessive load on local infrastructure. Adverse impact on parking, congestion, air quality flooding and drainage. Pressures on schools.	5697/13420	
	Objection- Haxby grown far too much past its original village boundary already, adding to this will put an excessive load on the local Haxby infrastructure. Concern over the number of planned housing and problems with traffic. Concern over pressure on school. Concern over issues such as flooding, parking, drainage and the general quality of the local environment.	5698/13424	
	Objection- development would be detrimental to the community and would overload the village infrastructure- transport, congestion, local services and school parking. Concern over the social impact it would have. Concern that a large influx of people will disturb the 'familial' bond of Haxby's community and turn it into a village of strangers.	5699/13428	
	Objection- current amenities can only just cope with the current population and associated traffic. Extra houses should not be built until the local infrastructure and road network has been improved. Additional commuters from the new houses will add to large problems already existing with the local roads.	5707/13447	
	Objection- current infrastructure cannot support such a large number of new houses/people. Drainage already in Haxby already inadequate. Roads in and out of Haxby already full to capacity. Concern over increase in pollution and air quality. Would make the heavily congested outer ring road even worse. Concern over school capacity. Concern over impacts on quality of life for residents.	5709/13452	
	Objection- development will spoil the natural beauty and the views and would reduce the value of properties in the area. Concern that the road network is currently unable to cope at peak times as it is- further development will make this worse. Development would also impact on the nature in the area.	5712/13461	
	Objection- concern over how the area could cope with extra housing without substantial infrastructure improvements. Concern that government imposing a duty on councils to increase housing stock, improve environments, air pollution and congestion in city boundaries is pushing its problems onto satellite towns without considering the impact on functioning, balanced communities.	5715/13465	
	Objection- concern how such a massive increase in residents will impact on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton. Concern over stretching of schools, roads/traffic, parking, recreation/play areas etc. concern over effect of value of homes	5718/13476	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	with an increase in properties. Concern over the way 'new housing estates' comprise of close together town houses and affordable housing and how this does not fit with a village feel. Future development should only take place when infrastructure can cope and after brownfield land has been used up.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- traffic in Haxby already extremely high. Population growth will exacerbate this and reduce air quality. Parking in the centre is a problem. Drainage is a major problem. In an area with a high water table and poor drainage, building such a large number of houses will increase the risk of flooding. Alternative sites should be sought which would have less impact on residents.	5719/13479	
	Objection- the infrastructure would not cope. No more routes in and out of Haxby could be provided. The increase in traffic and damage to the environment would be unacceptable. Concern over responsibility of providing more schools, youth clubs, doctors, dentists etc. Haxby does not have the capacity to cater for so many more households.	5722/13486	
	Objection- Haxby only just retaining its village feel with current housing numbers and traffic levels. Concern over no solid mention of opening a railway station in Haxby and the widening of roads and safer cycling routes. Current issues with the village centre coping with traffic flows. Open, recreational space is not sufficient for the village.	5724/13489	
	Objection- the proposed housing plans will place an excessive unsustainable strain on all aspects of the villages including the road/transport network, schools, local amenities and the drains and sewerage systems which are already strained. Concern development will destroy the local community feel of the villages that currently exist.	5725/13491	
	Objection- the local infrastructure including roads, schools, shops doctors and other local amenities are all at capacity. The plans would destroy not benefit the villages and the city. Concern over the destruction of countryside and green belt.	5727/13494	
	Objection- concern over increased traffic congestion and the negative impact on current resident's travelling times. Concern over increased pollution levels and reduced air quality and the effect of this on health. Concern over parking problems, potential accidents, increased pressure on all local services (schools, surgeries etc), drainage problems, the negative impact on house values, the loss of a sense of village community and the negative impact on the surrounding natural environment and wildlife.	5736/13511	
	Objection- more demand on existing resources. Will be a need for more school places, parking and medical resources. Existing drainage issues.	5737/13513	
	Comment- new homes would cause more problems for the drainage systems, already	5739/13521	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overloaded. Traffic congestion will increase.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- infrastructure and drainage could not cope with an influx of at least 1600 cars. Schools already full; even if more classrooms were built there still wouldn't be enough room.	5742/13544	
	Objection- Haxby already has the population of a small town but exists on a village infrastructure which is already strained. 750 homes is unsustainable, parking already difficult during the day, primary schools are full, the two comprehensives are at full capacity, the road system already struggles to cope with traffic flows. No consideration of the impact on existing traffic from Haxby, let alone that added by proposed developments and a new town at Clifton moor. Concern over where new residents would work.	5755/13606	
	Objection- impact on infrastructure of both villages and increased traffic.	5756/13609	
	Objection- further large scale development will damage schools, shops and infrastructure. Concern over existing traffic flow issues. Concern over the size of the village.	5757/13611	
	Objection- infrastructure could not cope. Issues with parking and congestion.	5758/13613	
	Objection- increase in houses will create more flooding and will require a new school in the area. Questions if a new school is planned in the Local Plan.	5763/13623	
	Objection- building on the green belt is unacceptable when there are derelict/brownfield sites available. Existing brownfield sites should be used first. Concern that an increase of traffic/congestion will increase. Issues with flooding/drainage and sewerage on the land- infrastructure needs upgrading before houses built. The plans are unsustainable and fail under central government terms for use of greenbelt land.	5769/13646	
	Objection- Haxby already overcrowded. Local services and school unable to cope with such a dramatic increase in the population. Shops and current parking facilities would be pushed to facilitate the increase in population. Concern over developing on the greenbelt. Issues already with local flooding.	5770/13647	
	Objection- issues with current overcrowding, adding to this would only further this problem. Local services would be unable to cope with the increase in population, neither would the schools. Issues with local shops and parking. Concern that an increase in residents will affect traffic.	5773/13654	
	Objection- this development should not be permitted. Concern over access through Usher Lane which is already a busy thoroughfare, any additional traffic would be unacceptable and create huge congestion at peak times. Issues with shops and	5777/13669	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure already at capacity in respect of traffic and parking. Concern over the provision of dentists, doctors and schools which are already at capacity.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment- roads in the area are small, narrow and not meant for heavy traffic. Drains must be upgraded for both sewerage and top water. The development would increase flooding. Issues with local school that is already full. Concern with increased pressure and waiting times on doctor's surgery. Concern that more bus routes would be needed. Concern that police and fire service will not be able to cope with the increase of people in Haxby.	5782/13689	
	Objection- concern with infrastructure, drainage, sewerage and traffic. The main sewers are not big enough to cope. Concern with the several hundred school children who walk down York Road to Joseph Rowntree school, raising safety concerns, and also concern with air quality for residents and pedestrians.	5796/13723	
	Objection- car parking already an issue. Schools and GPs would not be able to cope. Concern with construction traffic. The greenbelt should be protected for future generations. Concern about the increase volume of traffic and reduction of the air quality development would cause.	5802/13738	
	Objection- concern over the type of housing to be built, where the new residents will work (employment), where new children will be schooled, traffic issues especially because access to the site is not clearly defined and Oaken Grove is already overloaded and concern with water drainage. Concern over housing value once green belt is developed on.	5808/13743	
	Objection- Haxby does not have the services or structures to support this large increase in population, particularly roads, parking and recreational space. Concern that the proportion of social housing in this proposal is too high.	5814/13755	
	Objection- the total housing numbers would apply unsustainable pressure to the road system and town infrastructure and services and will devastate agricultural land. Healthcare and education services rarely keep pace with the expansion of population.	5819/13771	
	Comment- concern the two available access routes into the site will not be sufficient enough to accommodate the extra traffic.	5826/13786	
	Objection- areas in haxby have poor drainage and are unsuitable for access let alone construction traffic. Concern with the effect of development on wildlife in the area. Road access in and out of Haxby is restricted and congested at peak times.	5831/13808	
	Objection- the development will have a huge impact on Haxby. The number and nature of the retail outlets in the centre of Haxby, health services etc are nicely matched to current need, the plan admits there is little scope to increase these even if	5833/13810	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	it were desirable.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection- no public transport to the north of the village. Present facilities in Haxby already stretched.	5836/13812	
	Objection- concern with how infrastructure can cope with new development. Schools already at full capacity, roads in a very bad state of repair, drainage inadequate and there are many rat runs to avoid the endless queues to get to the ring road on a morning.	5840/13817	
	Objection- concern over how the infrastructure will cope in Haxby. Concern regarding school places and roads/traffic that are already very busy. Concern over village amenities and parking. Concern over the effect of affordable housing in the area (rubbish dumped outside, antisocial behaviour and noise levels). Impact on housing values and drainage which is already insufficient. The effect of 15 years construction will have a negative impact on the general environment in the village – noise, air quality, traffic, pollution and general dirt. The balance between green areas of parkland and the built areas within the village would be affected. Concern with healthcare- the GP is already at capacity. York Accident and Emergency already struggles.	5843/13824	
	Objection- the roads to the bypass are bad enough. The drains cannot cope now. Questions over the proposals of healthcare. Concern that there are not enough facilities in the village to cope with extra families.	5845/13834	
	Objection- concern over the capacity of infrastructure, road congestion, primary school places, healthcare facilities and the local GP and Hospital, and drainage issues.	5846/13835	
	Objection – shops, health care, schools are just adequate now, increase in traffic.	5851/15098	
	Objection – additional traffic, risk of flash flooding, low mains water pressure, increase in pollution.	5854/15103	
	Objection – greenbelt location, prolong disturbance as development is built, increased demand on schools, not enough parking, increased pollution levels.	5859/15123	
	Objection – greenbelt location, increased demand on local infrastructure.	5860/15126	
	Objection – sewage and drainage at capacity, increase in congestion, lack of school places, parking spaces and medical services.	5864/15130	
	Objection – extreme pressure on current facilities in the village, over subscribed parking, healthcare and dentist over subscribed, flooding risk, increase in congestion. Comment – Would like to see positive commitment to allocate resources to necessary infrastructure.	5865/15133	St Mary's Parochial Church Council
	Objection – overloading of essential services, increased congestion, air pollution,	5867/15139	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	dangerous to pedestrians, greenbelt land.		
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Comment – no consideration for the need for improved infrastructure in the area, greenbelt location.	5869/15143	
	Objection – roads, parking and schools are already stretched, increased pollution due to bottlenecking on A1237.	5870/15146	
	Objection – increase demand on primary schools, congested roads, poor access, flood risk, strain of sewerage and drainage.	5873/15156	
	Objection – improvements needed to supporting infrastructure and transport. Increase in congestion, poor and congested access roads, detrimental impact on air quality, parking and safety, need for more green spaces, drainage issues.	5875/15160	
	Objection –town is already at full capacity in terms of people and traffic, poor quality roads, drainage, foliage upkeep, congestion, air quality; construction traffic would further damage the roads.	5876/15162	
	Comment – there are issues with the infrastructure and supporting services but an increase in population would not destroy the small town feel of Haxby.	5895/15203	
	Comment – flood risk, high water table, sewerage system needs updating.	5900/15213	
	Objection – Greenbelt location.	5908/15228	
	Objection – adding more people to Haxby with the proposals to build on the green belt will cause havoc in the village with extra traffic. Car parking in the village is difficult now.	5968/15332	
	Objection – no school, no access, no need.	5975/15341	
	Objection – does not think Haxby could absorb so many new houses without adverse effect on quality of life.	5977/15346	
	Objection – increased demand on schooling, healthcare and traffic will be enormous, poor, congested access roads, lack of parking.	5981/15351	
	Comment – this and the safeguarded land would create a settlement in its own right.	6041/15462	
	Objection – road congestion, lack of parking, schools are at capacity, impact on quality of life of existing residents.	6049/15486	
	Support – seem coherent even the plan to develop new railway stations	6121/15545	
Objection – increased traffic, narrow access roads, gridlocked ring road, inadequate parking, strain on school places, issues with drainage and sewerage, greenbelt locations, proposed volume of housing is not required.	6130/15554		
Objection – large increase in housing would quickly change the identity of the area, previously been rejected as urban sprawl.	6135/15585		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – area sewerage system needs attention, surface water issues.	6141/15607	
	Objection – Greenbelt location, alter the charm of Haxby, traffic would be dangerous, increased congestion and air pollution, lack of parking, school places and medical services.	6155/15645	
	Objection – impact on infrastructure, road networks, school places, greenbelt location.	6171/15702	
	Objection – Parking issues, traffic congestion due to railway crossing, ambulance station access.	6181/15719	
	Objection – greenbelt location, drainage issues, congestion on ring road.	6201/15738	
	Objection – Future development should only take place when the infrastructure has been installed and brownfield	6227/15784	
	Objection – roads, school and drainage system is not in place to cope with expansion, flood risk, poor car parking.	6233/15798	
	Objection – stain on the infrastructure, especially health care.	6255/15826	
	Objection – already heavy traffic and congestion, lack of parking, increased pollution, school capacity, medical services, high water table, flooding risk, insufficient drainage, lack of employment opportunities, green belt location.	6278/15868	
	Objection – roads are congested, flooding during heavy rainfall, local schools are full.	6283/15878	
	Objection – A1237 is congested, increase of traffic on York road, greenbelt location. Alternative site is off the A64 between A19 (designer outlet) and A1079 Dunnington.	6286/15890	
	Objection – ring road is congested, increase in noise and pollution, safety and parking, greenbelt location and flood risk.	6298/15928	
	Objection – over subscribed drainage system, traffic congestion, lack of parking, lack of school places, flood risk.	6300/15934	
	Objection – increase in traffic, high water table.	6332/15993	
	Objection – infrastructure is over stretched, access to A1237 is poor, needs upgrading to duel carriageway.	6369/16086	
	Objection – Increase of traffic.	6371/16092	
	Objection – this is a Site of Special Scientific Interest.	6377/16107	
	Objection – facilities will be over stretched with this increase of population.	6388/16127	
	Objection – shopping facilities are not sufficient, the number of homes are not needed.	6389/16129	
	Objection – drainage and flooding issues, congested roads, shortage of school places, greenbelt location.	6390/16131	
Objection – infrastructure cannot support proposed development. Greenbelt location, roads and paths are in poor state of repair, overloaded sewerage system.	6416/16137		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST9 Land North Of Haxby Continued	Objection – increase in traffic, lack of parking, school and medical services are full.	6436/16154	
	Objection – destroy the character of the village, roads are too narrow, lack of parking, increase in traffic, need for new schools.	6442/16161	
	Objection – increase in traffic and need for new schools.	6446/16169	
	Objection – totally against this development.	6447/16171	
	Objection – totally against this development.	6448/16173	
	Objection – destroy the character of the village, roads are too narrow, lack of parking, increase in traffic, need for new schools.	6451/16176	
	Objection – infrastructure is overloaded, additional traffic, need to improve bus services.	6452/16178	
	Objection – infrastructure is already over loaded, flood risk.	6455/16180	
	Objection – roads are already congested.	6456/16184	
	Objection – Sewerage system, flood risk, congested roads, need for more health centres, need for more open space. Comment – roads are not the soul use of car users, consideration needs to be made for horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians.	6512/16295	CLlr Tony Richardson
	Objection – greenbelt location, district shopping centre is constrained by streets and buildings and cannot expand to meet the needs of more development, need for more parking spaces, need to increase size of cemetery, low capacity minor roads would be over loaded and create bottlenecks, issues with surface water drainage and naturally high water table, need for extra school places.	6522/16502	CLlrs P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
	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	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe	Comment- should ST10 be retained Natural England would welcome further discussions regarding assessments and potential mitigation to avoid a significant negative impact.	2/11586	Natural England
	Comment- guidance to be applied to site- see response for detail, see flood risk to strategic housing sites pages.	3/11731	Environment Agency
	Objection- due to the impacts on the nature reserve at Askham Bog. The site is within 250 metres of the nature reserve which was the very first reserve that the Trust was given in 1946. Askham Bog is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and designated as a valley mire with unique flora and invertebrate fauna. Natural England lists a range of operations which damage Askham Bog SSSI and would require permission from them before they are carried out. A number of these operations likely to occur in an uncontrolled way as a result of the allocation. If ST10 were allocated an Area Action Plan would be essential, which was part of the Local Plan for the entire area of green space between Askham Bog and stretching up to B1224 should be drawn up.	42/11700	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection- In the report to the York Green Belt Local Plan in 1994, the inspector considers that "Moor Lane provides a clear and satisfactory edge to the developed area of York". In his opinion development south of Moor Lane would "... be very harmful to the underlying objectives of the Green Belt". Given that little has changed in either the character of this part of the City or the purposes of the York Green Belt, the Inspector's conclusions as to the appropriateness of this area as an allocation appear just as relevant.	238/14061	English Heritage
	Objection- Askham Bog is a wetland site whose special conservation features depend on maintaining that characteristic. Essential for a full hydrological survey to be undertaken with an acceptable plan put in place for managing the hydrology of the site in the future. It is very sensitive to water levels. It is likely that damage would be caused by human disturbance of all kinds and the impact of domestic pets. The presence of domestic dogs and cats in ST10 would result in increasing predation of birds and small mammals within Askham Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest. Any planned access between ST10 and Askham Bog is highly undesirable. This could be mitigated by designation of a buffer zone of 500m or more funding allocated for management of this as a wildlife rich area. Suitable planting and management could help to minimise unwanted intrusion onto Askham Bog itself. A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment including thorough year round ornithological surveys should be carried out to determine the potential impact of the proposed scheme alone and in	401/16523	York Ornithological Club

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	combination with the other proposed developments in Local Plan. Detailed mitigation and a habitat management plan should be provided prior to any determination and this should be agreed with Natural England, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and York Ornithological Club.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Support- supportive of the allocation of ST10 for housing. Fairly reflects the policies and proposals set out in the plan. Site is available for development and will be brought forward for housing at the earliest opportunity. The site does not fulfil any Green belt purpose and therefore does not need to be kept open and included in the Green Belt. Key facilities are within walking distance. Site has good access to a range of shops and services accessible on bike, foot or public transport. The proximity of the proposed P&R facilities will provide frequent access to the city centre. The site is well serviced by bus services and is accessible to a wider range of jobs, educational facilities and services. The site is flat, Greenfield land which is not contaminated and lies in flood zone 1 access can be achieved from multiple locations.	534/16717	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – In 1988 the Council refused permission to develop this land on the grounds it was green belt and productive agricultural land of grade II quality. The Council were concerned about potential adverse affect on Askham Bog as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Also of concern was the local sewer system. All of these reasons for refusal are as relevant today as they wee in 1988 and should be considered carefully when reviewing the site.	1355/17330	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Support- agree with the allocation for site ST10.	1669/15049	Consortium of Landowners of Land at Moor Lane
	Objection- the area of Woodthorpe would be ruined by an additional 500+ homes on 40 acres of the green belt. This area is prone to flooding and close to a nature reserve. Local roads, especially the A64 and A1237 are already congested and local schools would be unable to cope with such large population increase.	1681/9762	
	Objection- the area of Woodthorpe would be ruined by an additional 500+ homes on 40 acres of the green belt. This area is prone to flooding and close to a nature reserve. Local roads, especially the A64 and A1237 are already congested and local schools would be unable to cope with such large population increase.	1682/9765	
	Objection- more than 500 new houses are to be built on green belt to the south of Moor Lane. Assume that no provision will be made for an alternative access other than Moor Lane. The infrastructure as it stands would not cope with this increase considering the pressure that would be placed on the water and sewerage services.	1930/143	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection- vast increase of traffic coming onto Moor Lane, Already a 'rat run'. School capacity inadequate. Affect on wild life. Using green belt land. Has thought been given to the drainage- this is a very wet area.	2056/930	
	Objection- the proposal is too close to the wildlife site in Askham Bog. This land is likely to flood. No mention of any improvement to the local infrastructure if this development goes ahead. Moor Lane already a cut through from the ring road to Askham Bar.	2363/6555	
	Objection- concerns due to drainage into Askham Bog.	2547/6839	
	Objection- concern over proposal's to build on green belt land. Green belt land should remain as such. The development is a stones throw away from Askham Bog Nature Reserve. Development will have devastating effects on wildlife, bringing noise, and acts of vandalism, selfish behaviour and introducing the domestic cat which are notorious for killing and decimating wildlife. Woodthorpe is unable to sustain such a large development and would put a strain on existing infrastructure and amenities. There is already suffering from gridlocked roadways.	2687/7141	
	Objection- the traffic is about as bad as it gets in any city in Britain. New projects will result in wall to wall brick and concrete landscapes to anyone that ventures from The Shambles.	2734/7243	
	Objection- annoyance and disappointment at 511 homes on over 40 acres of green belt. York is already stretched to its absolute limits and traffic alone is becoming more than problematic enhanced by the councils latest proposal to close one of our only three bridges across the Ouse. Moor Lane is at present well known for its gridlock situation. Moor Lane is also subject to floods by seepage which maintains the constancy of wildlife and flora of Askham Bog. Any development would have an extreme detrimental effect on the Bog site. Do not need another 1200-1500 cars in the same area.	2773/7336	
	Objection- Moor Lane is a busy road and it will not cope with the extra cars that an extra 511 homes will bring with them at Peak rush hour times. That land floods every winter and even when there has been little rainfall, it is marshy. This land on Moor Lane is also close to Askham Bog and deer can often be seen in the fields- what happens to this wildlife? Where will the children from these houses go to school? The doctors are overflowing with patients already and it's hard to get an appointment. There are brownfield sites that could be developed first or empty offices that could be turned into housing.	2802/7439	
	Objection- City of York Council previously stated that the site would remain part of the	2806/7451	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	green belt- what has happened to this commitment. Traffic congestion objection. The proposed site regularly floods. Proposed development borders Askham Bog and would cause damage to this area.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection- concern that development could have a detrimental effect on Askham Bog Nature Reserve.	2809/7455	
	Support- a preferred option for housing is ST10. Comment- should have the number of houses reduced.	2929/7659	
	Objection- proposal is on greenbelt land and this should remain as greenbelt land. It is only a stones throw away from Askham Bog Nature Reserve which is protected. Woodthorpe and Dringhouses are unable to sustain such a huge development and would put an enormous strain on the existing infrastructure and amenities. This area is already suffering from constantly gridlocked roadways.	2982/7762	
	Objection- does not feel there is a true demand for this many new houses. Not seen any evidence to substantiate the suggested level of increased jobs that this development will bring. The proposed site cannot adequately provide the required level of infrastructure from roads; schools etc. there could be an environmental impact on Askham Bog.	3101/7996	
	Objection- the greenbelt surrounding it should be left alone at all costs.	3104/8000	
	Objection – Strongly object to the proposals to build 500+ houses on Moor Lane, Woodthorpe. Apart from the serious detrimental impact on local services and infrastructure it is an inappropriate area for housing development given York’s history of flooding and requirement for flood defences.	3427/8752	
	Comment- many do not know exactly where the houses are going to be built in Moor Lane, Dringhouses, Tesco’s? Woodthorpe school is already the second largest in York, and more houses will affect places. Objection- Services- doctors/schools/dentists/drains not sufficient. Wildlife will be affected. Brownfield sites should have been used. 511 homes must detract from the open character of the green belt.	3625/9640	
	Objection- This is greenbelt land and should remain as such. The proposed development is a stones throw away from Askham Bog Nature Reserve. Woodthorpe is unable to sustain such a huge development and would put an enormous strain on the existing infrastructure and amenities. This area is already suffering from constantly gridlocked roadways. Road system is not designed for such massive passages of traffic leading to unacceptable levels of congestion and rising pollution.	3714/10001	
	Objection- deep concern over a 511 housing development on 40 acres of Green belt	3785/10204	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	land south of Moor Lane in Woodthorpe. The plans are totally inappropriate. Main objection is that this is greenbelt land and should remain as such. The proposed development is a stones throw away from the very important Askham Bog Nature Reserve. With no housing estate nearby, the reserve is successful in sustaining a safe and peaceful haven for the countless species of birds, animals, insects and plants that are thriving in harmony within and around the reserve. Woodthorpe is unable to sustain such a huge development and would put an enormous strain on the existing infrastructure and amenities; there are no plans to upgrade these. This area is already suffering from constantly gridlocked roadways with the Racecourse, York College, Tesco and access to the outer ring road all adding to the rising level of road users.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection- previous attempt to develop this land by persimmon in 1988 refused. The reasons have not changed over time, indeed the recognition of the importance of biodiversity, wildlife and the statutory protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) has markedly increased. This area is particularly in danger of urban sprawl. This land grows our food. In rotation, it grows wheat, barley, oats, oil seed rape, potatoes and grass crops to make silage for the cattle and sheep also kept here. It is classified as Grade11 best and most versatile agricultural land. The local sewer is inadequate for the development. Highway design conflict. From recent discussions with council officers regarding the plan, it would appear that this previous refusal had not been declared or flagged up, when the 2012 call for land went out. Comment- suggestions made to support development include: install pedestrian crossing on Moor Lane at Grassholme- this is on a blind bend on the road and would not be permitted. Install a footbridge over the main railway- would be cost prohibitive and would be designed to comply with disability discrimination law. Protect the landscape setting, including SSSI (Askham Bog) - building houses/shops employment etc will not protect the visual landscape, it will destroy it (against National Planning Policy Framework). A significant buffer must be maintained to the SSSI. Concern regarding scale and density of housing around the area.	3836/10311	
	Objection- Woodthorpe seems another target for development. 500+ homes on the green belt south of Moor Lane and in excess of 200 homes around Tadcaster Road and Dringhouses. Issues with road flooding at the corner of children’s nursery. Concern over the density of traffic density that has increased since more building occurred. Issues with gardens flooding, mains water pipe bursts on an annual basis. Woodthorpe school struggles to accommodate children as it is although it is not designated as full. The green belt south of Moor Lane provides space for wildlife and is a good habitat as	3839/10318	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	well as productive agricultural land. Building on this land would further impact natural drainage and worsen flood risk and traffic congestion. Comment- it is unlikely building contractors will provide all the many forms of infrastructure required to fulfil 50% of Local Plan proposals.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe	Objection- to the proposals to build such a large number of house son green belt sites around York. The proposed area is known to flood on a regular basis. The whole area to the south of the proposed development is a designated bog. The water table in fields proposed for building is high and they flood on a regular basis. Concern over fields adjacent to Moor Lane flooding- new hard standing would only exacerbate the situation.	3893/4575	
	Objection- concern that the land floods and that Woodthorpe school would be oversubscribed. Concern that Askham Bog would be adversely affected. Concern that the police have not been consulted regarding policing policy and new housing development.	4040/10684	
	Objection – The Moor Lane/Woodthorpe Site is known to flood (in 2002, suggesting a high water table in the area) and is in close proximity to Askham Bog (SSSI).	4049/10714	
	Objection – This was regarded as green belt land. Implication for Asham Bog could spell disaster for area if developed. The water table may be upset to the detriment to the Bog. Traffic along Moor lane and the area around Tesco Roundabout is currently at capacity at rush hours and will only worsen if development takes place. Wildlife is important and should be considered. York has neither the infrastructure nor the superstructure to expand at the rate proposed.	4075/10762	
	Objection – The proposed 511 dwellings would cause significant problems for the existing infrastructure. There are traffic problems on Moor lane at present but 1000 more cars would create gridlock.	4110/10810	
	Objection- The site is currently subject to surface water flooding. Development of this site could impact on surface water drainage leading to local flooding. Any further development in this area will further increase pressure on Tadcaster Road in and out of the city. AT peak times this route cannot accommodate the current traffic load.	4305/11168	
	Objection- issues with traffic- Moor Lane is already a very busy road. Congestion is particularly bad at times when traffic is entering or leaving the Sixth Form College and at all rush hour times. Schools- An extra 550 homes would put unbearable strain on local primary and secondary schools. Environment- Askham Bog is home to a wide variety of birds and wild animals. Deer are often seen roaming in the fields between bypass and A64, south of Moor Lane. Concern at the effect of the new proposed	4393/11383	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development on this green belt land to the environment and wildlife in the area.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – value highly Askham Bog Nature reserve. Although the proposed development would appear to be far enough away from the Reserve local residents are well aware of the way small ditches and watercourses take rainwater from the fields (which are generally flooded in winter) into the Reserve’s fragile ecosystem. Any disturbance and drainage of this land would potentially destroy this fine balance and thus a piece of ancient marshland with its special flora and fauna.	4404/11408	
	Objection – Woodthorpe School is striving to become a Good and Outstanding School but the risk of overcrowding and larger class sizes will jeopardise this. Concerned that the education of future generations will suffer unless any increased numbers of pupils also come with sufficient funding to allow for the employment of sufficient staff and additional resources.	4407/11415	RA&QS Committee Of The Governing Body Of Woodthorpe Community Primary School
	Objection – The proposed building plan in Woodthorpe and Dringhouses is totally inappropriate. Any further development will mean hundreds more families moving into Dringhouses and relying on the existing facilities. This will also mean hundreds more cars adding to congestion. The Moor Lane site floods and this could have a detrimental effect on the adjacent Askham Bog. Again these proposals are not sustainable.	4468/11482	
	Comment – 511 houses is the tip of the iceberg – they (Moor Lane Zero Carbon Partnership) want to build over 1000 with further land between Acomb Park and the A1237 also in their ownership.	4644/11772	
	Objection – Moor Lane cannot take additional traffic. Similarly the roads/roundabouts at either ends – A1237 and A1036 cannot accommodate present traffic levels. The public bus service is poor and unless drastic measures are taken it will not attract people to use it.	4712/12001	
	Objection – Please do not place this invaluable site (Askham Bog) under any possible threat.	4748/14269	
	Objection – York is unique in character and it would be very easy to over compromise its essence. Askham Bog was given in good faith to the people of York. It is one of the best, if not the best example of bog in the UK. So, therefore, its importance cannot be emphasised enough.	4812/12128	
	Objection – No provision for services – the local school is full to capacity and is second largest in North Yorkshire with little room for expansion. Already the volume of traffic is unacceptable. This pollution of a residential area is unacceptable. Most importantly the land earmarked is flooded 10 months of the year and building on this land will have a detrimental effect on the Askham Nature Reserve and adjoining land.	4823/12141	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – Object to the proposal to build a large number of new homes on green belt land around the city of York, especially in the area south of Moor lane which neighbours the precious Askham Bog nature reserve. The Woodthorpe proposals are dangerously close to the renowned nationally recognised nature reserve – these plans should be abandoned and the land should be preserved as green belt. The roads around York especially to the south are already at an almost constant stand still. The bus services are inadequate and expensive especially off peak. There are few enough jobs in this area as it stands especially considering that York’s main employers have closed down in recent years. It is not possible to guarantee 16000 new jobs. The whole infrastructure is already at breaking point.</p>	5118/12229	
	<p>Objection – Feel that the proposed development on Moor lane is completely unnecessary for several reasons. Additional building would place a greater burden on the local infrastructure, the local school and add considerable amount of congestion to what is already a congested area with people taking short cuts from the by-pass. There is no reason for this development to go ahead when so much in this area has already been done and would suggest that this work outlined in the Local Plan for this area should be abandoned.</p>	5132/12249	
	<p>Objection – This site proposed for housing is breaking into green belt which will detract from the rural appearance of the boundary of west York. The site also removes green space from the area which is in short supply. The road system is already overloaded. Can it be ensured that services, gas, electricity, water, sewerage and drainage are not overloaded? The area is designated as bog and usually floods in winter. Any new drainage could adversely affect water levels in Askham Bog. The area is good farm land which should not be taken out of use for building. Woodthorpe school is already oversubscribed. Doctor and dental facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>	5197/12419	
	<p>Objection – Feel strongly about the plan for more housing in the area which is proposed on green belt land on Moor Lane Dringhouses. The land in question was already banked by Persimmon approximately 18 years ago and was turned down for house building – one of the reasons being the Nature Reserve. Residents in this area are tired of the volume of traffic at this side of York. Leave the green belt alone – there is more reason to keep it clear of house building if only to mention the name ‘Askham Bog’ – what about the drainage – a big problem.</p>	5203/12429	
	<p>Objection – Objection to the proposed building of 511 new houses at Woodthorpe off Moor Lane. No thought given to how the existing infrastructure will stand up to the</p>	5231/12542	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	extra strain this building will put on it. How can Moor Lane cope with 500+ vehicles at peak times twice a day? Added to that there is a proposed Park & Ride site. Public transport is not the answer as it will not be used. The service here is unreliable. Can the existing drainage cope with another 511 houses? What cognisance has been taken over the effect on Askham Bog Nature Reserve?		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – concerned about the fairly ‘free’ attitude to the conservation of the green belt and open spaces. The proposed site at Moor lane Woodthorpe will have an impact on the nature reserve at Askham Bog, if not directly then by the pressure of the built environment on wildlife corridors and the probable consequent change in local water table because of the loss of the area for rain water capture. There does also seem a willingness to develop new sites rather than revive existing brown field sites and the improvement of the existing housing stock. New build developments take money away from the local economy whereas small scale renewals are more usually done by local contractors and the subsequent economic benefits stay within the local area.	5243/14324	
	Objection – Askham Bog is yet again being threatened by the close proximity of the planned new estate on Moor lane. It is unique in its red listed birds which breed there and are in need of responsible protection on this Yorkshire Wildlife Trust’s oldest site. Reconsider the despoliation of this green field site.	5246/14344	
	Objection – strongly object to the Local Plan proposals particularly the 500 new homes on the south of Moor lane Woodthorpe. Local roads and current infrastructure cannot cope with the huge increases in cars. The green belt should be protected.	5342/14531	
	Objection – the proposed housing on Moor lane will build on the buffer zone for Askham Bog which is a nationally renowned nature reserve. Building near it will affect its ecology detrimentally – there seems no consideration for schools, play parks or other amenities in this house growth. Building on flood plains will just offset future floods elsewhere.	5344/14536	
	Objection – current infrastructure cannot support the existing population let alone another 511 dwellings The primary school is full and medical facilities are already overstretched. Traffic bottlenecks at the Askham Bar roundabout. Surface water is an issue. Askham Bog is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), proposals to build within 200 yards of this conservation area without any apparent thought as to the impact that 500+ have on it and its wildlife habitat. There will be no integration of this new development within the existing Woodthorpe community because Moor lane and its traffic density will act as a barrier as well as increasing the air pollution. The land is high grade agricultural land that we can ill afford to lose that currently protects and	5353/14542	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	enhances the Askham Bog conservation area. This would result in a significant negative impact on the Woodthorpe community.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – directly affected by proposed development on green belt land south of Woodthorpe. It is an important area for wildlife – any development will reduce accessibility for the wildlife and destroy the habitat for ever. The 40 acres of housing and roads will cause enormous damage to the natural drainage of the area and to the multitude of ponds alongside Moor Lane which are important breeding grounds for amphibians, insects, birds, etc. Askham Bog nature reserve is just to the south of the proposed 40 acre development and will be very vulnerable to drainage changes. Since recent new developments more traffic comes along Moor Lane in both directions – This has led to frequent long queues at the Tesco roundabout and accessing the A1237 even more problematic. If 500+ houses are built that adds a possible 1000 cars to an already busy road. New developments of shops, dentists, surgeries, schools etc will be needed – the current facilities are already struggling to provide satisfactory service.	5416/14707	
	Objection – the area has limited infrastructure. More houses will mean more cars. There aren't enough jobs so commuting is a reality for many. More cars will push already trained ring road to its limits.	5461/14803	
	Objection – agricultural land is a limited resource especially when many other brownfield sites could be developed. Where will all the surface water from the new houses drain to? Will drainage be improved? There would be a massive increase in traffic in the already gridlocked area. Will Moor Lane be resurfaced and improved? Will access to the housing be off Moor lane or the ring road? Will road junctions along Moor Lane be improved especially the mini roundabout at Challoners Way. Deer are currently seen on the proposed site. Houses on Moor Lane will have their open aspect removed. What type of housing is being proposed? Where will new occupants work? Has the full consequences of the impact on local services been reviewed?	5486/14845	
	Objection – building on this land will spoil the feel and destroy the valuable habitat for wildlife. The extra vehicles will make congestion – an investment in the road network possibly making the ring road a dual carriageway will be required. New amenities would be required for the increase in population which has not been mentioned in the plan. Do we need more housing in the area considering the redevelopment of the York College? Also where will these extra people work?	5506/14885	
	Objection – concerned about the lack of infrastructure. Woodthorpe Primary School is already very big and full, there are no secondary schools in the area. Are there any plans to build another primary or secondary school? Moor Lane is very busy –	5537/14956	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	especially in rush hours. Are there any plans to build another road – perhaps from the housing to the outer ring road or over the railway lines to Tadcaster Road? There are precious little recreational facilities in this area – has any thought been put into a Youth Club and playing fields? The necessary infrastructure needs to also be put in place.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – concerned about the impact will have on the areas already failing infrastructure. The roundabout at the junction between Moor Lane and Tadcaster Road is particularly hazardous and stressful. Public transport offers no realistic alternative. The Park & Ride is a useful service during the daytime although it stops at 8pm. Concerned also about the impact of the proposed development on wildlife and the environment. This area is green belt. Also development will have a significant impact on the wider catchment’s ability to cope with flooding.	5541/14961	
	Objection – totally inappropriate for the area. The land is known to have a high water table and considerable drainage problems with regular periods of standing water on fields adjacent to Moor Lane, as well as one or two properties on the north side of Moor Lane – a feature that would be made considerable worse if the development took place. No consideration appears to have been made concerning local infrastructure. In particular Woodthorpe school is at capacity and traffic along Moor Lane is incessant particularly at peak morning and afternoon periods. Moor Lane forms a natural southern boundary between the urbanised area of York and the nearby village of Copmanthorpe, the development of the size proposed would forever damage the character and semi rural charm of the area.	5604/13155	
	Comment – the Council needs to take account of the surface water regularly seen during period of even moderate rainfall and the environmental impact, including the nearby Askham Bog, of draining the site sufficiently to build housing. The roundabout to the east of the site Moor Lane with Tadcaster Road is already a known traffic bottleneck. Consideration should be given to the extra traffic this junction will experience. Especially bearing in mind the existing new housing development on the former college site and the proposed redevelopment of the present Park & Ride site at Askham Bar.	5642/13273	
	Objection – would turn the area into a massive building site. Unsited to the location. The traffic is already a nightmare along Tadcaster Road. Public amenities and services in the area are already over stretched. The schools are not suited to cope with yet more new homes and the drains won’t be able to cope.	5652/13294	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – terrible idea which will ruin a beautiful part of the city. Cities have green belts for a very obvious reason. Find an alternative site.	5702/13435	
	Objection – destruction of present green belt when brownfield sites are available. Destruction and upheaval to wildlife. The area suffers from poor drainage known locally as Askham Bog; building will put more pressure on existing services/facilities. Will bring a dramatic increase to traffic on Moor Lane which will impact at Askham Bar and Woodthorpe roundabout on the southern by pass causing congestion at two of the most important entries to the city. Local Schools are already oversubscribed and will be unable to cope with increased pupils.	5703/13436	
	Objection – it is an area of environmental importance with species of wildlife in the area known as Askham Bog. Will impact on the flora and fauna of this important nature reserve. The existing infrastructure is already choked and any further development can really only be carried out if a solution is found towards traffic congestion. Concerned about the green belt and unique nature of the city which could easily be spooled especially by further residential development in this area of the city.	5772/13652	
	Objection – it is counterproductive to maintain the sense of green space around the city. The area around monks cross could be developed further without too much intrusion into the green belt.	5775/13661	
	Objection – the site is adjacent to Askham Bog, a Site of Special Scientific Interest and is one of the most botanically bio diverse sites in the region and nationally important for invertebrates. The proposed development could potentially damage the hydrology of the reserve causing irrevocable damage. Concerns about the sustainability of the site given that all residents would need to travel to access work, secondary education and shopping. Also concerned about the adequacy of health facilities in the area and access to both primary and secondary schools.	5822/13776	
	Objection – concerned that extending the boundaries of York will begin to lose the identity of the city and become of the west riding sprawl, will have a detrimental effect on the delicate eco wildlife within in this community (Askham Bog). Concerned it will seriously impact on the facilities to support current and the proposed housing such as schools and infrastructure, but more importantly drainage, especially in an area that is already prone to flooding. Object to the loss of good food producing land.	5837/13814	
	Objection – how come the status of the green bet land has changed so that it can be built on? Any further development would have to consider and come up with an acceptable solution to the increase in traffic to Moor Lane and the current unacceptable volume of traffic to the Tesco Roundabout.	5855/15107	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – traffic on Moor Lane is already very heavy around rush hour and there are no other roads leading out of the south York area. The ring road and Tadcaster Road is already operating at capacity and the development on the old 6 th form college site is still expanding. It isn't even possible to plan other routes out of Woodthorpe as it is limited by the availability of railway bridges. 511 new homes is hugely ambitious and ill conceived proposal. The green belt shouldn't be considered until all the brownfield sites have been developed. The facilities in the area are already operating at full capacity. Will put an immense strain on already overloaded facilities. There is a nature reserve on the boundary of the proposed developed which has rare species and special scientific interest which should be protected.	5862/15128	
	Objection – oppose using agricultural land and the green belt, development over and close to wildlife areas, complete disruption in the area when being built for resident, amount of work needed for upgrading roads and services, unlikelihood of jobs in the area to sustain 511 houses and with sites being built near to the Moor Lane site York will be turned form a pleasant city to a giant building yard.	5888/15190	
	Comment – what are the Council planning for community buildings at ST10? Considered that it would be a great long term disservice to people if there is no church/community centre in the plan.	5896/15204	
	Objection - The council need to consider very carefully the impact of this proposal. Firstly the local infrastructure will not cope with the addition of these new homes. This includes schools, roads, bus services etc. Secondly the area of Askham Bog is one of the oldest Nature Reserves in the country. Any further building development near or close to this area will lead to the collapse of this reserve.	5991/15372	
	Objection – do no want any more housing in Moor Lane, the green belt is very precious.	5995/15379	
	Objection – disappointed about the proposals to build more houses in York especially on green belt near Woodthorpe. York and this country is obviously over population and we are encouraging more people. Why?	5996/15381	
	Objection – opposed to the developed of green belt land off Moor Lane. York has a major problem with infrastructure, access generally; the town layout does not lend itself to the 21 st century. It is a city of history and culture and should remain so.	5997/15385	
	Objection – Askham Bog needs to be preserved. Only one in England. Requires at least a five mile radius protection.	6002/15392	
	Objection – too much building has gone one with Acomb Park adding to too many houses. The roads in the area cannot cope now; incoming cars and traffic from the	6004/15395	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	added houses will choke Woodthorpe. It is crucial to retain greenbelt area.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – the area is quite unsustainable for such a large amount of new build, the infrastructure is nil at this time and likely to stay so.	6007/15399	
	Objection – the views and rural aspects are valuable, transport/road links are already under pressure from Tesco/Park & Ride traffic and York college.	6012/15406	
	Objection – oppose building houses on Moor Lane, where they will be too close to Askham Bog the nature reserve.	6017/15413	
	Objection – appalled at the extent of the building planned for the area. The infrastructure is already at breaking point, it takes weeks for an emergency doctor’s appointment, full schools, road congestion as examples. New ‘revival’ estate has added to all this where there are many homes still for sale. These estates are built but not filled as many are too expensive. The area will be subject to ridiculous pressure.	6023/15421	
	Objection – the greenbelt is very important. Cannot cope with any more housing this side of town. The road network just cannot take any more traffic. There is often a complete gridlock from the area into town.	6024/15423	
	Objection – York is a small city and the proposed development is out of proportion for its overall size. It risks spoiling the character of York turning it into a pre suburb of Leeds. Does the council have the funds to provide adequate services for the areas affected by the planned building sites? Agricultural land must be protected. Due to the topography of the area the fields along Moor Lane flood and standing water is seen on a fairly regular basis. The fields currently as the areas flood pain. The land in the area is heavy clay and is well compacted thus restricting drainage. There is a pumping station at the end of Moor Lane to deal with excess water indicating that the area is a wet area. Askham Bog is a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as such a protected area. Such a large development so close will have a detrimental effect from local land issues such as water sources and levels but also domestic issues such as noise disturbance, pets affecting the wildlife etc. It will also reduce and probably remove the green corridors needed by wildlife to move between different areas. York’s infrastructure is under considerable strain with frequent gridlock and it not fit for purpose as it currently stands. With the inclusion of such a vast number of houses this will have a detrimental effect on the already struggling infrastructure. There appears to be no plan for investment in new or current services. There are already problems with the local schools, GPs and dentists. The water main down Moor Lane is old and fails on a regular basis; increased pressure from the huge number of houses would put	6055/15499	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>additional strain on this already weak situation. There s also a problem with the gas main down Moor Lane which is too small for the number of properties it supplies. The loss of the mature trees and plants will create an increase in groundwater and cause further problem with flooding and be detrimental to the local wildlife. York is already short of green spaces especially on this side of town, several have been lost in recent years and there are no proposals to provide any new green spaces.</p>		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – concerned about the proposals at ST10 and the effect on Askham Bog a Sites of Special Scientific Interest, development is likely to affect the balance that creates this unique environment in the first place. Note that Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is very concerned and their concerns are supported. Do not think the site is sustainable. The community facilities and infrastructure in the area are already stretched. There is no employment close by which will lead to a lot more traffic as residents travel to school, work and to shop. The site has easy access to the A64 and would be highly attractive to commuters who travel to Leeds. The site would expand the city into the greenbelt and would affect the views of the city and minster from the A1237.</p>	6057/15508	
	<p>Support – support the allocation of ST10 and suggest that it should be extended to provide increased housing delivery to ensure the plan is effective and there is flexibility within the identified supply in the event that sites do not come forward as expected.</p>	6062/15511	ID Planning
	<p>Objection - quite likely that some developments, specifically Moor Lane south are more likely to become satellites commuter area for Leeds. There is already heavy congestion at peak times at the Tadcaster Road junction; this will only increase with the traffic from the college site development once completed. Additional traffic can also be expected from the re-siting of the current Park and Ride site as well as the proposed redevelopment of the existing site. At the opposite end of Moor Lane, a similar situation is likely to arise at the junction with the A1237. The land is already prone to flooding (the names of local sites such as Askham Bog, and Marsh Farm give historic clues to this fact). Any additional impervious paved areas, and run off from roofs, can only add to the potential for more severe flooding in the area unless an additional significant drainage scheme is introduced. Aware of the shortage of school places, particularly primary, in the area of south west York. It is unlikely that any developments, other than the two 'village' developments would warrant the provision any additional schools or classrooms. Currently the Woodthorpe/Acomb Park area is served by one Doctors surgery which is held in what is basically a chalet bungalow. There is no dedicated parking, and it is situated on an already busy road. The</p>	6249/15821	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development on Moor Lane would naturally add to the number of patients requiring medical support. It is likely to place an increase demand on an already sparse and erratic public transport service in the area.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – an essential boundary between town and country would be destroyed.	6269/15843	
	Objection - unhappy about this. Think it will urbanise the feel of the strip far too much and make things closed in. It is rather nice being able to see out as one drives along Moor Lane. Would hate to see this land built on.	6271/15855	
	Objection – Askham Bog will be impacted by ST10.	6277/15866	Friends Of Rawcliffe Meadows
	Objection – concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support the new development. Presents pressure on the existing infrastructure at the detriment of local communities Schooling is of significant concern. The lack of consideration for additional infrastructure means that the plans are unsustainable. The current road network already experiences severe traffic delays which will only worsen with additional road users in the area. The space to increase the road network is either not available or it is not viable due to coast and the extent of the work required. The unique character of York will be significantly impacted and the city will lose its charm and appeal. Concerned that the green belt would be lost.	6358/16065	
	Objection – Askham Bar is a bottleneck at peak times already. There will be no green belt between Woodthorpe and Tadcaster Road.	6380/16110	
	Objection - The current aspect of this suburb is rural, which is one popular and enduring thing about it. It has a very pleasant, open feel to it. Having such a large area of housing built would mean this would be lost. For example, due to the closeness of open countryside and the farmland directly adjacent to Moor Lane, backing onto Askham Bog, roe deer often frequent the streets and have been spotted on the roads and in gardens when they are active. The area is useful farmland. This particular farmland is especially useful for the local wildlife e.g. geese and roe deer. The farmland offers wildlife corridors and additional space for species to live in and move around in the area close to Askham Bog. The planned housing development's area is large and closes in on Askham Bog, which is a nationally recognised area of special wildlife interest. Askham Bog has already been affected by pollution and the affects of man. The dangerous changes in drainage due to the encroachment of urban sprawl may add to this and have irreversible affects for this already sensitive area. An increase in buildings, man-made surfaces etc. will need a lot of drainage (which means a lot of work and disruption), but even then, new builds will have flooded gardens.	6502/16248	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>This sensitive and priority habitat needs to continue to be protected, and building so close to it will jeopardise it no end. Humans should be kept away from it as much as possible and increased traffic near it will also harm it and the wildlife that live there. The development does not contribute to the Biodiversity Action Plan regarding habitat enhancement (a priority) or the potential to increase the size of current, valuable wildlife sites; indeed the development of green field land adjacent to the site will cause potential damage and decreases this potential. There are going to be hundreds of new homes in the area including the York College site which means hundreds more families in the area relying on the existing amenities plus hundreds more cars travelling through the area which will put undoubted pressure on the already busy A64 and A1237. An increased population in this area means more traffic using Moor Lane to access the ring road. This would mean that it will be more difficult for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists to cross. The A1237 is very busy and there is no under or over pass; have seen no plans to create one or the other to aid people crossing this road. There are also no plans to create a two-lane road in this area on the A1237, although this is likely going to be very busy and jammed with the increased traffic. Why are there no plans to do this, although it is proposed on the stretch further north? Not only is the greenbelt in this area enjoyed for its view, but also for the space to exercise dogs.</p>		
<p>Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection - The current aspect of this suburb is rural, which is one popular and enduring thing about it. It has a very pleasant, open feel to it. Having such a large area of housing built would mean this would be lost. For example, due to the closeness of open countryside and the farmland directly adjacent to Moor Lane, backing onto Askham Bog, roe deer often frequent the streets and have been spotted on the roads and in gardens when they are active. The area is useful farmland. This particular farmland is especially useful for the local wildlife e.g.: geese and roe deer. The farmland offers wildlife corridors and additional space for species to live in and move around in the area close to Askham Bog. The planned housing development's area is large and closes in on Askham Bog, which is a nationally recognised area of special wildlife interest. Askham Bog has already been affected by pollution and the affects of man. The dangerous changes in drainage due to the encroachment of urban sprawl may add to this and have irreversible affects for this already sensitive area. An increase in buildings, man-made surfaces etc. will need a lot of drainage (which means a lot of work and disruption), but even then, new builds will have flooded gardens. This sensitive and priority habitat needs to continue to be protected, and building so</p>	<p>6503/16252</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>close to it will jeopardise it no end. Humans should be kept away from it as much as possible and increased traffic near it will also harm it and the wildlife that live there The development does not contribute to the Biodiversity Action Plan regarding habitat enhancement (a priority) or the potential to increase the size of current, valuable wildlife sites; indeed the development of green field land adjacent to the site will cause potential damage and decreases this potential. There are going to be hundreds of new homes in the area including the York College site which means hundreds more families in the area relying on the existing amenities plus hundreds more cars travelling through the area which will put undoubted pressure on the already busy A64 and A1237. An increased population in this area means more traffic using Moor Lane to access the ring road. This would mean that it will be more difficult for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists to cross. The A1237 is very busy and there is no under or over pass; have seen no plans to create one or the other to aid people crossing this road. There are also no plans to create a two-lane road in this area on the A1237, although this is likely going to be very busy and jammed with the increased traffic. Why are there no plans to do this, although it is proposed on the stretch further north? Not only is the greenbelt in this area enjoyed for its view, but also for the space to exercise dogs.</p>		
<p>Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection – many residents are surprised and upset that the area is yet again being threatened with development. It has been proposed in the past and rejected primarily because of environmental issues. The site is adjacent to Askham Bog a Site of Special Scientific Interest and the detrimental effect the development of the site would have on the Bog means it should be rejected. Any development of this site would affect the residents and the infrastructure of Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward and not Rural West. Would query the sustainability of a site that would mean all occupiers would need to travel to access work, secondary education and shopping. Concerns about the loss of green fields that currently provide informal recreational space, the adequacy of health facilities in the area and access to both secondary and primary schools. The site only creates jobs in the short term while the housing is being built. Key strategic views of the Minster could be compromised. There is a lack of employment opportunities in the immediate area. This, along with the close proximity to the A64 with excellent links to Leeds and west Yorkshire will mean that it will be a magnet for the commuter.</p>	6515/16314	Cllr Ann Reid
	<p>Comment – concerned with the lack of consistency with the aspirations of Policy GI1 and ST10. According to the Sustainability Appraisal 'the quality of the land is</p>	6518/16413	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	associated with aquifer reserves and its ability to provide and store ground water for Askham Bog nature reserve. This could have 'significant environmental consequences' and 'significant adverse impacts'.		
Site ST10 Land At Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Continued	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	
	Objection – successive local plans have indicated that this land is important in enhancing York's rural setting. The nearby Askham Bog nature reserve could be adversely affected by any development. Concerned that development in this area would exacerbate the traffic congestion problems which are already evident at certain times of the day. Land should continue to be included in green belt.	Petition 17	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington	Comment- no further development to occur before study with the Internal Drainage Board looking at South Beck is completed and associated works completed to mitigate against fluvial and surface flooding. Site lies predominately in flood zone 1 with small area in flood zone 2. Development must take a sequential approach regarding layout. Surface water guidance to be followed.	3/11739	Environment Agency
	Objection- the proposal will leave Huntington with very little green space or Green Belt south of the A1237. Building of a 50% increase will create considerable strain and problems relating to infrastructure. The A1237 is routinely at a standstill and schools are already full. Drainage problems and standing water issues are on going concerns. Comment- the quantity of new homes in the local plan may not reflect the actual number in the planning application. The plan does not include any safeguarded land but is trying to use all of our buildable land for future development as recreational requirements.	67/12734	Huntington Parish Council
	Objection – this site includes the Roman camp on Huntington South Moor which is a Scheduled Monument. National policy guidance makes it clear that substantial harm to the significance of such an asset should be wholly exceptional. Huntington Grange to the west of this area is a Grade II Listed Building.	238/14062	English Heritage
	Objection – the amount of proposed housing in Huntington/Monks Cross is excessive with the lack of infrastructure, the roads are already congested. It could swamp an already large suburb and damage the natural environment.	258/14149	
	Objection- number of homes is excessive and needs to be reduced- it comes on top of the large John Lewis/Marks and Spencer/ Stadium development. This will create congestion on the A1237 and have a detrimental impact on local roads. The northern section of the outer ring road is already congested. Drainage in Huntington is at its limit already. Unacceptable pressure on existing local facilities, schools, doctors etc. A huge take out of the GB and a detrimental impact on Huntington’s character and environmental quality- radically changing the nature of the built/rural boundary for North Huntington. Air quality issues resulting from traffic generation. Reduce the Huntington allocation to a maximum of 400-500, located on an incremental basis to make use of existing infrastructure and services (enhanced locally).	527/16652	
	Objection- it is inappropriately placed in the Green Belt and would put immense strain on local infrastructure. Could mean potentially thousands more cars contributing to congestion problems on the A64 and A1237. Proposed development is unsustainable since the infrastructure is already inadequate for current needs. The roads are congested, schools are oversubscribed and medical services are overburdened.	529/16680	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Services for elderly and disabled residents have already declined alarmingly. Serious incompatibility between the proposed development and the duty of care for the natural environment and the Site of Special Scientific Interest.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Support – agree with Council’s assessment of site ST11 and conclusion that it represents a suitable allocation for up to 411 new homes. See response for detail. Objection - Object to the nature conservation designation on the southern part of site ST11. See response for detail.	659/15057	Persimmon Homes
	Objection- development will cause havoc on the roads, drains, air pollution etc.	741/16889	
	Objection- proposed development is inappropriately placed in the Green Belt and would undoubtedly put immense strain on the local infrastructure. Could potentially mean thousands more cars contributing to congestion problems on the A64 and A1237. Development is unsustainable, infrastructure already inadequate. Roads are congested, schools are oversubscribed and medical services overburdened. Services for elderly and disabled residents have declined. Further pressure on remaining services would be a cause of serious concern. Development within 5km of Strensall Common a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest.	835/16904	
	Objection - new houses will make existing traffic congestion even worse. Object to building on green belt land. Existing schools full. Huntington cannot cope with any more housing.	1045/80	
	Objection- too much infill. This is welcome green space. Do not want urban sprawl. New lane is a small road, couldn’t cope.	1144/17083	
	Objection – if the proposals go ahead there will be a considerable effect on the local road network, particularly in light of the concerns expressed by the Highways Agency. The 2,000 homes to the north and south of Monks Cross could have a detrimental impact on the ability of the retail park to thrive and generate economic growth for the city.	1355/17326	
	Objection- how can greenbelt land be abused in such a way? How can plans be made for almost 2000 houses in Huntington without any thought to schools, doctors and traffic?	1727/9808	
	Objection – accept the need for new housing but must object to so much. Appreciate the green areas in Huntington and this mass overdevelopment severely erodes these. The infrastructure to support the new houses does not accompany the plans. For example the schools in the community would not be able to support the number of new homes. What about other services?	1846/9897	
	Objection - the proposals for Huntington are absurd. The effect on local traffic, current	1897/60	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing, schools, and doctors will be catastrophic. Already getting new houses at the Sessions site. Traffic increases will be significant because of the new retail development, never mind thousands of more people living here. Covering yet more of our green belt with concrete will endanger local wildlife and greatly add to the threat of flooding. The drainage system will be unable to cope. Where are all these people coming from that all these houses are needed?		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection - will overload the local roads Even now there is often a long wait when turning out of North Lane into Strensall Road and extra housing in this area will make it much worse. The area is already liable to flood after quite moderate rainfall. Extra houses will exacerbate this. Who is going to occupy the houses, presume it will not all be pensioners so where are the jobs for the wage earners who will occupy these houses coming from and where will the money come from to pay their mortgage/rent?	1900/9906	
	Objection – New Lane premises already suffer from sewerage blockages and poor drainage. More homes will add to the problem. Malton Road often gets grid locked during busy commuting periods. Adding more household traffic to the road would be crazy. What are the plans to extend surgeries, schools and even York hospital for these extra residents?	1919/9913	
	Objection – traffic congestion would be appalling and very much object to greenbelt land being used.	1934/155	
	Objection – disappointed to see that there is a large area of development planned near Huntington (ST8 and ST11).	1949/222	
	Objection- traffic: access to and from the proposed development will be via New Lane. Traffic volume on this road is already at excessive levels. To increase this volume, which the proposal will do is completely unacceptable. Drainage: the site and whole surrounding area suffers from poor drainage. Concern that the existence of 411 new houses will exacerbate the problem. Problems with fluctuating water pressure which the development will exacerbate. No reference to how the existing school and health facilities will be expanded to accommodate the increased demand place upon them by the development. Public transport facilities are already inadequate. Question over the status of the green belt.	2311/6519	
	Objection- why have green belt land and why was it protected when councils just ignore this? The top ring road cannot cope with the traffic now. Basic services such as schools, doctors and dentists will to be able to cope.	2354/4368	
	Objection- infrastructure problems and impact on the green belt.	2416/6587	
	Objection- new development would exacerbate existing problems (traffic, noise,	2438/6721	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	congestion and pollution) even more. The local community is already facing increased congestion and pollution the new retail park will generate. Poor access road suitability from existing road network to the proposal development. The Huntington area meant to be a village is becoming built up with housing and retail. There is very little open space; this small piece of green space is a welcome and civilised distraction from the urban sprawl.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection- this is greenbelt land, and there are many brownfield sites which could be used. The volume of traffic on New Lane would be greatly increased.	2584/6928	
	Objection- development will use the outer ring road which already suffers from severe congestion.	2638/6995	
	Objection- Huntington is the focus for far immense over development in terms of housing and retail vicinity. There is much more traffic on New Lane resulting from growth already.	2652/7026	
	Objection- drainage and sewerage, traffic already a problem in Huntington with no plans readily available for dealing with it.	2670/7071	
	Objection- any more housing builds will add to congestion.	2674/7087	
	Objection- local infrastructure would not cope. Need new schools, new GP surgeries, leisure facilities and none of this is mentioned in any of the plans. Who is going to live in these houses?	2725/7220	
	Comment- agree that Huntington/York needs new housing. This density far exceeds the number needed and this expansion is unrealistic and will destroy the character of the area and environment. There is already great pressure on the road network- schools and the hospital. The local infrastructure will be compromised.	2961/7737	
	Comment- noted that more housing is needed but in the village of Huntington the infrastructure is such- school for primary is already full. Extra traffic is not adequate. Do not object to the housing proposals to Monks Cross, maybe this is where this is where a new school should be situated?	2971/7753	
	Objection- the fields along New Lane are often water logged in winter with surface water evident in other seasons.	2973/7757	
	Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area; will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	3001/7823	
Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area; will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	3002/7827		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection- concerns regarding the water and sewerage of the proposed site on New Lane. The drainage system could not cope with a large development of this scale. Concern about the volume of traffic.	3177/8173	
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection- land prone to flooding. Infrastructure-no proposed increase to the local primary school, doctors or dentists. Roads- busy enough at the moment. North Lane is a very narrow road with no drainage facilities or curbing.	3183/8191	
	Objection- development will harm the unique character of the area; will cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. Green belt should not be used until brown field sites are fully developed over all total house building of 2000 homes in greenbelt Huntington is unrealistic. There should be no further building on New Lane. To meet any demand, new roads, new drainage, new facilities (schools, shops, leisure clubs) would be essential. When Monks Cross and stadium completed, traffic congestion is unavoidable unless new roads are built to accommodate homes, leisure and shopping.	3185/8194	
	Objection- these areas are important for wildlife and birds. The destruction of the hedgerows would remove habitat for birds. Deer and foxes in these areas have been seen. These areas important to soak away major rainfall. Increase in housing would create more traffic on already busy roads and the schools, doctors etc wouldn't be able to cope. Would be better to have development more spread and to retain the green spaces. If so many new houses are needed essentially a new village ought to be developed. These can be developed with their own schools and services so that they won't damage communities. This would mean Huntington's busy enough roads won't get worse and wont increase air pollution.	3186/8198	
	Objection- green belt land should be kept for as long as possible and use brownfield sites, as it will harm our area of Huntington and New Lane. The drainage and sewerage are quite bad now.	3187/8200	
	Objection- there are enough brown sites in York to be developed before starting building on green sites build on brown sites first. Huntington cannot sustain 2000 more homes on green belt land. More traffic – absolute chaos. To meet reasonable demand, new drainage, new roads, new facilities, shops, leisure, schools, doctors must be implemented. Monks Cross and stadium will vastly increase traffic congestion.	3188/8203	
	Objection- development will cause more congestion, increase air pollution, cause problems with drainage and sewerage. The site of green belt north has a population of great crested newts. It is important to safeguard habitats.	3189/8205	
	Objection- Traffic in the local area is already a problem. Further homes would lead to	3191/8212	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	gridlock on a weekend. The impact on wildlife would be terrible. Some of the fields are ancient, dating back to medieval times, there are remains of ridge and furrow. Will all heritage be lost to development?		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection- how will infrastructure hold up? How will local schools cope with numbers? Are the numbers correct for these areas considering all the other factors? Traffic is already struggling. Reduce number of houses and invest the rest of the money into improving infrastructure: drains, roads, and schooling.	3192/8214	
	Objection- area prone to heavy flooding during periods of heavy rain. The existing drainage system is already undersized. The roads are too narrow to accommodate the extra vehicles that will be forced onto them. The local schools are stretched; the existing doctors and dental practices are under pressure already. Where are the jobs for the influx of new people? The John Lewis/Marks and Spencer development will bring even more traffic into Huntington. There will be a loss of green belt which seems to be the easy option of choice rather than use brownfield sites.	3193/8218	
	Objection- New Lane cannot cater for more traffic. Local schools- impossible to increase intake. The clay area is prone to flooding. Leave green field sites alone after all brown field sites of which there are many.	3194/8220	
	Objection- huge amounts of traffic created. Flooding always been a concern down New Lane. Schools, doctors are going to be inundated. Unfair amount of new building in Huntington especially on green field sites when brown sites available elsewhere.	3195/8223	
	Objection- all these houses are not required- roads already crowded. Schools full. Using green field sites.	3196/8225	
	Objection- effects on local services and community. Where will people work? The road network is far too narrow for more traffic. There is problem with drainage in this area.	3197/8228	
	Objection- is there to be a new drainage system to cope with extra sewage, new roads to cope with extra cars, probably new school. Where are the people who buy these houses going to work? All York's workforce has been terminated, rail, Nestle, Cravens, Terry's.	3198/8230	
	Objection- no mention of Land Drainage Act Section 24/5 survey. Yet refer to flood events before and after this survey. Do consultants know of very widespread electric failure and where the New Lane area drains into the Foss? Why aren't the Internal Drainage Board boundaries shown on the maps? Why does it refer to the water coming across by Tower Street, the latter would no doubt be covered by an Environment Agency scheme alongside the Ouse?	3199/8232	
	Objection- not convinced the large number is needed or desirable, it will put much	3200/8234	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	strain on the infrastructure around Monks Cross and Huntington. Disagree about building in green field land. All brownfield land should be built on first. The amount of traffic in the area will treble causing all sorts of problems.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – housing on New Lane not done yet so that will create even more pressure on schools, doctors, shops and traffic. There does not appear t be any suggestion or definite plans for extra local shops. Current doctors surgery is already a week to wait for an appointment, Local schools not big enough to cater for such a huge influx if both new lane and monks cross are developed.	3201/8236	
	Objection – developing ST11 will cause severe congestion, and impact on the drainage and sewerage which is already a problem in Huntington.	3202/8239	
	Objection – development of ST11 is relying on existing roads, sewerage systems, schools, and hospitals etc, all of which are stretched to capacity as it is.	3203/8240	
	Objection – development of ST11 is relying on existing roads, sewerage systems, schools, and hospitals etc, all of which are stretched to capacity as it is.	3203/8241	
	Objection – Huntington is congested enough especially with the ongoing development on Monks Cross. This will only add to the problems. Getting a doctor’s appointment is difficult and parents should be ensured their “first choice” for schools in the area.	3204/8243	
	Objection – the development of ST11 will harm the area, cause severe congestion, air pollution, and impact on drains and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. School, doctors are already struggling to accommodate the rising residents in the area.	3207/8255	
	Objection – totally opposed to the development of green belt land off new lane in Huntington. This will lower the standard of living in the area dramatically in what is already an overcrowded area. This area was protected greenbelt under the 2005 Local Plan, why has this designation changed? It shows an enormous lack of respect to those at rest in the cemetery.	3212/8277	
	Objection – another 2000 homes on the area would put an overwhelming load on the drainage system and roads. The A1237 cannot cope with the current levels of traffic; it would not cope with more traffic.	3252/8347	
	Objection –development of ST11 will harm the unique character of Huntington. It will cause severe congestion on the roads as we already have the new Monks Cross outlet bring built which will attract many visitors which in turn means cars, All these proposed homes will impact greatly on our sewerage and drainage system, which is already a major problem every year. Yorkshire Water visits New Lane at least three times a year.	3267/8391	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – the site is easily waterlogged and will require much drainage – this in turn will destroy habitat for wildlife. Apart from changing the character of Huntington there will be too great a strain on the infrastructure. The drainage system in New Lane especially gives cause for concern. The sewers are inadequate, resulting in raw sewage spilling out into gardens, a great health hazard. Roads in Huntington maybe adequate at present but further development will put great strain on the existing system. Also the community facilities such as schools and health provision will be under strain.	3269/8395	
	Objection – drainage and sewerage area a big problem in Huntington. A lot of expense will be involved in maintaining existing and providing new systems for this project. More roads would have to be built with more planning into the width and position of them.	3270/8400	
	Objection – the proposed housing on these sites would make this a town rather than the village. There are problems with the drainage and sewerage which would have exacerbated with all these extra houses. The existing schools and doctors surgeries could not cope with all these extra people. The extra traffic generated would be horrendous.	3286/8432	
	Objection – ST11 will harm the unique character of our area; will cause severe traffic congestion and air pollution impact and drainage and sewerage system which are already a major problem in Huntington.	3343/8526	
	Objection – lack of infrastructure detail. Roads in this area are congested, there is little or no detail on how the sewerage system will cope, existing drainage and flooding problems, no detail or study carried out on the effects of pouring acres of concrete over Huntington will have on an already rising water table within the plan.	3349/8538	
	Objection – the drains are always blocked more cars pose a safety risk, there is no room to expand the cemetery, Huntington needs a large green park.	3351/8542	
	Objection – development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village and the village amenities such as doctors and schools. It will cause further congestion especially on the A1237. The council should re-develop brownfield sites and then re-assess the actual building requirements.	3352/8546	
	Objection – the advert impact on the drainage and sewerage, which will be exacerbated by further development. The site at new lane is always flooded in winter. This Greenfield area is valuable to birds and wildlife and helps absorb noise and air pollution caused by the heavy flows of traffic using Monks Cross. Houses built on this land would also be subject to disturbance from the loudspeaker system of the proposed stadium and also the impact of the floodlights on match days. There would	3355/8562	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be an increase in traffic. Proposed development seems excessive in the Huntington area. Brownfield sites should be considered first.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – development will harm the unique character of the area, cause severe congestion (especially on new lane), impact on drainage and sewerage.	3359/8612	
	Objection – this area covers a disproportionate area of Huntington compared to other parts of the city area. It, with other proposals in the Huntington area would remove all green areas within Huntington. Huntington is already developed to a significant degree due to the extension of Monks Cross, the new football stadium, the “Barratt” estate on new lane and the Sessions site. The transport and drainage infrastructure is already over loaded. Further development is unrealistic, the local facilities such as schools cannot support such population increases.	3361/8622	
	Objection – there are insufficient facilities such as schools, doctors and road as well as the loss of substantial greenbelt. The village of Huntington will be lost in identity. Not enough infrastructure to succeed, the area will become too populated having more traffic delays for locals.	3366/8635	
	Objection – the infrastructure in Huntington will never cope with the scale of the expansion making everyone’s lives a misery. Local parents cannot get their children in to school because pupils are travelling from outlying areas. Traffic is already at almost optimum levels. What will happen if this scheme goes ahead – gridlock. Wildlife and their habitats will be lost.	3372/8654	
	Objection – the areas marked out for development are largely marshy in nature and subject to flooding. Development in these areas will therefore require greater land preparation costs than average, the plan would roughly double the population density of this area and the proposed density is significantly greater than at present. An upgraded administrative infrastructure will be needed to support this increase in population. Roads in this area are already heavily used. The plan does not currently include any proposal to upgrade the transport capacity for private cars, commercial traffic or public transport. Upgraded local services for all ages will be need for such as education, medical and caring services, shopping, public and residential parking, sport and recreational facilities, policing and emergency services. Public utilities covering power, water, communications, drainage, sewerage will need major upgrade.	3373/8660	
	Objection – site is water logged and access to and from the houses of those who already love there.	3374/8662	
	Objection – inappropriate due to proximity to cemetery, these proposals will lead to the strangulation of Huntington and almost double its size. This in turn will severely	3394/8694	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	disrupt traffic flow which is already congested and more so of peak times. There will be greater strain on the drainage and sewerage; there is not mention of how this would be alleviated or mention of healthcare and education needed. The infrastructure is not able to Support and maintain this level of building and subsequent population.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – the development will cause harm to the character of the local area, it will further exacerbate the situation with drainage and sewerage which is already a problem. New Lane where it meets Malton Road only allows three vehicles to leave on each change of the lights, the effect of the new development at Monks Cross which will at least be causing extra traffic at peak times.	3461/8886	
	Objection – drainage problems and effluent leakage problems, congestion along the A1237, pedestrian safety issues, congestion of A64, provisions of amenities and general infrastructure, including schools, healthcare and local retail.	3571/9519	
	Comments – Huntington already has the largest secondary school in York and second largest primary school, with little possibility of expansion, new development will attract new families with children requiring schooling. The scale of development will affect the sense of community and well being in the area, there must be new provision for community facilities to encourage people to integrate and the are not become a commuter dormitory settlement, access is an issue and congestion, other ways of accessing the development should be found, provision of public transport should be provided on the development to encourage people to use it.	3584/9546	Church Of England Parish Of Huntington, Earswick & New Earswick
	Objection – the land is designated greenbelt, Huntington is low lying and boggy, more water in the area will increase water table, roads will become more congested and over crowded ring road will add to pollution. Consideration needs to be given to school provision, doctor’s practices are full and bus service is poor so householders prefer to use their own cars.	3594/9575	
	Objection- concern over proposals using greenbelt land. Concern that Huntington would become engulfed and that the single carriageway of the outer ring road cannot cope at the present time and North Lane is no more than a country lane.	3799/10244	
	Objection- there is no statement that infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with all this building. The development at New Lane will only add to an already busy road, which will become ever more used when the development at Monks Cross is completed.	3842/10326	
	Objection- development of ST11 will harm the unique character of the area will cause severe congestion and air pollution impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington. Such a large proposal for development will put	3954/10523	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pressure on schools, hospitals and social services. Schools are already overcrowded and a larger intake will lower educational standards. Hospitals already struggle to cope with admissions. Social services are already over burdened and an increase in population will only stretch resources further. Concern that more homes means more cars on the road.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – there are not plans to address the increased congestion on the A64, Malton Road or Hull Road should such developments go ahead, no consideration appears to have been given as to the effects on schools, colleges, surgeries, dentists or roads. Green belt should remain as Green Belt.	3958/10539	
	Objection – the drainage and sewerage should be sorted out before any development occurs, there is a problem with standing water. The roads in Huntington are too small for the volume of traffic. The school is overflowing and more doctors’ surgeries are needed.	3981/10588	
	Objection – development of ST11 will cause more congestion and air pollution, have an impact on drainage and sewerage, have an impact on medical services and overload an already poor (no5 bus) transport system.	4003/10621	
	Objection – this seems a particularly lazy way to address the housing need – just fill in the obvious green space up to the ring road and eliminate the very concept of green belt. In addition the occupants of these dwellings are unlikely to find work in the immediate are and so will join the rush flow westwards on the already grossly overcrowded ring road. Tinkering with “Park & Ride” will not solve this.	4011/10633	
	Objection – development of ST11 will cause more congestion and air pollution, have an impact on drainage and sewerage, have an impact on medical services and overload an already poor (number 5 bus) transport system.	4012/10637	
	Objection – the housing need as laid out by the council is far too much for this area, where will all the children go to school; expansion of the school will go into the play ground or playing field, reducing capacity for sport. There would be more traffic congestion. Brownfield sites should be developed first. Access is poor is weight restrictions and narrow roundabouts.	4044/10697	
	Objection – there is no need for more houses, the roads are already at saturation point.	4046/10709	
	Objection – greenfield sites should not be developed on until all the existing brownfield sites are developed, such as nestle site, former sugar beet site, manor school sites, Hungate, York Central, Terry’s Factory.	4050/10720	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – who are the people and where do they come from to occupy the proposed dwellings?	4051/10722	
	Objection – the infrastructure has already been compromised, local schools are full, GP practises are over worked and unable to offer appointments to its residents, congestion of the out ring road is already causing chaos and Huntington has flooded and has sewerage problems.	4063/10742	
	Objection – there are problems with the flooding in this area, not only rain water but with sewerage, the current system cannot cope. The schools are over subscribed. The area will be ruined by the building of so many houses.	4098/10793	
	Objection – the drainage needs sorting out in Huntington first and building should be on brownfield sites first.	4101/10803	
	Objection – roads are narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic, access is poor, local facilities cannot cope with more residents, bus service is poor, roads are busy and often gridlocked, Huntington is going to become a small town.	4102/10805	
	Objection – too much traffic now, there will be no green parts left , there would be a need for more playgroups, schools, doctors and dentists, other areas in York seem to have more play areas than Huntington. Huntington is becoming more and more of a town, than a village.	4105/4805	
	Objection – the amount of housing proposed is unacceptable. The greenbelt should stay greenbelt. The village infrastructure cannot cope with extra housing, drainage and sewerage is a major problem in Huntington.	4130/10840	
	Objection – the proposed access road would result in a great increase in traffic and congestion when joining the A1036. The area is subject to flooding and standing water, attempts to rectify this may just move the flooding elsewhere in Huntington.	4132/10841	
	Objection – such expansion will overwhelm the local amenities e.g. schools, roads and health services and will alter the character of the city and Huntington. Development will add to congestion on the ring road and pollution and alter the housing values of Huntington.	4134/10847	
	Objection – Greenbelt land, housing sites unfairly distributed across York, infrastructure is inadequate, and area is prone to flooding, impact on wildlife and habitats.	4169/10898	
	Objection – more development will alter the outlook of homes and result in a built up area.	4173/10900	
Objection – there are not enough jobs in York already, this scale of development will changes the character of York itself, brownfield sites should be used first, the land	4174/10905		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	floods and the primary school already use temporary classrooms, roads are congested.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – the plan will funder mentally alter Huntington, the infrastructure is inadequate, the roads will be more congested at peak times, including the A64 and Hopgrove roundabout. There is a drainage problem with clay soil and high water table, air quality will be made worse, the removal of the greenbelt, the land is the green lungs of the area for the existing populations health and wellbeing, question the need for so many houses and the sufficient work to support those families.	4177/10908	
	Objection – greenbelt land and not enough facilities in Huntington.	4192/10917	
	Objection – the drainage and sewerage systems already cause problems, brownfield sites should be used first, Huntington has had its fair share of development and these proposals would completely spoil the character of the area, the traffic generated would be particularly unbearable, the schools, health services and cemeteries have not be envisaged.	4193/10919	
	Objection- to build so many houses is impractical. Schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists in the local area already cannot cope with the growing population. The hospital has severe problems with Accident and Emergency and ambulances tied up as no beds for patients. The local primary school runs to capacity and there is no room for growth and expansion, even if more money was allocated. Many dentists are too full to accept NHS patients. Facilities in the area could not cope with such an influx of population. Huntington already has a huge drainage problem with a long history of flooding. Particularly the proposed site on New Lane. Huntington and new land are at huge risk of congestion with the new stadium the level of traffic creates a huge problem. There are issues with speeding and issues with pedestrians crossing at the end of New Lane. Issues regarding air quality with an increase of traffic. Unclear why greenbelt is being used when there are other options.	4268/11071	
	Comment- questions raised over children’s education spaces when existing local schools are at capacity already. Issues regarding water problems in the Huntington area. Extra housing will block the A1237 completely. Housing and retail does not work. Surrounding Portakabin with houses will make it intolerable for them to fulfil their orders and maybe forced to move due to noise issues.	4290/11127	
	Comment- more houses on New Lane means more people, more cars therefore more traffic. Concern that existing schools will not be able to take on more pupils. Huntington cannot take this amount of housing.	4291/11132	
	Objection- to the proposal of all new houses on New Lane. The schools are both full. Class sizes are already full and more children could affect the quality of teaching and	4292/11134	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	child development/education. Doctors- issues with lengthy waiting times for appointments. Concern over access- 411 new houses will require car parking and traffic entrance/exit sites. Drainage- the fields are often waterlogged during heavy rain. Concern over further building and drainage. Concern over wildlife habitats- area has bats, an owl, foxes, rabbits, moles etc.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection- opposed to the 411 new houses on site. Concern over the two schools (infant/primary) that are already full. Class sizes are already at maximum capacity. Any more would seriously affect the quality of teaching and development of the children. Concern over the existing two week waiting time to see a doctor. Concern over extra traffic that will be generated by each house having one or two cars. Drainage: fields at the moment already hold water during heavy rain – where will extra water go with development? Concern over wildlife habitats.	4293/11135	
	Objection- development of the site as well as harming the environment will cause extra traffic congestion and have an adverse impact on drainage, which is already a problem in Huntington.	4300/11153	
	Objection- the loss of green belt and the scale of the new housing planned are such that the local environment will be ruined and an unbearable strain placed on amenities and services but without any benefit for Huntington residents. The Monks Cross development area is prone to flooding and will have major access problems. The development planned for New Lane restricts future requirements for the cemetery. Concern over houses overlooking gravestones.	4301/11157	
	Objection- building on the green belt is ill thought out and would be a disaster for the wild life and well being of the residents. The area already has trouble with drainage and sewage, the land floods easily. The addition of several hundred new vehicles on the roads in this area would cause even greater congestion and make travelling anywhere difficult. The wholesale destruction of natural habitat is unacceptable. Concern over if there are any plans to build new schools or enlarge the existing ones. New housing would warrant further schools. This area is already overdeveloped- use up brownfield before using greenbelt.	4304/11167	
	Objection- this area is also often flooded. Concern over proximity of development to the cemetery.	4310/11188	
	Objection- the number of housing proposed to be built in this area along with all the other development is far in excess of what the local infrastructure can support. Namely traffic, schools, medical, sewerage and all other services that will be needed.	4312/11192	
	Objection- opposed to the proposal to build 2000 houses in Huntington on green belt	4338/11255	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	land. This proposal will completely ruin a very pleasant area in which there is currently a good mix of housing and farmland/open spaces. There is not enough infrastructure to support these proposals, and probably insufficient grid resources for Gas and electric, plus water and drainage. Concern over the standard of housing proposed and if any will be sold? No to proposals on the basis of ruination of local environment, inadequate infrastructure, no details of proposed builds, no provision for open space and total lack of realism.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection- to new housing round the cemetery on New Lane both for the new residents and particularly for the bereaved. There must be plenty of brownfield sites instead of using supposedly protected Green Belt land.	4354/11750	
	Objection- Huntington does not have the infrastructure to support these developments and people. Drainage is poor, roads are busy and will get more so with the new Monks Cross shops. Schools are full and local children having to take places in more distant schools. Concern that improving the infrastructure will cost residents more.	4357/11289	
	Objection- proposals are inappropriate and unsustainable. Reasons include congestion: Traffic along Jockey Lane is already very heavy at most times of the day as it is a major artery serving monks cross. Adding further homes on land adjacent to New Lane can only cause further congestion. Pollution: increase in road traffic and congestion would inevitably increase local air pollution and noise which is a major issue already. Schools: not enough school capacity to accommodate proposed increase in homes. Further extension at Huntington school is long awaited and Burnholme is already closed. Impact on existing services: services such as hospitals, local health practices, refuse collection etc already at capacity. Proposed increase in homes would further burden these. An increase in homes would have a negative effect on the value of existing properties in the Jockey Lane area. Issues concerning impacts on resident's quality of life. Loss of greenbelt: there is no sustainable reason for losing anymore greenbelt land to development. There are many brownfield sites available around York. Safety: Jockey Lane and New Lane are already very busy roads.	4398/11395	
	Objection – this area surrounds the local cemetery and would venture to suggest that at some time in the not too distant future the land available for Christian burials would need to be enlarged taking into account proposals for a 30% increase in York's population. This development should only be allowed either to the north or south of the cemetery to let the dear departed rest in peace. The rest of the land could be used for recreation in conjunction with the stadium development at Monks Cross. The proposal appears to only be accessible from New Lane therefore an increase in vehicle	4467/11474	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	usage of New Lane is another objection point.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Comment – hopes that affordable housing will be maximised at ST11.	4469/11486	
	Objection – where is the infrastructure? Schools are already full and doctors are stretched to the limit. Roads are already in a bad state of repair due to the volume of traffic and what about the pollution? Why are brownfield sites not considered first? There won't be any greenbelt land left in this area which is unfair. What about the environment? Is this what we want for the future?	4470/4921	
	Objection – Huntington does not have the infrastructure to support this development. Schools are already full. Doctors are already stretched and overflowing. The roads, New Lane, are struggling to cope with the traffic currently using it so why add to it and the pollution. This is a green field site and should remain so.	4471/4923	
	Objection – far too many houses proposed in the Huntington area. The roads will not cope with the extra traffic and will cause more pollution. The drainage will also suffer and will probably end in localised flooding.	4698/11990	
	Objection – the only green belt land in the area. It is very close to the cemetery. Other objection is the volume of traffic it will cause.	4704/12000	
	Objection – need another primary and secondary school to be built before houses are built. Schools are already over crowded. Opposed to the use of greenbelt land. There will be no nature if the building works are to happen. Development of ST11 is relying on existing roads, sewerage systems, schools, and hospitals etc, all of which are stretched to capacity as it is.	4713/12002	
	Objection – queries whether thought has been given to amenities and flooding issues. As it stands now there is bad flooding after snow and heavy rain. It will be far worse if the development goes ahead.	4718/12010	
	Objection – the idea that Heworth Without can cope with ST11, along with ST7 and ST8 is ludicrous and entirely inappropriate. Will result in severe congestion, the roads are not set up to cope with a larger volume of traffic even if a further junction/exit was created off the A64. Will be added air pollution, noise and safety around crossing Stockton Lane since this will become a new commuter route. Proposals will have a detrimental effect on the area.	4721/12018	
	Objection – land is always waterlogged. Why build on land that houses will subside. There are great crested newts and deer on the site; soon there will be no nature left. More pollution will affect residents. Local schools are already full.	4730/14264	
	Objection – should wait for current development at Huntington Road to be finished in order to assess the impact on current infrastructure.	4748/12035	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – concerned about the erosion of the green belt and the huge impact it will have on infrastructure. Have seen a variety of wildlife in the area which will be destroyed once the area has been developed.	4751/12042	
	Objection – along with ST8, the development of ST11 will harm the character of the area which is already congested and will get worse with the new development at Monks Cross with John Lewis, M & S and new stadium. Drainage is bad enough, where will the water go if the fields are developed? Will cause air pollution.	4777/12068	
	Objection – along with ST1, the development of ST11 will spoil and harm the outlook of the area. There are plenty of brownfield sites that should be used first. The impact to build on this area will be huge – the volume of traffic, the streets will no longer be safe for children, impact on air pollution and drainage which is already a big problem. Doctor’s surgeries will not cope. Wildlife will be affected massively.	4778/12070	
	Objection – lack of infrastructure is main concern. The roads are already congested. There is little or no study or detail on how the sewerage system will cope. Currently flooding issues and a rising water table. No detail on how these issues will be addressed.	4791/14279	
	Objection – there will be too much traffic, not sufficient investment in schools, doctors, new drainage and be a blight on an already heavily built area. The council should concentrate on brownfield areas.	5114/12227	
	Objection – concerned with the overwhelming amount of proposed new building in the Huntington area, on greenbelt land, directly affecting the already congested road network in the area. Was told that the development of land at ST11 was unlikely. Land is subject to flooding and this in turn would cause drainage concerns for the surrounding properties already in residence. There are newts and other wildlife breeding in the area. Roman remains lay in the site of ST11 and this was always the main reason that future development in the area was doubtful.	5130/12245	
	Objection – opposed to building on green field sites in Huntington. All existing brownfield sites should be used first. Total number of houses proposed is massive and is not a ‘small percentage of green belt land’. The infrastructure is non existent – schools and doctors are already stretched, there are already problems with sewerage and drainage, this would increase massively. 411 dwellings proposed is excessive. The privacy and peace of the cemetery would be lost. The whole character of Huntington as a village will be lost by being swamped to such a degree. The area cannot cope with further congestion. With all the extra traffic there is the great possibility of unwanted accidents. Many children walk to schools through the village. Huntington is a village in	5171/12308	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	its own right dating back to pre 800 AD. Do not wish the whole area to be referred to as Monks Cross.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – disagree with new homes in New Lane and Monks Cross (ST8). To consider building over 2,000 new homes in these areas without dualling part of the A1237 ring road and upgrading in some way the A1036 is madness.	5194/12416	
	Support – the allocation of ST11 is fully supported. See response for detail.	5245/14332	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – realises that more housing is needed but the plan has not taken account of the infrastructure to support the plans. In the Huntington area the road system can barely cope now, the A1237 will not be able to cope with the extra traffic. The sewerage system and surface drainage is bad now and with extra housing there will be more runoff and as a result more flooding. Has thought been given to extra surgeries and schools? Get the infrastructure up and running to support this massive build before it starts.	5279/14391	
	Objection – there are plenty of options available in York and there are already houses being built in the Huntington area. Is the Council going to leave any greenery for the village? The council are going to be providing people with brand new house when they don't even work. This is green belt land.	5355/14545	
	Objection – will harm the unique character of the area, will cause severe traffic congestion and will overload the existing facilities and infrastructure. Air quality will suffer with the resultant air pollution.	5392/14638	
	Objection – why has the greenbelt land been chosen when there are brownfield sites like the Barbican which are not currently being uses, apparently due to the current financial situation? What provision will be made for species such as bats, foxes and deer? What evidence is here that he site will be developed and that there will be buyers. No provisions appear to be made for the traffic improvements to alleviate the road network in and around Monks Cross. What provisions have been made for the extra cars that would come with the 411 houses? What research has been done into the environmental impact resulting from the proposed development? What considerations have been given to water and sewerage and how this will affect the existing infrastructure? What plans are in there to ensure there are sufficient places at local schools, sufficient medical coverage, playgrounds for the children and other amenities?	5396/14646	
	Objection – concerned that a busy place is not being made busier by the building of new houses. The roads, shops, schools and libraries in Huntington are well used already. This will be made worse by the impact of 200 more families.	5445/14780	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – why is the majority of housing being concentrated around Huntington? The area is already saturated by heavy traffic. If the proposed residents of these houses are going to commute to Leeds then they should live on the south of the city. Why no house in the Naburn, Acaster Malbis, Bishopthorpe, Askham Bryan/Richard and Poppleton areas? All of which have easier access to the south bound A64. Why are you destroying the greenbelt?	5528/14944	
	Objection – will increase pollution and have a negative impact on the quality of life.	5546/14976	
	Objection – ST11, along with ST8 should not be developed as proposed as Huntington’s character is already being eroded and this development would destroy what little is left of its village community spirit. The existing infrastructure could not cope with the housing expansion on this scale.	5601/13148	
	Objection – suggests that housing in Huntington has already expanded to its limit there should be no more expansion. The effect on traffic and drainage with monks cross 2 has not yet been experienced and further development of circa 2,000 houses (ST11 and ST8) will be intolerable. This amount of new houses is not necessary and would spoil Huntington as a place to live. The primary school is already full.	5610/13188	
	Objection – along with ST8, the development of ST11 and 2,000 new houses in Huntington is too many and traffic would be even more of a nightmare than it is at present.	5632/13256	
	Objection – the lane is that busy with traffic on a morning already, difficult to get out of the top of the street let alone cross the road on foot. The local schools are already full to bursting. There is no local dentist to support this increase in population. Huntington’s local shops, garage and post office are only small, just big enough to support the existing village and would not be able to cope with another 400 homes worth of people.	5656/13304	
	Objection – there are more suitable brownfield site available such as the grain stores in Clifton and the now flattened factory site on Haxby Road between Nestle and New Earswick. More housing is already planned in the Huntington area on the old Sessions site. Traffic in the area is currently poor. Where is the proposed entrance to the estate going to be? Most families have one or two cars not many just own bicycles. The existing drainage system is poor and will not cope with the extra housing. Which school will the new resident’s children go to? Or is another new school on the agenda? There are presently waiting lists for doctors and dentists.	5657/13306	
	Objection – disagrees with proposals to take green belt land for development. The greenbelt is finally coming into play to protect Huntington from urban sprawl but this	5659/13312	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proposal simply ignores the long term future planning that created them. The number of houses proposed is excessive. The city needs jobs and is trying to create them but it is futile if at the same time we attract thousands of extra workers from elsewhere.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – why build over Greenfield sites when there are ex industrial brownfield sites such as Terry’s factory standing derelict? This is an appalling use of land resources. 2,000 houses (ST11 and ST8) are too much for Huntington to cope with. Where the new schools and hospitals that will be needed. How will the ring road cope with the extra traffic? If the Council can’t get the ring road and congestion issues sorted than you are no t fit to plan new housing. The council does not care about the quality of life for the people living here or for the environment.	5661/13320	
	Objection – the schools and health facilities are not big enough and the roads cannot cope. There will be a massive impact on the drainage system which is already struggling to cope. Where are all the new residents going to work? The local schools have barely enough room to expand, where are the children going to be educated? During these austere times how can the Council afford to adopt new areas when they cannot even afford to cope with existing infrastructure? Will have a massive negative impact on the area with air pollution.	5669/13344	
	Objection – the plan envisages a substantial increase in the number of people living in Huntington thereby exacerbating the traffic situation further. Seems certain there will be an increased number of short car journeys between ST8 and ST11 and ST18 for the purposed of grocery shopping, public transport is unlikely to prevent such an increase. Concerned that little or no thought appears to have been given to the impact substantially increased traffic volumes will have on the road system in Huntington. Poses an immediate physical danger and air quality will be adversely affected.	5678/13383	
	Objection – the proposed developments in Huntington and the suburban sprawl it entails will destroy what is left of the rural character of Huntington. Plans are over ambitious and unsustainable as they will undoubtedly put a great strain on existing amenities in the area. Where are the additional infrastructure proposals identified to support the additional housing? The arterial road systems in the area are incapable of dealing with the additional traffic that will be generated. Huntington is well known to have a very high water table and the fields on which the houses are to be built regularly suffer from standing water during periods of heavy rain. How is this issue to be addressed?	5711/13456	
	Objection – the area is already heavily saturated with few green spaces. Residential streets are now used as cut thoughts from monks cross. More residents feeding onto	5789/13710	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	these roads will make it impossible for those living in those streets, together with the extra traffic enticed to the new monks cross retail development. Local first time buyers trying to get on the housing ladder should be given priority of nay housing built in the area.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – concerned about the impact on local schools, doctors and the local roads, does not think the solutions to these problems have been considered or realised. North Lane is already used as a cut through to the ring road with speeding cars and this will only get worse if the development goes ahead. A possible solution would be to close the road to through traffic.	5825/13782	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not in place to cope with the amount of housing proposed. The whole of Huntington would need a complete overall of the drainage system to withstand the extra housing. More schools will be needed. Road congestion is already very heavy and set to get heavier with the new shopping development at monks cross, extra housing would increase this.	5847/13841	
	Objection – totally opposed to any further development of green belt land around Huntington, brownfield sites should be developed. The development of ST11 is unrealistic and will destroy the character of Huntington, destroy trees and hedgerows, will cause server congestion and if Broome Close is opened up this will become a rat run for cars and increase pollution. There are already issues with drainage and sewerage. Schools and Hospitals are already at capacity and will not cope with the additional people.	5857/15117	
	Objection – object to proposals to build up to 2,000 new homes in monks cross and along new lane, largely because of the huge scale of the development and the resulting increase in traffic that it will bring.	5892/15195	
	Comment – people need homes but also the necessary facilities. The congestion on the ring road around Monks Cross is a menace. Roads need attention first. School places need to be made available before children arrive. Doctors and Transport are just two other facilities which will be stretched.	5894/15200	
	Objection – totally against any future developments in or around Huntington. There is no call for all the new housing in such a large scale around York.	6025/15426	
	Support – the move to develop at Clifton, Haxby, Wigginton and Monks Cross seems a more coherent plan for development, particularly as the four new railway stations are intended to serve these areas.	6121/15546	
	Objection – will have a serious impact on travel. Access on to New Lane can already by problematic without an extra 400+houses and their attendant cars vying for road	6175/15708	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	space.		
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection – the addition of so many homes will mean more cars on the roads and dangerous levels of congestion, especially in the triangle of the Oakgate Shopping Development, Monks Cross North and Bad Bargain Lane.	6374/16098	
	Objection – how will the infrastructure and schools cope? The roads will be impossible. Need green spaces not all brick houses.	6397/16136	
	Objection – flooding and drainage has been a worsening problem in Huntington these problems have had a major impact on sporting life in the village with many football matches having to be postponed due to excess water on the playing fields. The ever increasing concrete jungle will further affect these drainage problems. The roads cannot cope with the increase. Fears that a serious accident(s) may well occur due to the increased numbers of cars.	6427/16149	Huntington Rovers Football Club
	Objection – will generate more vehicles in and around Huntington. The infrastructure of the village can not sustain the planned developments, especially drainage of surface water and sewerage. The concrete jungle keeps on increasing; a once rural village is being spoilt by over development. Can the local schools, health centres and roads cope? Will the planned developments affect the value of existing properties?	6428/16151	
	Objection – the development of brownfield sites should be maximised first. Bringing large numbers of people into the area will overpower the two primary schools. Where will these people work? Jobs first.	6437/16156	
	Objection – Broome Close is already used a cut through by people coming off the A1237. The nature of the close can make it quite dangerous should two vehicles meet. The primary and secondary school are already at full capacity. It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment. Can York District Hospital really cope with an increase in population?	6449/16175	
	Objection – The wildlife is appreciated in the area with dears, fox, different birds and crested newts. Great shame to the environment to build on these fields. The field does have a flooding problem but this brings all sorts of wildlife to it. Presume that development of this scale would have a whole new infrastructure with new shops, pubs, school, libraries, doctors, parks etc. The existing infrastructure would not hope. If Broome Close is extended then the cul-de-sac will be lost where children currently play in the street.	6471/16194	
	Objection – increasing housing off new lane will only add to the already heavy traffic due to monks cross. Doubt that the drainage which is already inadequate will improve. Many people who drive will use new lane and the roads off it as a rat run.	6472/16195	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST11 Land At New Lane, Huntington Continued	Objection - will harm the unique character of the area, and cause severe congestion and air pollution and impact on drainage and sewerage which is already a major problem in Huntington.	6477/16202	
	Objection – access is very important. Sole access through Broom Close would mean a great deal of traffic through a narrow road. Some open space should be left as at the moment there area has a lot of wild life. The large oak tree at the end of the road much be protected. The area does not have the necessary shops, schools etc to support a gigantic rise in population. There will be even more traffic.	6479/16204	
	Objection – the roads will not cope with extra traffic.	6482/6423	
	Objection – already have a drainage problem. Traffic to monks cross especially on a weekend is manic. More houses will make it worse. Will harm the unique character of the area. Oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington.	6484/16208	
	Objection – already have drainage problems, with monks cross in the area there is a lot of traffic. Will harm the unique character of the area. Will cause air pollution. Oppose the use of green belt land in Huntington.	6485/16211	
	Objection – will swallow up more of the countryside and the infrastructure is not there to support it.	6491/16218	
	Objection – oppose the use of green belt land in and around Huntington. Aware of the need for affordable housing but does not believe that allowing developers to build on valuable green belt is the answer. Developers crowd it with low quality housing for maximum profit, stretching local infrastructure beyond its capacity. Not only do the local community loose the open space, vies and the well being, yet more habitats for birds and mammals is lost.	6496/16232	
	Objection – unsustainable for housing numbers in Huntington to increase by the scale proposed. The roads are already congested. There are current frequent problems with drainage and sewerage. Would remove almost all the green belt in Huntington and fundamentally change the character of the area. Places too many houses in one part of award which already has a particular problem of access, infrastructure, including roads and schools and particularly drainage and sewerage. Existing brownfield sites which are as yet undeveloped should be developed first.	6513/16300	Cllrs K, C & H Orrell, Runciman & Hyman
	Objection – oppose building 2,000 houses in Huntington and New Earswick Ward.	Petition 1	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	
	Objection – new shopping complex will increase traffic in the local area. Monks Cross roundabout has become more congested resulting in traffic back up and minor road	Petition 18	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	incidents on a very regular basis. Worsen congestion on the extremely congested A1237. Increased traffic as a result of new stadium. On match days fans already park in Forge Close blocking driveways and causing a danger to young children. Local schools already full. GP services already overstretched. Local bus routes are limited.		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe	Comment- guidance to be applied to site- see response for detail, see flood risk to strategic housing sites pages.	3/11732	Environment Agency
	Comment- concern that the numbers of vehicles will increase if proposals to build 600 additional homes goes ahead.	53/12603	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection- to add further 560 houses with an additional population of almost 1500 persons is not sustainable. It would overwhelm local infrastructure and services and cause significant reduction in quality of life for existing and new residents.	57/12616	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a very large village. To extend it further risks losing its strong village community identity.	192/14004	
	Objection- the proposal is completely unsuitable for a village the size of Copmanthorpe. It would also remove prime farmland and drive away the wildlife that currently habits these areas.	433/16560	
	Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core, but extending into countryside with no evidence to indicate this is sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the GB.	544/16770	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe’s identity as a village.	917/3047	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. 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.	1053/3338	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/622	
	Objection- road system would not be able to deal with the increased traffic flows. The sewerage system cannot cope. The primary school would not be able to cater for more pupils. Shopping is catered for in the village at the present time, but a great increase in the population could not be served. This would lead to more people driving to supermarkets. The doctors surgeries could not cope with the increase in patients the proposed developments would bring. The communities ‘village feel’ would be eroded by the vast developments proposed; to the detriment to of the present population.	1124/17066	
Objection- infrastructure in the village is inadequate to cope with an additional 1200+ residents in terms of water supply and sewerage, road widths, school provision, shopping and car parking facilities. Improvements to the facilities and infrastructure of the village are required in advance of any additional housing development.	1176/17092		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection- new developments should avoid the sacrifice of good quality farmland. Too many of the identified areas seem to be driven by opportunism by landowners rather than sound planning considerations. The land is on terminal moraine and is productive land.	1207/17104	
	Objection – residents in Copmanthorpe are deeply concerned about the impact that 600 new homes (ST12, ST13, H40, H29, SF5) will have on the existing infrastructure and amenities in the village. There are also grave concerns over the impact of potentially over a thousand more cars joining the A64 from Copmanthorpe every day.	1355/17331	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.	1504/2178	
	Support – supports the inclusion of ST12 but proposes that the boundary should be extended to the west as recommended by the site owners Askham Bryan during the autumn call for sites consultation. The extended site meets the objectives of the Local Plan and is deliverable.	1668/15031	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	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.	1884/6	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No thought has been given to infrastructure for these plans. No provision for roads. Schools already full, Doctors surgeries could not handle more patients, shops inadequate, surface water drainage and sewage at capacity, bus service would not suffice. Proposals would be on prime farming land.	1885/12	
	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.	1886/20	
	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.	1888/32	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	1892/43	
	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.	1917/113	
	Objection - has some major concerns for development for up to 600 houses in 'green belt' land around Copmanthorpe. If this does go ahead in some shape of form, it will forever change the 'village' into a small town. This is so abhorrent. With all this expansion and without major infrastructure improvements will cause havoc, even chaos to Copmanthorpe's small and charming streets. The impact on the local communities will be severe, feel it would be a retrograde step in the quality of life outside of work, when relaxing with families should be encouraged and without stress. Another set of concerns is the already stretched Doctors surgeries, dispensaries and even now the inadequate shopping outlets. The local junior school situated centrally will surely be overwhelmed, and would have to be expanded onto their vital recreational land to cope. Due consideration has been taken of essential infrastructure and service improvements to sewage, water, and the electrical demand made by such expansions of populations, all of which have had their problems.	1931/144	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a large village although it still has a sort of village character at its heart. The plan to build 600 or so new homes will go close to doubling the size of the settlement; this will not be popular with the residents and will take away the character that remains. How about the infrastructure to cope with this – roads, drainage, schools and so on, also the loss of quality farmland in the green belt location. The semi-rural idyllic nature of much of outer York is important too, just as its historic centre.	1933/9916	
	Objection – the proposal is to build on prime agricultural land, surely brownfield sites and non agricultural land within the city boundary should be developed first? There are no plans to increase the size of Copmanthorpe primary school which is already full and cannot cater for the increased population proposed. There are no plans to increase the health care provision within Copmanthorpe to cope with the proposed	1937/166	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	increase in population. The junction of Manor Heath with the A64 slip road is already a bottleneck and increased traffic will make that junction increasingly dangerous. The main water supply in Copmanthorpe currently suffers from substandard pressures during periods of high demand and cannot cope with the additional demand created by the proposed housing.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	1940/173	
	Objection – before commencing any building work the infrastructure must be reinforced. Understood that the sewage system in Copmanthorpe is at capacity, likewise the rainwater drains, has the Council considered the consequences when 600 new homes use an overburdened system? The exit roads from Copmanthorpe are already congested. Understand the density of housing is much greater with no allowance made for car parking. The doctor’s surgeries and the schools are at full capacity. Will we be building on the school playing fields and reduce the children’s quality of life? Copmanthorpe is already a dormitory village for Leeds and the people who work in Leeds shop in Leeds hence the loss of shops in the village. Why are the Council proposing to build on prime agricultural land instead of the brownfield sites within the city of York.	1941/181	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1942/186	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not there to cope with the strain that would be put on it, schools, roads, water, sewerage, drainage, healthcare etc as they struggle to cope now. The use of greenbelt, valuable agricultural land must strongly be resisted so we can preserve for future generations. The precedent therefore must not be allowed. Sure that many brownfield sites in and around York exist.	1943/191	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1954/233	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/247	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/255	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/263	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/271	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/278	
		1964/286	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/294	
	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.	1966/302	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be extremely dangerous.	1967/310	
	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.	1968/318	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/326	
	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.	1970/334	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/342	
		1972/350	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/357	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/365	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/372	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/378	
		1977/386	
		1978/394	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/401	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1980/409	
		1981/417	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1982/424		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/432		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses. Countryside should be protected.	1985/442		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/450		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/458	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/466	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/473	
	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.	1990/481	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character of Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/488	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/496	
	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.	1993/504	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/518	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/525	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/533	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/541	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no objection.	1998/549	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/555	
		2000/563	
		2001/571	
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.	2002/579		
Support – absolutely support the building of new homes for people in Copmanthorpe but these new homes should be in keeping with the houses already in the village. Objection – concerned about the density of housing proposed for the area. Understands that the housing proposed will be high density town houses with no garden or off street parking. This will fundamentally change the character of the	2007/596		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	villages. Current services will be overwhelmed by the influx of so many young people and families. What residents need are houses for downsizing couples and established families as well as homes for our adult children. Concerned about transport links. Roads will be overwhelmed by cars unless the current bus services are improved. Comment –hope very much that development will include open play spaces and shops, pub, cash point etc so that the current facilities are not overwhelmed. Facilities should be in keeping with what we have and aspire to. No more ‘fag n booze’ shops.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/606	
		2012/614	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/630	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/638	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/645	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2016/653	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/661	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2018/669	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2019/675	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2020/683	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/691	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/698	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/706	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/714	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/722	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/730		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/736		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/744		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/751		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2030/758		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2031/765	
		2032/771	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/778	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/786	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/794	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/802	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/810	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/818	
		2039/826	
		2040/834	
		2041/842	
	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.	2042/850	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/858	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/866	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/874	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/881	
		2047/889	
	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.	2048/897	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/905	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/913	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/936		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/943		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.	2060/951		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/957	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/965	
	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.	2063/971	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/979	
		2065/987	
	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.	2066/995	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1002	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1010	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1018	
		2070/1025	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1032	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1040	
		2073/1048	
		2074/1056	
	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.	2075/1064	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1072	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2077/1080	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt.	2078/1087		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1095		
	2080/1102		
	2081/1110		
	2082/1118		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2083/1125	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1133	
		2085/1141	
		2086/1148	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or large enough to prevent people from travelling.	2087/1156	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1163	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1169	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1175	
		2091/1183	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1191	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1199	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1207	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new houses.	2095/1215	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1222	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1228	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1236	
		2099/1244	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Ruin York.	2100/1251	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1259		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2102/1265		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2103/1273		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.	2104/1281		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2105/1288	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with community leading to development of Local Plan.	2106/1296	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2107/1304	
	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.	2108/1312	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2109/1320	
		2110/1328	
	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.	2111/1336	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites situation.	2112/1344	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1352	
		2114/1360	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2115/1368	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2116/1376	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2117/1384	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2118/1392	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More flooding and loss of allotments.	2119/1399	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development will spoil village.	2120/1406	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2121/1414	
		2122/1422	
	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.	2129/1437	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1445	
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.	2131/1453		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2132/1461		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2133/1469	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1477	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1485	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1492	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1500	
		2138/1508	
		2139/1516	
	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.	2140/1524	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2141/1532	
		2142/1548	
		2143/1555	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1563	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1571	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1578	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1586	
		2148/1594	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1602	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses is excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. If so many houses are needed would be better to build a small town rather than piecemeal in Copmanthorpe. 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 and already have parking problems.	2150/1610		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1616		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be	2152/1624		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	protected for future generations.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1631	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1639	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1646	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1654	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1662	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1670	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1677	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1685	
		2161/1693	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around York.	2162/1701	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1709	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1717	
		2165/1724	
		2166/1732	
		2167/1739	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1745	
	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.	2169/1753	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1760	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1768		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2172/1776		
	2173/1784		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2174/1792	
		2175/1799	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1805	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1813	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1820	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1828	
		2180/1844	
		2181/1852	
		2182/1858	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1866	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1874	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1882	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1890	
		2187/1906	
	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.	2188/1914	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1922	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1929	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues. 200 homes is more realistic. Increased traffic and demand on amenities is a problem.	2191/1936	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1944	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1952	
2194/1960			
2195/1968			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made?	2196/1976		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1984	
		2198/1992	
		2199/1999	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2200/2007	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2014	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2022	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2038	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2046	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2052	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary.	2207/2060	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2068	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2075	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2083	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2091	
		2212/2099	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2107	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2115	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2130		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2138		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2146		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2154		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2219/2162	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2170	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2186	
	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)?	2222/2194	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2202	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2208	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2216	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2224	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2232	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2239	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are 4 active badger setts on the proposed development site.	2229/2247	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath be destroyed?	2230/2255	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2263	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2271	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2279	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2287	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 - 200.	2235/2294	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2302	
	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.	2237/2309	
	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.	2238/2317	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village	2239/2325		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	could not cope with extra traffic.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2240/2332	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2340	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2348	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2356	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2363	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2371	
		2246/2379	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2387	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2394	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2402	
		2250/2410	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2418	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2426	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Large areas of land such as Monks Cross within 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.	2253/2434	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2442	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2450	
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.	2256/2458		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2466		
	2258/2473		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2259/2481	
		2260/2489	
		2261/2497	
		2262/2505	
		2263/2513	
		2264/2519	
		2265/2527	
		2266/2535	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2267/2543	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2551	
		2269/2559	
		2270/2567	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2575	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely.	2272/2583	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2591	
	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.	2274/2599	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2605	
		2276/2612	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them.	2282/2630	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2638	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2646		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2654		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2662		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded.	2287/2670		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel.	2288/2678		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2289/2686		
	2290/2693		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2291/2701	
		2292/2709	
		2293/2717	
		2294/2725	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2295/2733	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2296/2741	
		2297/2749	
		2298/2757	
		2299/2765	
		2300/2773	
		2301/2781	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2789	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2797	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2805	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2813	
		2306/2821	
		2318/2829	
		2319/2837	
		2320/2845	
		2321/2852	
	2322/2860		
	2323/2868		
	2324/2876		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2884		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2892		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2900		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2906		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2914		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with the Council.	2330/2921	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2929	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2937	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2944	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3153	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3161	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2950	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2957	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2965	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2973	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2981	
		2374/2988	
		2375/2996	
		2376/3003	
		2377/3010	
		2378/3017	
	2379/3025		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3032	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3039		
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.	2382/3055		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3062		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3070		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3078		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2386/3086	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3093	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3101	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3108	
		2390/3116	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3124	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3130	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3138	
		2394/3145	
		2395/3169	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3175	
	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.	2397/3183	
	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”.	2410/3191	
	Objection- as it is the pavements are not wide, it will cost a lot of money to extend the school and roads would need to be widened. Need to improve the shopping centre and car parking as there is not enough room. Not many people will be able to afford that especially first time buyers. Getting on the bypass is dangerous, what is it going to be like with all the new cars that are going to travel on it?	2414/6575	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3198		
	2449/3206		
	2450/3214		
	2451/3245		
	2452/3222		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	<p>Objection- the sewerage for the whole village is assisted by an over capacity pumping station. Foul water and solid waste has backed up into homes in that area. The proposal is a disaster waiting to happen. Insufficient mains water pressure is often the case in the village. What plans are there to cope with considerable additional demand that will result from the new houses with their multitude of bathrooms? The proposal on the west side of Manor Heath is on prime, top quality agricultural land. How does the Council propose dealing with the huge, high pressure gas main that runs right through the centre of this site? How expensive will it be to re-route the main as legally, no houses can be built directly over it? What will the village ne like with another 600 houses? What are the councils proposals for widening Old Moor Lane, Main Street, School Lane, Horseman Lane, Top Lane and Manor Heath to accommodate extra traffic? All these improvements to roads and drains must be put in place and working before new housing is commenced. Where is it proposed that the huge number of children from these new houses will be accommodated? Again more congestion from parking on the daily school run. Those few shops we have in Copmanthorpe to serve the present community are barely sufficient. There is in effect no space in the centre of the village to build additional shop units not for any additional much needed parking. It would not be accepted should there be significantly more houses, heavier traffic and a lot more people. Will the two GPs be able to cope with an additional estimated 2500-3000 residents?</p>	2469/2624	
	<p>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.</p>	2488/3229	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	2489/3237	
	<p>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.</p>	2490/3252	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	2493/3354	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.</p>	2494/3362	
	<p>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.</p>	2495/3370	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3377	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3385	
		2498/3393	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3401	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3409	
		2501/3417	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3330	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3346	
	Objection- concerns due to drainage issues already in the area. Has the area close to Westfield been considered as it is of little visual value?	2547/6840	
	Objection- building on prime agricultural land is reducing the country’s ability and capacity to grow our own food. Cannot see how the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe could cope with water, drainage and sewage. Serious improvements need to be made to that infrastructure. There is a problem exiting the village and additional traffic will only make this worse.	2559/6886	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3307	
		2570/3315	
		2571/3322	
	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	2589/3299	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3425	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3432	
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?	2610/3440		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3448		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3455		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3463		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3471	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3479	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3487	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3495	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is a green site and further development will destroy the environment Existing Copmanthorpe roads would become even more busy and dangerous. Development will kill off many native wildlife species. Will ruin the look of the entry to York and Minster vistas. Developing Copmanthorpe is not necessary and not wanted by the majority who live there.	2639/6999	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.	2640/6011	
	Objection – how will Copmanthorpe and York in general be able to absorb the additional residents? There is no funding proposed in the plan. How will cars from the development developments in Copmanthorpe gain access to the A64. No thought given to support the proposals. How will the village school accommodate the additional pupils when there is no funding? Drainage improvements noticeable by their absence.	2678/7103	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3573	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3581	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3587	
	Objection- do not understand why anyone would want to build on open fields when there are other areas which could be renovated first.	2762/7299	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.	2932/3997	
	Objection- see Copmanthorpe Analysis. It is a rural village which has had significant development over recent years. Suggest that houses to purchase are built facing Manor Heath and part buy are built into the estate a limit on the height of these properties should be placed also enough parking spaces provided. Would it not be more appropriate to build houses/bungalows which are in keeping?	2988/4520	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4004		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection- see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No economic justification for the number of houses proposed. The impact on the village of extra vehicles and residents at the moment the road struggles and the condition of the roads in Copmanthorpe. On Moor Lane the road is not suitable for new housing, as the road is only accessible by single track. Building houses so close to the railway lines at the bottom of Moor Lane should be considered as not a good idea as recently it has been reported of a high speed rail link to York which would have impact on houses near the railway lines.	3047/7901	
	Objection- to proposed plan to build additional housing on the outskirts of Copmanthorpe. Protect the environment- the proposal to build 600 houses on green belt land does not meet this requirement. The agricultural land is home to considerable wildlife. The increased congestion as the traffic queues will add to Co2 emissions. The land is agricultural land which has a clear role in supplying produce for the nation. The plan makes a mockery of the greenbelt protection. Get York moving- fail to understand how building 600 homes on the Leeds/Harrogate side of York will improve the York economy. Build strong communities- there is no room on the existing site to accommodate such an increase in pupils. Create jobs and grow the economy- the new houses will only attract workers commuting out of York.	3082/7957	
	Objection- Copmanthorpe has a poor road and drainage infrastructure, hopelessly inadequate parking in the village centre, too much car traffic, a reduced bus service. To increase the population by 40% would destroy the nature of the community.	3134/8067	
	Objection – the site is currently in the green belt, tested at a public inquiry in 1992, the boundaries then proposed have been treated as determined for all planning purposes. Will have cumulative and detrimental effects on the special character of York, both damaging the important landscape setting and increasing traffic, congestion and overcrowding. Will delay the reuse of urban brownfield sites because the ease of development of the Greenfield sites will cause developers to develop the Greenfield sites in preference to brownfield ones. Will increase congestion in the centre of the village where car parking is already at a premium. Along with ST13 do not contain sufficient dwellings to support their own retail and community facilities so that the new residents will be forced into the village. The distance means that the majority will travel by car. The primary school and healthcare facilities of the village are already overloaded as are the foul and surface water drainage facilities. Soakaways will not work because of the heavy clay soil in Copmanthorpe. Additional housing will add significantly to the overloading of the Manor Heath junction with the slip road to the A64 and northern ring road. Will encourage long distance commuting	3222/8290	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to Leeds rather than sustainable development. Regard should be had to the quality of agricultural land that will be lost. This site is Grade 2 and was described in the Local Development Framework in 2007 as highly fertile.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – does not think it is a good site for building. Difficult to access green space outside the village. No suitable pedestrian access. The area is frequently used by walkers and cyclists along the land. Please keep this area as countryside. Is it not part of the plan to preserve the environment and to encourage people not to use cars? If there is no space in Copmanthorpe considered that people will just get in the car.	3251/8344	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4012	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely alter community.	3283/4020	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4036	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4044	
	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.	3292/4028	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3318/4052	
	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.	3327/4059	
	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. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.	3330/4067	
	Objection – proposal to build more than 600 extra houses in Copmanthorpe is unacceptable and impractical. It would change the nature of the village to the great detriment of its current residents. Quiet enjoyment of life would be adversely affected by the threatened major expansion. The fields currently visible provide refreshment and pleasure to residents who are walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog owners and bird	3331/8512	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	watchers. The close proximity of open country to the heart of Copmanthorpe is an essential part of the village’s character. The infrastructure could not cope with the extra demands. Already roads are too congested and crowded and the water supply and sewerage systems are scarcely adequate for the present population. Local resources (shops, surgeries, school, and library) while sufficient for Copmanthorpe residents now could not meet the needs of so many incomers.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, 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.	3412/4075	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4083	
	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.	3414/4090	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4098	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4106	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed developments around Copmanthorpe. This area is already much developed and cannot accommodate more housing in the scale that is being suggested.	3418/8733	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8864	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8871	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8840	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8848	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8856	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6019	
	Objection – the roads are already heavy with traffic. There is very little parking for village amenities. The junction onto the A1237/a64 is extremely busy. 600 more houses means at the very least 600 more cars. The village will just not be able to cope with this amount of traffic.	3511/9433	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don’t see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6026	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6033		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – would like to know what measures the council proposes to mitigate congestion on the A64 which will inevitably result from the massive housing development planned for the south east of York, east of York and Heslington and the additional homes planned for Copmanthorpe. What measures are in place to ensure that current peak time’s problems will not be a daylong issue?	3571/9525	
	Objection – increase in the population of Copmanthorpe isn’t feasible because of poor infrastructure (schools, sewers, water supply, road junctions). To make this plan work there has to be a plan for these. Urban sprawl should be contained. This proposal will encourage ribbon development along the A64 towards Tadcaster. The area already floods on a regular basis during heavy rain.	3621/9633	
	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.	3626/9312	
	Objection – inappropriate for the village to have such a vast increase in its population. The village is already struggling with drainage. The drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at its full capacity. There is no room to expand the school without using most of the playground and then the children will lose the capability for outdoor activities and exercise. The roads struggle now to cope with the vast amount of traffic exiting the village on to the A64 and A1237. The roads will need to be widening to cope with the increase in traffic. The reason people visit and move to York and to Copmanthorpe is for the beautiful surrounding countryside. Will destroy wonderful views and the animal habitats including bats which are meant to be a protected species. Copmanthorpe will no longer be a village.	3720/10011	
	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. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	3726/5996	
	Objection – would alter village life and put a strain on local amenities. The style and density of the proposed housing (affordable) is not fitting with the current style of the village. The village would not physically cope with another 1000+ cars on the already busy roads. The quality of the roads is poor and will worsen with more vehicles using	3727/10026	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>them. The existing junctions of the village boundary are already overly busy. Parking facilities are already insufficient. Road parking is commonplace which leads to traffic congestion problems. Current transport links in the village are poor. The bus service is not frequent enough and others do not cover the whole of the village. The services would need upgrading to accommodate the increase in population. The primary school is already at full capacity, any extension would spool the current school grounds and sports facilities. Already difficult to get a doctor’s appointment, extra population would make this worse. Other shops and services within the village will also suffer from the increase in population, causing distress for current residents. Local power outages are quite common so additional housing would create a further strain on the electricity supply. Current surface water drainage and sewage system problems exist. Would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside.</p>		
<p>Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	<p>3734/6004</p>	
	<p>Objection – fail to see how the proposals can possibly be in the interests of the residents in the village and there are better sites in and around York which would be better suited to such a development. Already a large village but has evolved in a natural way over the years to accommodate a substantial increase in residents. Any further major increase in housing will put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure and will irrevocably change the nature of the village. It will become just another suburb of York rather than a village with its own identity. Land is prime agricultural land. Open spaces and fields are regularly used for general walking, bird watching, walking dogs etc. Housing on this site flies in the face of the government’s regard for and desire to improve the health of the nation. Traffic congestion will substantially increase. How is the council going to improve the infrastructure in the village to cope with the increased demand? What conditions will the Council impose on developers to ensure that any housing built will be sold to people who work in York rather than commute to cities outside York?</p>	<p>3820/10277</p>	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would increase village by approximately 40%. Infrastructure and services cannot cope.</p>	<p>3888/4556</p>	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too large for village. Development should reflect capacity of current amenities. Development will become a satellite of Copmanthorpe.</p>	<p>3889/4564</p>	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	<p>3903/4583</p>	
	<p>Objection – object to the quantity of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe. There is not an adequate transport network.</p>	<p>3966/10554</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	4057/4686	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – appreciate the need for additional housing in York area considered that the scale and density of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe is inappropriate for the area. Plan appears to make no improvements to the infrastructure of the village. Specific concerns include traffic, drainage and parking.	4099/10794	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – object to nearly 600 new homes to the west of Copmanthorpe and 55 acres taken out of the green belt.	4128/10823	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – concerned that the proposed building land has an extremely high water table. Drainage is no longer adequate, presumably silted up. Concerned that increasing the population size of Copmanthorpe by 40-80% will have a significant negative impact on the primary school which already has to convert parts of the building in order to accommodate the number of pupils.	4168/10891	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – any further development in this area will further increase pressure on the Tadcaster Road route in/out of the city. At peak times this route cannot accommodate the current traffic load.	4305/11169	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – gross overdevelopment of a small village. Infrastructure unsuitable to bear such an increase. Urban development of a village community is a bad idea.	4328/11232	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – development of 600 houses is much too large. If added to the potential safeguarded land this could lead to over 1100 houses. This is a gross overdevelopment. See no mention in the plan for any infrastructure development.	4329/11238	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope including drainage, sewage, roads, schools, health and welfare facilities and water supply. Objects to building on prime agricultural land. Brownfield sites must be developed before any green field sites.	4343/11612	
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – disproportionate scale of development and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the village. It will mean that the whole feeling of a rural location will change, easy access to the fields for walking, rural views, the sense of being part of the countryside will be lost to a large extent. Practical concerns include drainage, increased traffic on the roads, the school is at capacity now and a substantial increase in pupils will necessitate either building a new school which goes against the whole village ethos or building on the playing fields which are really appreciated by the children in the school.	4389/11371	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – an increase of 33% houses in itself is unacceptable in that the village amenities could not possibly cope with such a huge increase. In addition the majority of the village infrastructure is already at full capacity. Main Street is already unacceptably congested. To imagine that a few hundred more cars could be attempting to use this road is unthinkable and no thought seems to have been given to this.	4405/11409	
	Objection – no regard has been had to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. It is green belt and is prime agricultural land, how ridiculous to use such land when brown field land or areas which could be ‘refurbished’ could be used. Are all aware of the increasing and never ending cost of food so to destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous. The school is already at full capacity, local amenities are already operating at full capacity. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and parking will not be able to cope. Major concern is the amount of traffic which will be generated.	4412/11422	
	Objection – no regard has been had to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. It is green belt and is prime agricultural land, how ridiculous to use such land when brown field land or areas which could be ‘refurbished’ could be used. Are all aware of the increasing and never ending cost of food so to destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous. The school is already at full capacity, local amenities are already operating at full capacity. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and parking will not be able to cope. Major concern is the amount of traffic which will be generated.	4414/11434	
	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.	4434/5197	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can’t cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5204	
	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.	4451/5212	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	4737/5277	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5327	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Out of scale with village. In green belt. Needs significant investment in infrastructure. A64 already congested. Traffic in village would increase. Shortage of parking. Issues with sewage system. Impact on wildlife and flora. Area is site of a roman settlement.	4761/5333	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5341	
		4763/5349	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. Adding 600 to 800 houses would destroy what we have. Schools cannot cope with proposed increased numbers. Youth Groups of village at capacity. Problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. Problems with car parking and road system cannot cope with extra traffic.	4764/5357	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5365	
		4766/5373	
		4770/5381	
Objection – to the proposal to build a further 600 houses in the Copmanthorpe area. The current village infrastructure is already having to cope at full capacity. Local parking would not be able to handle the 50% increase in the current population. The building of these new homes will have a significant impact on local drainage and sewage. The drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at full capacity. The proposal is on green field land when brownfield sites should be targeted first. There has been no consideration of the increased health care needs for the community. Object to the disruption to local wildlife in particular bats. The area is prime farmland.	5137/12449		
Objection – proposal to build an additional 600 houses is an increase of more than one third. During wet weather the drainage and sewage system does not cope with the current housing stock. The school, the car park in the village centre and the vehicle exit routes from the village are all currently operating at full capacity and could not cope with such a large expansion of housing, cars and primary school children.	5166/12300		
Objection – proposals are inappropriate. They will fundamentally alter the nature of the village increasing its size inorganically by circa 40%. Proposed housing density is	5186/12388		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>inappropriate for a village and will further negatively affect the ambience of the village. What is the justification for requiring greater housing density on Greenfield sites than on brownfield ones. There is no indication that there will be adequate vehicle parking arrangements for residents of the new housing. No indication as to why prime agricultural land should be developed for housing when there is a national requirement to ensure that the UK maximises its own food production. No indication that the Council will ensure that any and/or all developers will first ensure that all infrastructure improvements will be completed before any housing is commenced. There are already infrastructure pressures in Copmanthorpe – poor rainwater drainage, low water pressure, both junctions to the A64 and the northern relief road are under intense pressure at peak times already. The new houses will not be occupied by people locating in York to take up new jobs but by people commuting to Leeds.</p>		
<p>Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection – do not agree with the plans for Copmanthorpe. The numbers of houses proposed are too high.</p>	5202/12423	
	<p>Objection – object to the strategic housing sites outside of the York ring road. All land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered as green belt.</p>	5223/12495	
	<p>Objection – object to the scale of the development proposed for Copmanthorpe. The addition of 600 houses would increase the village’s size by around 35% which is unsustainable. Would overwhelm the existing infrastructure. Village amenities are already over stretched. The village school is full, the village centre struggles to cope with the car parking. The drains and sewers are already stretched to capacity and regularly flood. The water pressure is sub standard. Electricity supply is regularly subject to faults. Access points into the village by car are already incredibly congested. There would have to be significant investment in such infrastructure to enable any large scale development to take place. To develop to the western side of the village would also skew its population significantly away from the current centre; the suggestion that that additional retail facilities or an additional school should be built ignores the fact that having a clear centre, a single school and clearly defined boundaries are important elements of Copmanthorpe’s character.</p>	5239/12572	
	<p>Objection – does not take into account the neighbourhoods concerned. The infrastructure wouldn’t be able to accommodate such a large percentage population increase. The local primary school is full and only land around it that could be developed is the playing field. Prime agricultural land is needed for crop production. The drainage system cannot cope now the addition of 560 housed would increase this</p>	5261/14355	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>problem and lead to flooding. Medical and dental services would struggle to accommodate such a large increase. Traffic levels are high. Some sites could be found for small developments in and around the village which wouldn't have such an impact but not the numbers suggested in the plan. Would have detrimental impact on the views of York. Is the building of social housing so far from the centre of York sensible or practical? As Copmanthorpe is a catchment area for Tadcaster Grammar could the increase in numbers lead to them to decided that Copmanthorpe is no longer in the catchment area? Where would the pupils go?</p>		
<p>Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Comment – valuable site for residential accommodation which is required in York near extensive road links to Leeds and Scarborough. Location means it will have impact on other properties/residents in Copmanthorpe as the new development will feed directly onto and off the A64. Askham Bryan College's recruitment is growing exponentially increasing the need for accommodation for increase in staff.</p>	5507/14889	
	<p>Objection – the proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are thoroughly inappropriate given the size and atmosphere of the village. Will have a catastrophic impact on life in the village and a significant impact on enjoyment and property values.</p>	5508/14893	
	<p>Objection – if houses are built in Copmanthorpe all it will do is create cheap housing for people that work in Leeds. Where are all the children going to go to school in Copmanthorpe? The school is already full. Why is it ok to build on green belt land but if they wanted to build a house in their back field it would be flatly refused?</p>	5511/14903	
	<p>Objection – would turn Copmanthorpe into a small town and erode the green belt to the detriment of the city. Why not build on brown field sites rather than on prime agricultural land. Concerned about the impact on local wildlife, in particular bats by building on the green belt.</p>	5514/14907	
	<p>Objection – village cannot cope with so many extra houses. The school is already full to capacity. Not convinced here is any real need either to build so many houses given the state of the housing market and the numerous houses in the village that already can't sell. Worried about building on the green belt. York has a distinct identity and building on farm land would harm that significantly. Would make what is currently a small village feel like a small town.</p>	5515/14913	
	<p>Objection – don't think the village of Copmanthorpe can support the proposed housing.</p>	5516/14919	
	<p>Objection – infrastructure cannot cope as it is. Plenty of empty homes/offices in the York area, these need to be used first. Adding an extra 600 houses to Copmanthorpe</p>	5518/14926	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	is not sustainable. 30% affordable homes will bring its own unique set of problems.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – the number of houses proposed is far too large. Do not see the evidence for why so many are needed. Such large scale building would have a detrimental effect on the local community. Important to ensure that it doesn't become a dormitory village for commuters to Leeds. Don't consider that the character of the houses proposed is in keeping with the village. Does not believe that there is sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with the houses. The main road through the village is already heavily congested. Do not believe the local primary school has the capacity. The school is already a series of buildings bolted together, would there be funding to address this properly without a complete new build? What of existing arrangements for Copmanthorpe children who attend Tadcaster Grammar.	5553/13013	
	Objection – too many houses being built where there is no or little infrastructure to support it with school places, few doctors, adequate access/egress roads and other vital facilities. Will mean lots more people living in Copmanthorpe with very few facilities. They will all need to get in their several cars per household to get to where the facilities area. Is the plan to expand Copmanthorpe until it meets Leeds?	5556/13026	
	Comment – how will the Council ensure that sustainable transport provision and planning are a key component of future development and subsequent operation? How will the Council help to deliver the infrastructure to support sustainable travel?	5622/13227	
	Objection – Inappropriate. It is valuable open space bringing a visual and environmental buffer to all residents of Copmanthorpe. The land is actively used by Askham Bryan College in pursuit of their educational and agricultural aims. Great concern that the Council's considers giving up green belt so lightly. The scale of development proposed is completely out of proportion to its current size. Concerned about infrastructure, primary school capacity, shopping and car parking facilities, adequate health care provisioning.	5747/13553	
	Objection – what about the increase in school capacity, doctor's surgeries, dentists. How does Copmanthorpe school cope with the influx of families who will be occupying the hundreds of houses?	5750/13565	
	Comment – the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development for drainage, there is flooding in Back Lane and roads.	5760/13618	
	Objection – the proposed building outside of Copmanthorpe would be completely inappropriate to the village atmosphere and despoil beautiful countryside.	5764/13627	
	Objection – it's wrong to build on green belt land. There has been a serious lack of	5765/13630	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	investigation into the suitability of the village to cope with additional housing. The traffic routes are already over stretched and getting in and out of the village at peak times is a struggle. The school could not cope with an influx of extra kids and parking at the shops is already difficult. It would no longer be a village but more of a dormitory town losing its character.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – to add 560 – 1750 houses in Copmanthorpe is unsustainable and would have a negative impact on all infrastructure and local services which would not be able to cope. All services would require overhaul and significant upgrade, including schools, drainage, highways, healthcare and local shops. Over many years the green belt has been defended by the Council and surrounding authorities proving a long established greenbelt.	5766/13635	
	Objection – existing infrastructure can't support the additional houses. Roads are too narrow. Parking at the village shops is at capacity. The drainage system seems to be at or beyond capacity already. Drains are overloaded. Mains water pressure is pathetic not to mention broadband connection rate. Isn't it time to call a halt to habitat destruction and urban sprawl? We need the land for food. Should build on land already rendered unfit for agriculture.	5787/13701	
	Objection – too many houses proposed. These will just bring in Leeds commuters and not help York housing.	5799/15009	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6225 5807/6233	
	Objection – object to building of new houses on the greenbelt around Copmanthorpe. Fields used regularly for walks and to enjoy seeing wildlife. Essential that the green belt is left to counteract the pollution from the very busy and noisy A64. The school is already overcrowded. Would put strain on what few community facilities there are in Copmanthorpe.	5844/13828	
	Objection – grave worries about the houses to be built in Copmanthorpe in particular roads and infrastructure. The roads are at present disgusting and a danger to cyclists, how will they cope with an extra minimum 500 cars? In additional how will the cars leave the village to access the A64; it is bad enough with the numbers we have.	5856/15111	
	Support –agree that the village can sustain an increase in some houses; agree to building on land opposite Hallcroft on the edge of the village.	5880/15170	
	Objection – do not belie the site should have been selected as it is an environmental asset and a valuable open space. It is used by Askham Bryan College for a variety of educational and agricultural purposes which should take precedence. Well being from	5884/15180	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unbroken views should not be ignored. Already have to put up with excessive and increasing noise from the A64. Greenbelt land is an invaluable concept that should not be built on it should be nurtured. Other problems include infrastructure, schools and healthcare which cannot cope with increased population. Such a vast increase to the population will also change its character and turn it into a vast housing estate.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – where will 600 children go to school plus 600 vehicles or more trying to get out of Manor Heath onto the A64?	5909/15230	
	Objection – would ruin one of the most beautiful aspects of the village. Surely the villages have a right to preserve their history as well as York City Centre.	5946/15293	
	Objection – object to the proposed site for housing and raise concerns about housing plans for Copmanthorpe generally.	6132/15564	
	Objection – would conflict with the policy for building on greenbelt land, it detracts from the open character of the land and it is not limited development. Copmanthorpe is very much a series of residential housing estates and developments strung together. ST12 would significantly extend and increase this effect, neither diversifying uses of buildings nor enriching the natural settlement. Would further separate Copmanthorpe from the countryside. Would detract from the openness and rural nature of the village. Will cause pressure on local facilities and impact on wildlife and the landscape. Brownfield sites should be considered first but without reducing or diluting the affordable housing target. An alternative site as suggested in the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan is the eastern side of moor lane where there are less routes or footpaths out into the countryside west of the village.	6132/15570	
	Comment – some more housing will help sustain local services and improve public transport. The junction at Manor Heath would need improvement and the merge onto the A64 is not great heading Leeds bound. The local school could do with more children from within the catchment as the school traffic associated with the relatively high numbers coming from out of the catchment is a problem.	6232/15793	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable and workable, lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage, lack of adequate facilities in the village. It is not credible for the council to say that developers will carry out infrastructure improvements; improvements over several years would be insufficient. Object to building on grade a food producing land. The villagers will lose dog walking routes.	6292/15904	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable and workable, lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage, lack of adequate facilities in	6293/15910	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the village. It is not credible for the council to say that developers will carry out infrastructure improvements; improvements over several years would be insufficient. Object to building on grade a food producing land. The villagers will lose dog walking routes.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15920	
	Objection – the views and appreciating nature as well as walking in the fields and enjoying the countryside and freedom to run in the open are reasons why people live in Copmanthorpe. There is a possibility that people will want to move away if the proposals go ahead. It will also change the whole character and village life of Copmanthorpe. It will develop into a town. It seems fitting for such a historical and widely admired city of York to be bordered by villages and for those villages to be bordered with greenbelt areas. Object to building on prime agricultural land. There appears to be no plans in place to accommodate the amount of extra traffic, people, drainage. The school is already full. No plans shown as to whether a new school will be built which would take away the current playing fields which would be devastating and detrimental to the whole education of the children there.	6320/15973	
	Support – wholly support the proposed allocation of ST12. The land is suitable for residential development which will be sustainable in accordance with the NPPF. The site is available for immediate development. The allocation of ST12 is soundly based and justified and delivery of this site will occur and as such the allocation of the land will be effective.	6349/16036	Linden Homes North
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6322	
	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.	6433/6329	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6337	
		6435/6345	
		6457/6366	
		6467/6387	
	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.	6486/6433	
	Objection – at present the local amenities and infrastructure are sufficient but considered that the considerable increase in housing proposed would be unsustainable	6525/16515	Brian Bell Carpets Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and have a detrimental effect on the physical and emotional environment of the village. Green areas are very limited; it would be a travesty to build on green field sites.		
Site ST12 Land At Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for housing.	Petition 9	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Comment- guidance to be applied to site- see response for detail, see flood risk to strategic housing sites pages.	3/11733	Environment Agency
	Comment- concern that the numbers of vehicles will increase if proposals to build 600 additional homes goes ahead.	53/12604	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection- to add further 560 houses with an additional population of almost 1500 persons is not sustainable. It would overwhelm local infrastructure and services and cause significant reduction in quality of life for existing and new residents.	57/12617	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a very large village. To extend it further risks losing its strong village community identity.	192/14005	
	Objection- the proposal is completely unsuitable for a village the size of Copmanthorpe. It would also remove prime farmland and drive away the wildlife that currently habits these areas.	433/16561	
	Support- the proposed allocation for housing as it reflects the policies and proposals set out in the plan. Comment- the site should be allocated for delivery in the short term (1-5 years) and not the short-medium term (1-10 years). The allocation is soundly based and justified and delivery of this site will occur and as such the allocation of the land will be effective.	534/16724	DPP One Ltd
	Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core, but extending into countryside with no evidence to indicate this is sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the Green Belt.	544/16771	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe’s identity as a village.	917/3048	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. 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.	1053/3339	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/623	
Objection- road system would not be able to deal with the increased traffic flows. The sewerage system cannot cope. The primary school would not be able to cater for more pupils. Shopping is catered for in the village at the present time, but a great increase in the population could not be served. This would lead to more people driving to supermarkets. The doctors surgeries could not cope with the increase in patients the proposed developments would bring. The communities ‘village feel’ would be	1124/17067		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	eroded by the vast developments proposed; to the detriment to of the present population.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection- infrastructure in the village is inadequate to cope with an additional 1200+ residents in terms of water supply and sewerage, road widths, school provision, shopping and car parking facilities. Improvements to the facilities and infrastructure of the village are required in advance of any additional housing development.	1176/17093	
	Objection- new developments should avoid the sacrifice of good quality farmland. Too many of the identified areas seem to be driven by opportunism by landowners rather than sound planning considerations. The land is on terminal moraine and is productive land.	1207/17105	
	Objection – residents in Copmanthorpe are deeply concerned about the impact that 600 new homes (ST12, ST13, H40, H29, SF5) will have on the existing infrastructure and amenities in the village. There are also grave concerns over the impact of potentially over a thousand more cars joining the A64 from Copmanthorpe everyday.	1355/17332	
	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.	1504/2179	
	Objection - Phasing for delivery should be brought forward in the short term rather than medium.	1663/133	DPP
	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.	1884/7	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No thought given to infrastructure. No provision for roads, schools are already full, the two Doctors 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.	1885/13	
	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, car parking and healthcare provision need to be improved. Copmanthorpe is full to capacity and will no longer be a village.	1886/21	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	1888/33	
	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.	1892/44	
	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.	1917/114	
	Objection - has some major concerns for development for up to 600 houses in 'green belt' land around Copmanthorpe. If this does go ahead in some shape of form, it will forever change the 'village' into a small town. This is so abhorrent. With all this expansion and without major infrastructure improvements will cause havoc, even chaos to Copmanthorpe’s small and charming streets. The impact on the local communities will be severe, feel it would be a retrograde step in the quality of life outside of work, when relaxing with families should be encouraged and without stress. Another set of concerns is the already stretched Doctors surgeries, dispensaries and even now the inadequate shopping outlets. The local junior school situated centrally will surely be overwhelmed, and would have to be expanded onto their vital recreational land to cope. Due consideration has been taken of essential infrastructure and service improvements to sewage, water, and the electrical demand made by such expansions of populations, all of which have had their problems.	1931/145	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a large village although it still has a sort of village character at its heart. The plan to build 600 or so new homes will go close to doubling the size of the settlement; this will not be popular with the residents and will take away the character that remains. How about the infrastructure to cope with this – roads, drainage, schools and so on, also the loss of quality farmland in the green belt location. The semi-rural idyllic nature of much of outer York is important too, just as its historic centre.	1933/9917	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – the proposal is to build on prime agricultural land, surely brownfield sites and non agricultural land within the city boundary should be developed first? There are no plans to increase the size of Copmanthorpe primary school which is already full and cannot cater for the increased population proposed. There are no plans to increase the health care provision within Copmanthorpe to cope with the proposed increase in population. The junction of Manor Heath with the A64 slip road is already a bottleneck and increased traffic will make that junction increasingly dangerous. The main water supply in Copmanthorpe currently suffers from substandard pressures during periods of high demand and cannot cope with the additional demand created by the proposed housing.	1937/167	
	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.	1940/174	
	Objection – before commencing any building work the infrastructure must be reinforced. Understood that the sewage system in Copmanthorpe is at capacity, likewise the rainwater drains, has the Council considered the consequences when 600 new homes use an overburdened system? The exit roads from Copmanthorpe are already congested. Understand the density of housing is much greater with no allowance made for car parking. The doctor’s surgeries and the schools are at full capacity. Will we be building on the school playing fields and reduce the children’s quality of life? Copmanthorpe is already a dormitory village for Leeds and the people who work in Leeds shop in Leeds hence the loss of shops in the village. Why are the Council proposing to build on prime agricultural land instead of the brownfield sites within the city of York.	1941/182	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1942/187	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not there to cope with the strain that would be put on it, schools, roads, water, sewerage, drainage, healthcare etc as they struggle to cope now. The use of greenbelt, valuable agricultural land must strongly be resisted so we can preserve for future generations. The precedent therefore must not be allowed. Sure that many brownfield sites in and around York exist.	1943/192	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1954/234	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/248	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/256	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/264	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/272	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/279	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1964/287	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/295	
	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.	1966/303	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be extremely dangerous.	1967/311	
	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.	1968/319	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/327	
	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.	1970/335	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/343	
		1972/351	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/358	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/366	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/373	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/379	
		1977/387	
		1978/395	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/402	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1980/410		
	1981/418		
	1982/425		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/433		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses. Countryside should be protected.	1985/443	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/451	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/459	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/467	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/474	
	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.	1990/482	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character OF Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/489	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/497	
	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.	1993/505	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/519	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/526	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/534	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/542	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no Objection.	1998/550	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/556 2000/564 2001/572	
	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.	2002/580	
Support – absolutely support the building of new homes for people in Copmanthorpe	2007/597		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	but these new homes should be in keeping with the houses already in the village. Objection – concerned about the density of housing proposed for the area. Understands that the housing proposed will be high density town houses with no garden or off street parking. This will fundamentally change the character of the villages. Current services will be overwhelmed by the influx of so many young people and families. What residents need are houses for downsizing couples and established families as well as homes for our adult children. The land is prone to flooding, how will this be dealt with?		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/607	
		2012/615	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/631	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/639	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/646	
		2016/654	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/662	
		2018/670	
		2019/676	
		2020/684	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/692	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/699	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/707	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/715	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/723	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/731		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/737		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/745		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/752		
	2030/759		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2031/766	
		2032/772	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/779	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/787	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/795	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/803	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/811	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/819	
		2039/827	
		2040/835	
		2041/843	
	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.	2042/851	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/859	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/867	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/875	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/882	
		2047/890	
	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.	2048/898	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/906	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/914	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/937		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/944		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to	2060/952		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited in village and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/958	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/966	
	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.	2063/972	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/980	
		2065/988	
	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.	2066/996	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1003	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1011	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1019	
		2070/1026	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1033	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1041	
		2073/1049	
		2074/1057	
	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.	2075/1065	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1073	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2077/1081	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt land.	2078/1088		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1096		
	2080/1103		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2081/1111	
		2082/1119	
	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.	2083/1126	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1134	
		2085/1142	
		2086/1149	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or large enough to prevent people from travelling.	2087/1157	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1164	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1170	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1176	
		2091/1184	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1192	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1200	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1208	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new houses.	2095/1216	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1223	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1229	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1237	
		2099/1245	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Ruin York.	2100/1252		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1260		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2102/1266		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2103/1274		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.	2104/1282	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2105/1289	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with community leading to development of Local Plan.	2106/1297	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2107/1305	
	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.	2108/1313	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2109/1321	
		2110/1329	
	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.	2111/1337	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites situation.	2112/1345	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1353	
		2114/1361	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2115/1369	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2116/1377	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2117/1385	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2118/1393	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More flooding and loss of allotments.	2119/1400	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development will spoil village.	2120/1407	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2121/1415	
		2122/1423	
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.	2129/1438		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1446		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. To build houses in hope this will attract	2131/1454		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	people before there are sustainable jobs is putting the cart before the horse		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1462	
		2133/1470	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1478	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1486	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1493	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1501	
		2138/1509	
		2139/1517	
	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.	2140/1525	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2141/1533	
		2142/1549	
		2143/1556	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1564	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1572	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1579	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1587		
	2148/1595		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1603		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses are excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. If so many houses are needed would be better to build a small town rather than piecemeal in Copmanthorpe. 200 to 250 are 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 and already have parking problems.	2150/1611		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1617	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be protected for future generations.	2152/1625	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1632	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1640	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1647	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1655	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1663	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1671	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1678	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1686	
		2161/1694	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around York.	2162/1702	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1710	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1718	
		2165/1725	
		2166/1733	
		2167/1740	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1746	
	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.	2169/1754	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1761		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1769		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2172/1777	
		2173/1785	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2174/1793	
		2175/1800	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1806	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1814	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1821	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1829	
		2180/1845	
		2181/1853	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2182/1859	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1867	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1875	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1883	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1891	
		2187/1907	
	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.	2188/1915	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1923	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1930	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues. 200 homes is more realistic. Increased traffic and demand on amenities is a problem.	2191/1937	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1945		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1953		
	2194/1961		
	2195/1969		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made?	2196/1977	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1985	
		2198/1993	
		2199/2000	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2200/2008	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2015	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2023	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2031	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2039	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2047	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2053	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary.	2207/2061	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2069	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2076	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2084	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2092	
		2212/2100	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2108	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2116		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2131		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2139		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2147		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2155	
		2219/2163	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2171	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2187	
	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)?	2222/2195	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2203	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2209	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2217	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2225	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2233	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2240	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are four active badger setts on the proposed development site.	2229/2248	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath be destroyed?	2230/2256	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2264	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2272	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2280	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2288	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 - 200.	2235/2295	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2303	
	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.	2237/2310	
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.	2238/2318		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village could not cope with extra traffic.	2239/2326	
	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.	2240/2333	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2341	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2349	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2357	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2364	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2372	
		2246/2380	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2388	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2395	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2403	
		2250/2411	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2419	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2427	
	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.	2253/2435	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2443	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2451	
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.	2256/2459		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2467	
		2258/2474	
		2259/2482	
		2260/2490	
		2261/2498	
		2262/2506	
		2263/2514	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2264/2520	
		2265/2528	
		2266/2536	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2267/2544	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2552	
		2269/2560	
		2270/2568	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2576	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely.	2272/2584	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2592	
	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.	2274/2600	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2606	
		2276/2613	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them.	2282/2631		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2639		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2647		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2655		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2663		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded.	2287/2671		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel.	2288/2679		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2289/2687	
		2290/2694	
		2291/2702	
		2292/2710	
		2293/2718	
		2294/2726	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2295/2734	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2296/2742	
		2297/2750	
		2298/2758	
		2299/2766	
		2300/2774	
		2301/2782	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2790	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2798	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2806	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2814	
		2306/2822	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2318/2830	
		2319/2838	
		2320/2846	
		2321/2853	
	2322/2861		
	2323/2869		
	2324/2877		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2885		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2893		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2901		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2907	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2915	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with YCC.	2330/2922	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2930	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2938	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2945	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3154	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3162	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2951	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2958	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2966	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2974	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2982	
		2374/2989	
		2375/2997	
		2376/3004	
		2377/3011	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2378/3018	
		2379/3026	
		2380/3033	
2381/3040			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3033		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3040		
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.	2382/3056		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3063		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3071	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3079	
	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.	2386/3087	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3094	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3102	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3109	
		2390/3117	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3125	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3131	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3139	
		2394/3146	
		2395/3170	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3176	
	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.	2397/3184	
	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”.	2410/3192	
Objection- as it is the pavements are not wide, it will cost a lot of money to extend the school and roads would need to be widened. Need to improve the shopping centre and car parking as there is not enough room. Not many people will be able to afford that especially first time buyers. Getting on the bypass is dangerous, what is it going to be like with all the new cars that are going to travel on it?	2414/6576		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3199		
	2449/3207		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2450/3215	
		2451/3246	
		2452/3223	
	Objection-by what means is the surface water drainage to be dealt with when it comes to the proposed additional one hundred and fifteen home son the estate? The sewerage for the whole village is assisted by an over capacity pumping station. Foul water and solid waste has backed up into homes in that area. The proposal is a disaster waiting to happen. Insufficient mains water pressure is often the case in the village. What plans are there to cope with considerable additional demand that will result from the new houses with their multitude of bathrooms? What will the village ne like with another 600 houses? The only access and egress planned for this estate is madness. The width of Willstrop Farm Road at no more than 6m is too narrow to safely carry all the additional traffic that 115 more houses would generate, obstructed by church parking. What are the council’s proposals for widening Old Moor Lane, Main Street, School Lane, Horseman Lane, Top Lane and Manor Heath to accommodate extra traffic? All these improvements to roads and drains must be put in place and working before new housing is commenced. Where is it proposed that the huge number of children from these new houses will be accommodated? Again more congestion from parking on the daily school run. Those few shops we have in Copmanthorpe to serve the present community are barely sufficient. There is in effect no space in the centre of the village to build additional shop units not for any additional much needed parking. It would not be accepted should there be significantly more houses, heavier traffic and a lot more people. Will the two GPs be able to cope with an additional estimated 2500-3000 residents?	2469/2625	
	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.	2488/3230	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2489/3238	
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.	2490/3253		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3355		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.	2494/3363	
	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.	2495/3371	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3378	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3386	
		2498/3394	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3402	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3410	
		2501/3418	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3331	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3347	
	Objection- concerns due to drainage issues already in the area. Has the area close to Westfield been considered as it is of little visual value?	2547/6841	
	Objection- building on prime agricultural land is reducing the country’s ability and capacity to grow our own food. Cannot see how the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe could cope with water, drainage and sewage. Serious improvements need to be made to that infrastructure. There is a problem exiting the village and additional traffic will only make this worse.	2559/6887	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3308	
		2570/3316	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2571/3323	
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.	2589/3300		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3426		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3433		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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?	2610/3441	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3449	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3456	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3464	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3472	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3480	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3488	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3496	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is a green site and further development will destroy the environment Existing Copmanthorpe roads would become even more busy and dangerous. Development will kill off many native wildlife species. Will ruin the look of the entry to York and Minster vistas. Developing Copmanthorpe is not necessary and not wanted by the majority who live there.	2639/7000	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.	2640/6012	
	Objection- how will vehicles from this scheme in Copmanthorpe access and egress from the A64. How will the village school accommodate the influx of pupils where there is no funding available or secured? Drainage improvements noticeable by their absence.	2678/7104	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3574	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3582	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3588	
	Objection- do not understand why anyone would want to build on open fields when there are other areas which could be renovated first.	2762/7300	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.	2932/3998		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection- see Copmanthorpe Analysis. It is a rural village which has had significant development over recent years. Suggest that houses to purchase are built facing Manor Heath and part buy are built into the estate a limit on the height of these properties should be placed also enough parking spaces provided. Would it not be more appropriate to build houses/bungalows which are in keeping?	2988/4521	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4005	
	Objection- no economic justification for the number of houses proposed. The impact on the village of extra vehicles and residents at the moment the road struggles and the condition of the roads in Copmanthorpe. On Moor Lane the road is not suitable for new housing, as the road is only accessible by single track. Building houses so close to the railway lines at the bottom of Moor Lane should be considered as not a good idea as recently it has been reported of a high speed rail link to York which would have impact on houses near the railway lines.	3047/7902	
	Objection- to proposed plan to build additional housing on the outskirts of Copmanthorpe. Protect the environment- the proposal to build 600 houses on green belt land does not meet this requirement. The agricultural land is home to considerable wildlife. The increased congestion as the traffic queues will add to CO2 emissions. The land is agricultural land which has a clear role in supplying produce for the nation. The plan makes a mockery of the greenbelt protection. Get York moving- fail to understand how building 600 homes on the Leeds/Harrogate side of York will improve the York economy. Build strong communities- there is no room on the existing site to accommodate such an increase in pupils. Create jobs and grow the economy- the new houses will only attract workers commuting out of York.	3082/7958	
	Objection- Copmanthorpe has a poor road and drainage infrastructure, hopelessly inadequate parking in the village centre, too much car traffic, a reduced bus service. To increase the population by 40% would destroy the nature of the community.	3134/8068	
	Objection – the site is currently in the green belt, tested at a public inquiry in 1992, the boundaries then proposed have been treated as determined for all planning purposes. Will have cumulative and detrimental effects on the special character of York, both damaging the important landscape setting and increasing traffic, congestion and overcrowding. Will delay the reuse of urban brownfield sites because the ease of development of the Greenfield sites will cause developers to develop the Greenfield sites in preference to brownfield ones. Will increase congestion in the centre of the village where car parking is already at a premium. Along with ST13 do not contain sufficient dwellings to support their own retail and community facilities so	3222/8291	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	that the new residents will be forced into the village. The distance means that the majority will travel by car. The primary school and healthcare facilities of the village are already overloaded as are the foul and surface water drainage facilities. Soakaways will not work because of the heavy clay soil in Copmanthorpe. Regard should be had to the quality of agricultural land that will be lost. This site is grade 2 and was described in the City of York Local Development Framework 2007 as highly fertile.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – does not think it is a good site for building. Difficult to access green space outside the village. No suitable pedestrian access. The area is frequently used by walkers and cyclists along the land. Please keep this area as countryside. Is it not part of the plan to preserve the environment and to encourage people not to use cars? If there is no space in Copmanthorpe considered that people will just get in the car.	3251/8345	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4013	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely alter community.	3283/4021	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4037	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4045	
	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.	3292/4029	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3318/4053	
	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.	3327/4060	
	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. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.	3330/4068	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – proposal to build more than 600 extra houses in Copmanthorpe is unacceptable and impractical. It would change the nature of the village to the great detriment of its current residents. Quiet enjoyment of life would be adversely affected by the threatened major expansion. The fields currently visible provide refreshment and pleasure to residents who are walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog owners and bird watchers. The close proximity of open country to the heart of Copmanthorpe is an essential part of the village’s character. The infrastructure could not cope with the extra demands. Already roads are too congested and crowded and the water supply and sewerage systems are scarcely adequate for the present population. Local resources (shops, surgeries, school, and library) while sufficient for Copmanthorpe residents now could not meet the needs of so many incomers.	3331/8513	
	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.	3412/4076	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4084	
	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.	3414/4091	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4099	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4107	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed developments around Copmanthorpe. This area is already much developed and cannot accommodate more housing in the scale that is being suggested.	3418/8734	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8865	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8872	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8841	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8849	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8857	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6020	
	Objection – the roads are already heavy with traffic. There is very little parking for village amenities. The junction onto the A1237/a64 is extremely busy. 600 more houses mean at the very least 600 more cars. The village will just not be able to cope	3511/9434	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	with this amount of traffic. Moor Lane is very narrow. Many houses on Moor Lane do not have driveways so need to park on the roads; there is also only footpath on the right hand side.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don't see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6027	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6034	
	Objection – would like to know what measures the council proposes to mitigate congestion on the A64 which will inevitably result from the massive housing development planned for the south east of York, east of York and Heslington and the additional homes planned for Copmanthorpe. What measures are in place to ensure that current peak time's problems will not be a daylong issue?	3571/9526	
	Objection – increase in the population of Copmanthorpe isn't feasible because of poor infrastructure (schools, sewers, water supply, and road junctions). To make this plan work there has to be a plan for these. Urban sprawl should be contained. This proposal will encourage ribbon development along the A64 towards Tadcaster. The area already floods on a regular basis during heavy rain.	3621/9634	
	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.	3626/9313	
	Objection – inappropriate for the village to have such a vast increase in its population. The village is already struggling with drainage. The drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at its full capacity. There is no room to expand the school without using most of the playground and then the children will lose the capability for outdoor activities and exercise. The roads struggle now to cope with the vast amount of traffic exiting the village on to the A64 and A1237. The roads will need to be widening to cope with the increase in traffic. The reason people visit and move to York and to Copmanthorpe is for the beautiful surrounding countryside. Will destroy wonderful views and the animal habitats including bats which are meant to be a protected species. Copmanthorpe will no longer be a village.	3720/10012	
	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.	3726/5997	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution 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 ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – would alter village life and put a strain on local amenities. The style and density of the proposed housing (affordable) is not fitting with the current style of the village. The village would not physically cope with another 1000+ cars on the already busy roads. The quality of the roads is poor and will worsen with more vehicles using them. The existing junctions of the village boundary are already overly busy. Parking facilities are already insufficient. Road parking is commonplace which leads to traffic congestion problems. Current transport links in the village are poor. The bus service is not frequent enough and others do not cover the whole of the village. The services would need upgrading to accommodate the increase in population. The primary school is already at full capacity, any extension would spool the current school grounds and sports facilities. Already difficult to get a doctor’s appointment, extra population would make this worse. Other shops and services within the village will also suffer from the increase in population, causing distress for current residents. Local power outages are quite common so additional housing would create a further strain on the electricity supply. Current surface water drainage and sewage system problems exist. Would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside.	3727/10027	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6005	
	Objection – fail to see how the proposals can possibly be in the interests of the residents in the village and there are better sites in and around York which would be better suited to such a development. Already a large village but has evolved in a natural way over the years to accommodate a substantial increase in residents. Any further major increase in housing will put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure and will irrevocably change the nature of the village. It will become just another suburb of York rather than a village with its own identity. Land is prime agricultural land. Open spaces and fields are regularly used for general walking, bird watching, walking dogs etc. Housing on this site flies in the face of the government’s regard for and desire to improve the health of the nation. Traffic congestion will substantially increase. How is the council going to improve the infrastructure in the village to cope with the increased demand? What conditions will the Council impose on developers to ensure that any housing built will be sold to people who work in York rather than commute to cities outside York?	3820/10278	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would increase village by approximately 40%. Infrastructure and services cannot	3888/4557	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cope.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Existing road infrastructure inadequate for size of development. Major issue would also be at junction of Methodist Church which is already problematic.	3889/4565	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3903/4584	
	Objection – object to the quantity of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe. There is not an adequate transport network.	3966/10555	
	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.	4057/4687	
	Objection – appreciate the need for additional housing in York area considered that the scale and density of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe is inappropriate for the area. Plan appears to make no improvements to the infrastructure of the village. Specific concerns include traffic, drainage and parking.	4099/10795	
	Objection – object to nearly 600 new homes to the west of Copmanthorpe and 55 acres taken out of the green belt.	4128/10824	
	Objection – concerned that the proposed building land has an extremely high water table. Drainage is no longer adequate, presumably silted up. Concerned that increasing the population size of Copmanthorpe by 40-80% will have a significant negative impact on the primary school which already has to convert parts of the building in order to accommodate the number of pupils.	4168/10892	
	Objection – any further development in this area will further increase pressure on the Tadcaster Road route in/out of the city. At peak times this route cannot accommodate the current traffic load.	4305/11170	
	Objection – gross overdevelopment of a small village. Infrastructure unsuitable to bear such an increase. Urban development of a village community is a bad idea.	4328/11233	
	Objection – development of 600 houses is much too large. If added to the potential safeguarded land this could lead to over 1100 houses. This is a gross overdevelopment. See no mention in the plan for any infrastructure development.	4329/11239	
	Objection – Infrastructure cannot cope including drainage, sewage, roads, schools, health and welfare facilities and water supply. Objects to building on prime agricultural land. Brownfield sites must be developed before any green field sites.	4343/11613	
Objection – disproportionate scale of development and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the village. It will mean that the whole feeling of a rural location will change, easy access to the fields for walking, rural views, the sense of being part of	4389/11372		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the countryside will be lost to a large extent. Practical concerns include drainage, increased traffic on the roads, the school is at capacity now and a substantial increase in pupils will necessitate either building a new school which goes against the whole village ethos or building on the playing fields which are really appreciated by the children in the school.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – an increase of 33% houses in itself is unacceptable in that the village amenities could not possibly cope with such a huge increase. In addition the majority of the village infrastructure is already at full capacity. Main Street is already unacceptably congested. To imagine that a few hundred more cars could be attempting to use this road is unthinkable and no thought seems to have been given to this.	4405/11410	
	Objection – no regard has been had to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. It is green belt and is prime agricultural land, how ridiculous to use such land when brown field land or areas which could be ‘refurbished’ could be used. Are all aware of the increasing and never ending cost of food so to destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous. The school is already at full capacity, local amenities are already operating at full capacity. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and parking will not be able to cope. Major concern is the amount of traffic which will be generated.	4412/11423	
	Objection – no regard has been had to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. It is green belt and is prime agricultural land, how ridiculous to use such land when brown field land or areas which could be ‘refurbished’ could be used. Are all aware of the increasing and never ending cost of food so to destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous. The school is already at full capacity, local amenities are already operating at full capacity. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and parking will not be able to cope. Major concern is the amount of traffic which will be generated.	4414/11435	
	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.	4434/5198	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can’t cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5205	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own	4451/5213	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	4737/5278	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5328	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Out of scale with village. In green belt. Needs significant investment in infrastructure. A64 already congested. Traffic in village would increase. Shortage of parking. Issues with sewage system. Impact on wildlife and flora. Area is site of a roman settlement.	4761/5334	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5342	
		4763/5350	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. Adding 600 to 800 houses would destroy what we have. Schools cannot cope with proposed increased numbers. Youth Groups of village at capacity. Problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. Problems with car parking and road system cannot cope with extra traffic.	4764/5358	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5366	
		4766/5374	
		4770/5382	
Objection – to the proposal to build a further 600 houses in the Copmanthorpe area. The current village infrastructure already has to cope at full capacity. Local parking would not be able to handle the 50% increase in the current population. The building of these new homes will have a significant impact on local drainage and sewage. The drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at full capacity. The proposal is on green field land when brownfield sites should be targeted first. There has been no consideration of the increased health care needs for the community. Object to the disruption to local wildlife in particular bats. The area is prime farmland.	5137/12450		
Objection – proposal to build an additional 600 houses is an increase of more than one third. During wet weather the drainage and sewage system does not cope with the current housing stock. The school, the car park in the village centre and the vehicle exit routes from the village are all currently operating at full capacity and	5166/12301		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	could not cope with such a large expansion of housing, cars and primary school children.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – proposals are inappropriate. They will fundamentally alter the nature of the village increasing its size inorganically by circa 40%. Proposed housing density is inappropriate for a village and will further negatively affect the ambience of the village. What is the justification for requiring greater housing density on Greenfield sites than on brownfield ones. There is no indication that there will be adequate vehicle parking arrangements for residents of the new housing. No indication as to why prime agricultural land should be developed for housing when there is a national requirement to ensure that the UK maximises its own food production. No indication that the Council will ensure that any and/or all developers will first ensure that all infrastructure improvements will be completed before any housing is commenced. There are already infrastructure pressures in Copmanthorpe – poor rainwater drainage, low water pressure, both junctions to the A64 and the northern relief road are under intense pressure at peak times already. The new houses will not be occupied by people locating in York to take up new jobs but by people commuting to Leeds.	5186/12389	
	Objection – do not agree with the plans for Copmanthorpe. The numbers of houses proposed are too high.	5202/12424	
	Objection – object to the strategic housing sites outside of the York ring road. All land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered as green belt.	5223/12496	
	Objection – object to the scale of the development proposed for Copmanthorpe. The addition of 600 houses would increase the village’s size by around 35% which is unsustainable. Would overwhelm the existing infrastructure. Village amenities are already over stretched. The village school is full; the village centre struggles to cope with the car parking. The drains and sewers are already stretched to capacity and regularly flood. The water pressure is sub standard. Electricity supply is regularly subject to faults. Access points into the village by car are already incredibly congested. There would have to be significant investment in such infrastructure to enable any large scale development to take place. To develop to the western side of the village would also skew its population significantly away from the current centre; the suggestion that that additional retail facilities or an additional school should be built ignores the fact that having a clear centre, a single school and clearly defined boundaries are important elements of Copmanthorpe’s character.	5239/12573	
	Objection – does not take into account the neighbourhoods concerned. The	5261/14356	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>infrastructure wouldn't be able to accommodate such a large percentage population increase. The local primary school is full and only land around it that could be developed is the playing field. Prime agricultural land is needed for crop production. The drainage system cannot cope now the addition of 560 houses would increase this problem and lead to flooding. Medical and dental services would struggle to accommodate such a large increase. Traffic levels are high. Some sites could be found for small developments in and around the village which wouldn't have such an impact but not the numbers suggested in the plan. Would have detrimental impact on the views of York. Is the building of social housing so far from the centre of York sensible or practical? As Copmanthorpe is a catchment area for Tadcaster Grammar could the increase in numbers lead to them to decide that Copmanthorpe is no longer in the catchment area? Where would the pupils go?</p>		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – the proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are thoroughly inappropriate given the size and atmosphere of the village. Will have a catastrophic impact on life in the village and a significant impact on enjoyment and property values.</p>	5508/14894	
	<p>Objection – If houses are built in Copmanthorpe all it will do is create cheap housing for people that work in Leeds. Where are all the children going to go to school in Copmanthorpe? The school is already full. Why is it ok to build on green belt land but if they wanted to build a house in their back field it would be flatly refused?</p>	5511/14904	
	<p>Objection – would turn Copmanthorpe into a small town and erode the green belt to the detriment of the city. Why not build on brown field sites rather than on prime agricultural land. Concerned about the impact on local wildlife, in particular bats by building on the green belt.</p>	5514/14902	
	<p>Objection – village cannot cope with so many extra houses. The school is already full to capacity. Not convinced there is any real need either to build so many houses given the state of the housing market and the numerous houses in the village that already can't sell. Worried about building on the green belt. York has a distinct identity and building on farm land would harm that significantly. Would make what is currently a small village feel like a small town.</p>	5515/14912	
	<p>Objection – don't think the village of Copmanthorpe can support the proposed housing.</p>	5516/14918	
	<p>Objection – infrastructure cannot cope as it is. Plenty of empty homes/offices in the York area, these need to be used first. Adding an extra 600 houses to Copmanthorpe is not sustainable. 30% affordable homes will bring its own unique set of problems.</p>	5518/14927	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – the number of houses proposed is far too large. Do not see the evidence for why so many are needed. Such large scale building would have a detrimental effect on the local community. Important to ensure that it doesn't become a dormitory village for commuters to Leeds. Don't consider that the character of the houses proposed is in keeping with the village. Does not believe that there is sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with the houses. The main road through the village is already heavily congested. Do not believe the local primary school has the capacity. The school is already a series of buildings bolted together, would there be funding to address this properly without a complete new build? What of existing arrangements for Copmanthorpe children who attend Tadcaster Grammar.	5553/13014	
	Objection – too many houses being built where there is no or little infrastructure to support it with school places, few doctors, adequate access/egress roads and other vital facilities. Will mean lots more people living in Copmanthorpe with very few facilities. They will all need to get in their several cars per household to get to where the facilities area. Is the plan to expand Copmanthorpe until it meets Leeds?	5556/13027	
	Comment – how will the Council ensure that sustainable transport provision and planning are a key component of future development and subsequent operation? How will the Council help to deliver the infrastructure to support sustainable travel?	5622/13228	
	Objection - the scale of development proposed is completely out of proportion to its current size. Concerned about infrastructure, primary school capacity, shopping and car parking facilities, adequate health care provisioning.	5747/13554	
	Objection – what about the increase in school capacity, doctor's surgeries, dentists. How does Copmanthorpe school cope with the influx of families who will be occupying the hundreds of houses?	5750/13566	
	Comment – the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development for drainage, there is flooding in Back Lane and roads.	5760/13619	
	Objection – the proposed building outside of Copmanthorpe would be completely inappropriate to the village atmosphere and despoil beautiful countryside.	5764/13628	
	Objection – it's wrong to build on green belt land. There has been a serious lack of investigation into the suitability of the village to cope with additional housing. The traffic routes are already over stretched and getting in and out of the village at peak times is a struggle. The school could not cope with an influx of extra kids and parking at the shops is already difficult. It would no longer be a village but more of a dormitory town losing its character.	5765/13631	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – to add 560 – 1750 houses in Copmanthorpe is unsustainable and would have a negative impact on all infrastructure and local services which would not be able to cope. All services would require overhaul and significant upgrade, including schools, drainage, highways, healthcare and local shops. Over many years the green belt has been defended by the Council and surrounding authorities proving a long established greenbelt.	5766/13636	
	Objection – existing infrastructure can't support the additional houses. Roads are too narrow. Parking at the village shops is at capacity. The drainage system seems to be at or beyond capacity already. Drains are overloaded. Mains water pressure is pathetic not to mention broadband connection rate. Isn't it time to call a halt to habitat destruction and urban sprawl? We need the land for food. Should build on land already rendered unfit for agriculture.	5787/13702	
	Objection – too many houses proposed. These will just bring in Leeds commuters and not help York housing.	5799/15010	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6226 5807/6234	
	Objection – object to building of new houses on the greenbelt around Copmanthorpe. Fields used regularly for walks and to enjoy seeing wildlife. Essential that the green belt is left to counteract the pollution from the very busy and noisy A64. The school is already overcrowded. Would put strain on what few community facilities there are in Copmanthorpe.	5844/13829	
	Objection – grave worries about the houses to be built in Copmanthorpe in particular roads and infrastructure. The roads are at present disgusting and a danger to cyclists, how will they cope with an extra minimum 500 cars? In addition how will the cars leave the village to access the A64; it is bad enough with the numbers we have.	5856/15112	
	Objection – object to building to Moor Lane which is central to the village and will have a bigger impact on traffic through the village.	5880/15171	
	Objection – where will 600 children go to school plus 600 vehicles or more trying to get out of Manor Heath onto the A64?	5909/15231	
	Objection – would ruin one of the most beautiful aspects of the village. Surely the villages have a right to preserve their history as well as York City Centre.	5946/15294	
	Comment – some more housing will help sustain local services and improve public transport. The junction at Manor Heath would need improvement and the merge onto the A64 is not great heading Leeds bound. The local school could do with more	6232/15794	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	children from within the catchment as the school traffic associated with the relatively high numbers coming from out of the catchment is a problem.		
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable and workable, lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage, and lack of adequate facilities in the village. It is not credible for the council to say that developers will carry out infrastructure improvements; improvements over several years would be insufficient. Object to building on grade a food producing land. The villagers will lose dog walking routes.	6292/15905	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable and workable, lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage, and lack of adequate facilities in the village. It is not credible for the council to say that developers will carry out infrastructure improvements; improvements over several years would be insufficient. Object to building on grade a food producing land. The villagers will lose dog walking routes.	6293/15911	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15921	
	Objection – the views and appreciating nature as well as walking in the fields and enjoying the countryside and freedom to run in the open are reasons why people live in Copmanthorpe. There is a possibility that people will want to move away if the proposals go ahead. It will also change the whole character and village life of Copmanthorpe. It will develop into a town. It seems fitting for such a historical and widely admired city of York to be bordered by villages and for those villages to be bordered with greenbelt areas. Object to building on prime agricultural land. There appears to be no plans in place to accommodate the amount of extra traffic, people, and drainage. The school is already full. No plans shown as to whether a new school will be built which would take away the current playing fields which would be devastating and detrimental to the whole education of the children there.	6320/15974	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6323	
	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.	6433/6330	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6338	
		6435/6346	
	6457/6367		
	6467/6388		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST13 Land At Moor Lane, 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.	6486/6434	
	Objection – at present the local amenities and infrastructure are sufficient but considered that the considerable increase in housing proposed would be unsustainable and have a detrimental effect on the physical and emotional environment of the village. Green areas are very limited; it would be a travesty to build on green field sites.	6525/16516	Brian Bell Carpets Ltd
	Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for housing.	Petition 9	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor	Comment- guidance to be applied to site- for detail please see response, see flood risk to strategic housing sites pages.	3/11734	Environment Agency
	Comment- concerns over how it would impact on the A 1237(T) ring road, which suffers from congestion. Concerns over increased journey times for Hambleton’s residents and workforce using this part of the strategic network.	7/11648	Hambleton District Council
	Comment- significant levels of development from ST15 are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079-A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11665	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Comment- query regarding scale of the allocation especially die to SF3. The allocation would be significantly bigger than nearby settlements. It is unclear what other services are needed or proposed to support the urban extensions and ensure sustainability and therefore what the related implications for the A64(T)/Outer Ring Road (A1237), the wider highways network and surrounding settlements might be. Suggested this be the subject of ongoing cross boundary discussions with neighbouring local authorities as plan further develops.	11/11680	North Yorkshire County Council
	Objection- where will the funding be achieved for drainage, education, health facilities and additional highways?	56/12612	Clifton Without Parish Council
	Objection- the Parish Council is unable to support the development without firm commitment to substantial improvements to A1237 to enable infrastructure to cope with increase of vehicular activity.	73/12744	Rawcliffe Parish Council
	Objection- the unnecessary and excessive level of growth proposed would require a housing development of 4020 houses at Clifton Gate which would dwarf Skelton and destroy the rural aspect of the land east of the village. The associated upgrading of the Northern Ring Road is speculative and even with an upgraded ring road, increased traffic levels that would use Skelton as a through route would be damaging and hazardous. The development presumes the northern ring road will be upgraded and grade separation will be constructed at main junctions. However this is speculative and at high risk of not being funded. A speculative developer is likely to take advantage of Clifton Gate being adopted in the plan and commencing a large development with out guarantee of upgrading the ring road. A duelled ring road with grade separation at the Rawcliffe roundabout would have severe impacts on the narrow band of green space between Skelton and Rawcliffe. An upgraded ring road would create unacceptable risk on coalescence between Rawcliffe and Skelton.	75/12757	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection- any increase in number of households will result in greater strain on schools and therefore increased new school provisions are essential. The B1363 presents additional hazards due to poor access/egress to the expanding Wigginton business	80/12790	Wigginton Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>park close to its junction with A1237. Increased development will exacerbate the long term flooding problem in the area. Future plans must include for light industrial opportunities and companies should be encouraged to look at the area as an opportunity to develop. Wigginton has no available land to increase the amenity of allotments which have a waiting list of 15. There is a current need to increase number of allotments and open play space. It is necessary to increase library facilities should there be an increase in households. It is essential to invest in sports facilities if the number of households is to increase. There is an urgent need to improve and increase the number of safe cycle paths and routes throughout the area. The increase in households in Haxby will severely impact Wigginton by increased volume of traffic on an already congested single carriageway rung road, and the S1237 and the B1363 which will now dissect any Clifton Moor ST14 development from Wigginton.</p> <p>Comment- proposed housing lacks detail in types and sizes. It is essential that development will provide a range of housing including social housing. There must be affordable housing to match income levels. An increase in population will result in further unreliable further public transport. To cope with demand the existing public transport system needs to be overhauled. Should the train halt become reality, the local infrastructure in inadequate to cope with parking and access.</p>		
<p>Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued</p>	<p>Objection- building new towns in green belt is socially and economically unnecessary. Building on this green belt land would urbanise a stretch of countryside from A19 eastwards, from Skelton to Earswick. An extra 12,000 people would dwarf Skelton 7 times over. Infrastructure would follow along way behind house building placing immense strain on existing services. Would be a huge increase in traffic through Skelton along Moorlands Road/Moor Lane. Assuming the housing proposals were to advance they would fail on the ground on sustainability. The development would bring huge pressure n a road system which is already at capacity. The A 1237 outer ring road features long traffic queues at busy times and the A19 on approach to the centre are similarly constrained. Minor junction improvements and traffic separation will not be adequate. Dualling the ring road over the required length is unlikely. Funding sources are ill defined and substantial investment will be hard to come by. Major infrastructure concerns relate to drainage and sewage. Concreting 330 acres then building 4000 dwellings has implications for water disposal where there are already flood issues.</p>	<p>136/12872</p>	<p>Skelton Village Trust</p>
	<p>Objection - ST14 is an area of particular concern as development of this area would compromise the special character of York; specifically the relationship between the</p>	<p>238/14045</p>	<p>English Heritage</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	City, its rural hinterland and surrounding villages.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection- concern and questions over whether the delivery of the full 4020 dwellings would be feasible within the plan period. Assumptions on the site too optimistic.	432/16547	Church Commissioners for England
	Support- proposals are welcome as need growth beyond outer ring road.	525/16634	
	Objection- number of homes is excessive and needs to be reduced- it comes on top of the large John Lewis/Marks and Spencer/ Stadium development. This will create congestion on the A1237 and on local roads. The northern section of the outer ring road is already congested.	527/16653	
	Comment – do not object to the allocation but is of the opinion that the delivery from ST14 is over optimistic and that the site is unlikely to be fully delivered until 2038.	534/16720	DPP One Ltd
	Objection- the proposed allocation is considered to be in conflict with the historic character of York as they represent intrusions into the open countryside, rather than connection to or towards existing outlying settlements.	544/16766	
	Objection- reservations about the housing development east of Skelton, not least its accessibility.	671/16817	
	Objection- proposed development seems like a recipe for traffic gridlock.	801/4547	
	Objection- any plan which has not considered the impact on surface water run off, sewerage and the impact of increased transport on the current road network deserves to be neither considered or approved. Without any traffic plan included, it must be assumed that traffic will be able to use Moorlands Road. This would have a dramatic and devastating effect on Skelton both during and after the building stages.	1009/17034	
	Objection - far too huge, unnecessary, erosion of beautiful countryside, lots of mature trees, wildlife etc. plus ring road could not cope.	1144/17085	
	Objection- access to the city will have to be via the outside ring road or by its roundabouts with the A19 and the B1363. This area is heavily congested and there is not the capacity for increased traffic flows.	1207/17110	
	Objection- this development is horrendous. Where will the residents work?	1210/17116	
	Objection – development will result in a loss in a shared sense of identity as a community for residents of Skelton. Concerns also centre on the local infrastructure and existing amenities in the village (Skelton) and how Moor lane and Moorlands Road will cope with increased traffic as well as the obvious impacts on the A1237. The Clifton Moor retail and business park already appears to be encountering some economic difficulties – this is largely due to difficulties of access because of congestion on the A1237. By adding 4000 new homes directly to the north west of this site and without guaranteeing the necessary investment in the northern outer ring road the	1355/17322	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	future of Clifton Moor can at best be described as uncertain.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Comment – the new villages south of Fulford and north of Clifton Moor – will that not provide enough additional homes? If the infrastructure is put in place they should not cause too much inconvenience.	1392/17348	
	Support – support the proposal for two new model towns which should be world class models of sustainable development.	1457/17382	
	Support – see submission for detailed comments. Comment – the Clifton Gate proposals include a Park & Ride on land to the east of the strategic allocation. The site lies to the north west of the A1237/B1363 junction in a location that will help to intercept traffic before reaching the Outer Ring Road. This land should not therefore be included in the green belt and should be identified on the proposal map accordingly.	1523/17508	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Comment – the proposed new major developments (inclusive of land north of Clifton Moor ST14) will add considerably to the load on NHS and emergency services. How exactly will they be 'supported'? Will this take the form of more staff, more ambulances, another fire station, more fire engines? If not, how will the existing (hard pressed) services cope? Objection – Support the setting of green belt boundaries and appreciates the importance of this to the future development of the city and to protect York against urban sprawl. However, given the criteria cited in GB1, how do developments that do not fit the purpose/scales etc cited – notably the proposed strategic sites of Whinthorpe and land north of Clifton Moor – qualify for exemption? Both are on land that has, until now, been designated as green belt. Is the Council simply ignoring the previous criteria set, or moving the goal posts to suit its concocted equation for number of dwellings required? Do not accept that the need to build vast developments in green belt is inevitable and unavoidable as the Plan suggests.	1665/12956	York Environment Forum
	Objection – the village suggested is bigger than Skelton – presumably there are comprehensive plans for infrastructure? There is no way the Council will be able to deal with the increased traffic and increased delays on the ring road that such a development will produce.	1899/63	
	Objection – the various housing developments (Whinthorpe and Clifton Gate are actually more akin to conurbations) are completely unsustainable with York's existing roads, schools and hospital and the impact and devastation on our green belt is horrendous. How many trees and habitats will be lost? Not to mention the hundreds of acres of productive farm land. All development must take into account the existing	1901/70	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>infrastructure. Clifton gate does not have the local highways to support a new town of 4000 houses. The A1237 on the north side of York is already at maximum capacity. The site selection paper suggests that an access road to Clifton Gate could be provided onto Skelton’s Moor Lane. This is currently a single track country lane cutting right through the heart of Skelton Village. Why should people of Skelton have to suffer increased traffic from people who do not even live there and are merely using it as a cut through to avoid grid lock on the A1237. Strongly object to the loss of over 500 acres of Skelton’s surrounding farmland, woodland and green belt countryside and the habitats and animals it supports. How long will it be before Skelton is swallowed up?</p>		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	<p>Comment – new housing at Clifton Moor will add to congestion on the ring road</p>	1908/86	
	<p>Objection – all development must also take into account existing infrastructure. Clifton Gate site does not have local highways to support a new town of some 4000 houses. The A12337 on the north side of York is already at maximum capacity. What employment is available locally for 4000 to 6000 people?</p>	1914/108	
	<p>Objection – this area would have enormous effect on the ring road. The traffic is at a standstill a lot of the time now – even the mentioned dual carriageway would not relieve the amount of traffic.</p>	1920/9915	
	<p>Objection – this development will perhaps mean 1500 more vehicles a day going onto the ring road – it is already a nightmare to travel on. It is all about infrastructure being able to cope & sustainability.</p>	1933/9921	
	<p>Objection – visitors come from all over the world to visit York and do not wish to see another urban sprawl! The infrastructure in this area would not support thousands more cars. More schools, medical centres, shops would need to be built to support the hugely enlarged community – who would pay for these? It is highly unlikely that the developers would.</p>	1984/440	
	<p>Objection - northern ring road already full to capacity. Proposal to build 4000 new homes could add up to 6000 more vehicles risking grid lock.</p>	2127/1433	
	<p>Objection- infrastructure problems and impact on the green belt. Large dormitory development within the city is likely to encourage the arrival of more residents who work in Leeds but do not wish to live there. The size of ST14 is predicated on expansions which are not appropriate economically or environmentally. Much greater thought needs to be given to how it is to be sustained economically or where it is likely to be located. ST14 likely to impose significant demands on infrastructure and transport services.</p>	2416/6588	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection - proposal will cause massive congestion on what is already an inadequate road for the volume of traffic. Alternative sites should be considered.	2419/6700	
	Objection- no evidence of planned expenditure on major road and public utility improvements. Driving to Monks Cross on the outer ring road can take 42 minutes to do 5/6 miles. Imagine the chaos with an extra 6000 cars nearby.	2466/2621	
	Objection- additional housing at Clifton Gate would add significantly to traffic on an already saturated single carriageway ring road. Until this ring road problem has been properly cleared do not consider making it worse.	2471/6756	
	Objection- too many houses in the green belt. Use brownfield land first. Can existing drains and water supplies cope without adding to flooding. Will existing roads and bus services cope with extra people travelling? Schools and the hospital; cope with larger population?	2478/6764	
	Objection- the height of folly to propose two strategic housing sites so close to the A1237 ring road near Clifton Moor and also the A64 at Heslington Common. Road traffic of both the A1237 and A64 is congested in rush hour; any increase to this density would make a bad situation indefinitely worse.	2513/6792	
	Comment - integrate purpose built traveller sites integrated into ST14.	2518/4366	
	Objection- the ability of existing infrastructure to service this employment. York ring road- the additional traffic will only lead to a state of gridlock. Healthcare is an issue, York District Hospital is already restricted and under strain. What is the requirement for major reform of the central hospital. Additional sewage works and the construction of more electricity pylons to service new developments. There are no viable options for the removal of rainwater from the new development without increasing occurrences of flooding in York or other population centres further down river. York should be working to protect the greenbelt. This development increases the urban sprawl around York. Development will bring a totally different feel to the character of the city and surrounding area.	2580/6918	
	Objection- the proposed buildings are neither wanted nor needed by the people of Haxby and Wigginton. It will destroy the village feel. Do not have the infrastructure to cope. Haxby floods, the drainage system is appalling. Concerns over what will happen in the future when a place is needed at Joseph Rowntree School which is already at capacity.	2585/6935	
	Objection- the way it has been selected it does not have any practical long term consideration to their development. The A1237 is already congested. The proposals do not have any inclusion on increased facilities to accommodate so many new residents.	2631/6976	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection- development will use the outer ring road which already suffers from severe congestion.	2638/6996	
	Comment- this area was once used for storage of mustard gas in WW2 and some has been found in recent years.	2653/7029	
	Objection- remote from transport corridors and will aggravate flooding in adjacent areas. Dependent on access from an already congested section of the ring road (A1237) proposed dualling of this section of road will not solve the problem. The flooding that will result from this development will render Skelton inhabitable. The inclusion of another retail area close to Clifton Moor will make one or both of them unbearable.	2673/7075	
	Objection- no right to take protected green belt land. As for services you cannot provide them. Roads cannot cope. What about schools, doctor's surgeries, York Hospital?	2676/7091	
	Objection- no consideration been given on the huge traffic increase through Skelton from a new road into Clifton Gate.	2696/7149	
	Objection- York has many brownfield sites which it could build housing but the Council believes it needs to build on greenbelt land and saves the brownfield sites for offices which lie empty for years and should someone finally rent them then they travel from the south of England bringing more people to house, extra traffic, noise but nothing for the people whom live in York already. Can York afford to pay the many compensation claims which will follow the building of this fiasco in the making	2788/7388	
	Objection- the reduced housing target, combined with the increased use of brownfield sites for housing would make Clifton Gate development unnecessary. The massive housing development of 4020 houses adjacent to Skelton- Clifton Gate, would dwarf Skelton and destroy the rural aspect of the land to the East of the village. Comment- an upgraded ring road would create an unacceptable risk of coalescence between Rawcliffe and Skelton.	2789/7395	
	Objection- the current road infrastructure is inadequate and will make the surrounding countryside will be an eyesore.	2790/7401	
	Support- supportive of plans for development in the Skelton area.	2795/7414	
	Objection- the way the site has been selected does not have any practical long terms consideration to its development as far as is able to see. There is a complete lack of infrastructure. The planned settlement would impact on yet more farmland potentially as far out as Shipton by Beningbrough. The proposals do not make allowance for the additional social facilities to accommodate so many new residents. New towns of this	2826/7488	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	size should have proper town plans to include town centres, schools, medical facilities, fire and social services and transport systems.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection- the way the site has been selected does not have any practical long terms consideration to its development as far as is able to see. There is a complete lack of infrastructure. The planned settlement would impact on yet more farmland potentially as far out as Shipton by Beningbrough. The proposals do not make allowance for the additional social facilities to accommodate so many new residents. New towns of this size should have proper town plans to include town centres, schools, medical facilities, fire and social services and transport systems.	2837/7514	
	Comment- the new housing near Clifton Moor and Rawcliffe isn't particularly needed, but it could be used in other ways.	2853/7595	
	Objection- Wheldrake will be adversely affected by other proposals in the plan, such as, the major 'new village' development off the A64 around Grimston Bar area.	2913/7625	
	Comment- extreme traffic difficulties will arise if this scheme goes ahead. Without great improvement to the A1237 at this point, Clifton gate would lead to total chaos.	2924/7650	
	Support- a preferred option for housing is ST14. Comment- should have their numbers reduced.	2929/7660	
	Objection- over 4000 house son the ring road- madness! It is already gridlocked.	3034/7884	
	Objection- huge increase in housing demand will inevitably generate permanent traffic beyond the existing road capacity. The ability to increase available road space is limited by roundabouts. More traffic will seek a way round the jams by taking short cuts through Skelton, a burden the village roads will be unable to bear.	3071/9753	
	Objection- the stench from the sewage in the P&R area is revolting. Are there any plans for dealing with extra waste from new development? There would be rainwater run off from the new buildings. Pollution due to increased traffic.	3105/8003	
	Objection- 4020 houses proposed will cause major disruption to that area at Clifton and far too much extra traffic. The A1237 is already highly congested around the Tesco roundabout. The A1237 cannot cope with the increase in the traffic which this will bring.	3107/8008	
	Objection – plans for a new access road Through Skelton into Clifton Gate from Moorlands Road will create a huge increase of traffic through the village of Skelton plus visual and noise impact. There will also be a loss of 500 acres of Skelton's surrounding farmland, woodland and Greenbelt countryside.	3112/8018	
	Objection – the "Clifton Gate" development plans, adding over 4000 homes, at least 6000 cars and 12000 people would place an enormous strain on local infrastructure	3139/8082	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and there is a lack of detailed proposals to fulfil these needs		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the proposal to build 4020 new homes at “Clifton Gate” will be a bout 20 times the size of the Brecksfield Council estate in Skelton. What is proposed to meet the strain on the infrastructure? The impact on local traffic will be dreadful.	3157/8130	
	Objection – oppose the proposed building of several thousand homes near Skelton (Clifton Gate) with the potential send hundreds of cars through the centre of the village.	3162/8138	
	Objection – the “Clifton Gate” development plans, adding over 4000 homes, at least 6000 cars and 12000 people would place an enormous strain on local infrastructure and there is a lack of detailed proposals to fulfil these needs.	3168/8148	
	Objection – the Clifton Gate development is inappropriate in the green belt and will put an immense strain on the local infrastructure in the area.	3173/8163	
	Objection – land north of Clifton Moor being used to build too many new homes.	3180/8178	
	Comment - how will access be gained to the A19 and how will provision be made for 4000+ properties’ vehicles to access the already congested A1237? Has the site been properly assessed regarding drainage?	3181/8182	
	Objection – what plans would be put in place to improve commuting before commencing any large development (4020 homes on land north of Clifton Moor)?	3210/8273	
	Objection – strongly against proposed housing development at Clifton Moor as the site is on Green Belt land, it will take over a large area of agricultural land and will require a major expansion of the sewerage infrastructure across the north of the city.	3254/8355	
	Support – more comfortable with the plans for the new village at Clifton Gate	3273/8410	
	Objection – object to the proposed building of 4020 houses at Clifton Gate. The local roads will not be able to bear the extra traffic and there are no guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to meet the required extra needs. An immense strain will be put on all local facilities. The development is inappropriate on the Green Belt and will destroy the peaceful and scenic character of the village [Skelton] and the surrounding countryside.	3302/8472	
	Objection – remove ST14. A much more cautious, flexible approach to policy development is needed. The expansion of existing settlements well away from the A64/A1237 orbital roads is preferred.	3356/8569	
	Support – if so many houses are needed why not simply create two new villages as suggested in the plan first?	3372/8657	
	Comment – has concerns about the increase of traffic on the A1237.	3377/8668	
	Comment - retail units and offices in the peripheral commercial location of Clifton Moor	3428/8777	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	earmarked for expansion in the Local Plan, are not well served by sustainable modes of transport.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – strong objection to the proposed development of Clifton Gate. There are no or economic reasons for the huge increase in housing. Traffic congestion on the Northern Ring Roads will only be many times worse than at present. The preservation of the Greenbelt around York is of great importance to protect the natural environment.	3429/8753	
	Objection – strong objection to the proposed development of Clifton Gate. There are no or economic reasons for the huge increase in housing. Traffic congestion on the Northern Ring Roads will only be many times worse than at present. The preservation of the Greenbelt around York is of great importance to protect the natural environment.	3430/8754	
	Objection - the Clifton Gate development will cause many more traffic jams on the A1237. It will also put a strain on the hospitals and schools in the area.	3470/8904	
	Objection – can't understand the proposed development at Clifton Gate. There are already serious traffic problems around the Tesco and A19 roundabouts. The infrastructure simply isn't there. It's also getting harder to arrange a Doctor's appointment without another 12000 people to cater for.	3476/8913	
	Objection – congestion along the a1237 will be greatly exacerbated by the additional traffic from the already expanding business and retail parks at Monks Cross and this is to be added to with homes planned for the north of Huntington and new town development at Clifton Moor.	3571/9521	
	Objection – concerned about the proposals affecting the Skelton area. It is already very congested. The roads in the area are not suitable to accommodate the extra traffic which would be involved if the number of new homes proposed were to be built. Moorlands Road is too narrow to take additional traffic as the other roads in the area. The green belt should be protected in the interests of future generations. Once it is removed it cannot be replaced.	3818/10272	
	Comment – businesses in Clifton Moor are not expanding or attracting investment due to overloaded road access which drives up costs. Why then is a new village/town being proposed near this area adding to congestion difficulties?	3839/10316	
	Objection – strongly object to the new houses proposed to be built on green belt land at Clifton Gate. The greenbelt as been sacrosanct, questions why everything has changed especially as there are a number of brownfield sites available.	3894/10437	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – object to the number of houses to be built next to Clifton Moor. There is not an adequate transport network, particularly the A1237 to cope with the extra housing. York does not require the addition of this many houses, maybe the Council should look at empty properties first. If land is green belt it should not be built on.	3966/10553	
	Objection – object to the development of Clifton gate due to the immense strain on the local infrastructure, local roads, schools, surgeries and hospital created. No social or economic reason in York for such a huge increase in housing. Local roads will not be able to cope. Object to the loss of hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland surrounding historic York. York is a unique and historic city and should not be turned into an urban sprawl. The unnecessary building on greenbelt land ahead of brownfield sites.	3969/10560	
	Objection – if huge numbers of houses are to be built the ring road will be gridlocked even more than it is now.	4040/10688	
	Objection – will have a hugely negative affect on transport, the northern ring road is congested not only at peak times. Use of public transport would not be feasible for many people travelling for leisure as it does not exist and where it does it is usually infrequent outside the working day.	4052/10727	
	Support – supports the proposals for Clifton Gate, appreciate the need for more housing but only on the condition that the surround fields are safeguarded from any future development in order to maintain the separate villages instead of ultimately having a suburban sprawl joining Skleton, Clifton Gate and Wigginton. Part of what makes York unique as a city is the smaller villages that sit on the outskirts.	4065/10744	
	Objection – objection based on the appalling prospect likely to be visited upon the local infrastructure – roads, sewerage, flood prevention etc. Alongside the effect on local schools, particularly at secondary level and the enormous strain on medical resources i.e. hospitals, GP Practices etc.	4068/10750	
	Objection – object to the proposals at ST14. Congestion problems with cars in the area and outer ring road.	4074/10758	
	Objection – objection based on the appalling prospect likely to be visited upon the local infrastructure – roads, sewerage, flood prevention etc. Alongside the effect on local schools, particularly at secondary level and the enormous strain on medical resources i.e. hospitals, GP Practices etc.	4095/10783	
	Objection – plans at ST14 are absolute madness. The A1237 cannot cope with the volume of traffic now.	4201/10943	
	Objection – actually more akin to a conurbation than a housing development. Is	4204/7798	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	completely unsustainable with York’s existing roads, schools and hospitals and the impact and devastation on the existing green belt is horrendous. How many trees and habitats will be lost? Not to mention the hundreds of acres of productive farmland. Will dwarf the historic villages near to ST14 especially Skelton. It would destroy Skelton’s rural aspect looking eastwards. Would dwarf Skelton seven times over and may in the future eventually subsume Skelton completely. Would bring enormous flooding risks to the village. There would be a high increase in traffic through the quiet centre of Skelton and if access is created onto Moor Lane this is currently a single track country lane and Skelton would become a rat run wanting to avoid the grid locked A1237.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the local roads will not be able to bear the extra traffic and there are no guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to meet the required extra needs. An immense strain will be put on all local facilities. Absolutely inappropriate development in the green belt and will destroy the peaceful and scenic character of Skelton and the surrounding countryside. Skelton is a quiet, picturesque village that should be protected from suburban sprawl by the green belt land surrounding it. Also object to the loss of hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland surround York.	4225/10982	
	Objection – no guarantees that local infrastructure will be upgraded makes it totally unsustainable and even if it is not practical to have what amounts to a development the size of another town between Skelton and the ring road. There are many types of accommodation in York that are empty and it would be disastrous for the city to increase its size much more as it is at saturation point already. Skelton is a rural village surrounded by green belt the whole point of which is to protect it from urban sprawl.	4231/10993	
	Objection – will only make worse existing congestion on the A1237. Not going to help the city’s tourism industry, more likely to do irreparable damage. Would dwarf Skelton 7 times over. The resultant increase in commuter traffic will inevitably lead to high vehicle increases through Skelton along Moorlands Road as both private and commercial vehicles seek to avoid an already heavily congested situation. This will have a marked effect on the village and its residents.	4275/11091	
	Objection – the ring road at the north will not cope with any further development. Adding 4,000 homes will equal total gridlock. Traffic/highway upgrade needs to be done before any development, not afterwards. Greenbelt land should be last to be used, there are large sections of brown field land that should be developed first. Building on the green belt will alter the attraction to live in York.	4286/11115	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – against ST14 for the following reasons; loss of prime agricultural farming land; the strain and unaffordability of necessary infrastructure; the huge increase in traffic through Skelton. Is it necessary for 4,040 new homes for north of York. The employment figures appear to be guesswork. Does not think the necessary tradesmen are available for such an undertaking.	4302/11159	
	Objection – completely out of character with the city of York, unsympathetic to its landscapes and disastrous for its green belt. Add their voice to others constructed objections on planning grounds to ST14.	4327/11226	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	Objection – reduced housing combined with using up more brownfield sites would make the Clifton Gate unnecessary. The building of more housing in this area would make movement on the bypass even more dangerous and at times impossible than it already is. Even if busy areas were made dual carriage ways the bottlenecks when back to single carriageway would be terrible.	4345/11262	
	Objection – huge impact on traffic on the already heavily congested outer ring road, local infrastructure would be unable to cope with such a large scale development and there are no details of who will fund the infrastructure required. Object to the loss of hundreds of acres of farmland/woodland. This is green belt land. Local village roads will suffer from rat runs to get away from the ring road. The City of York is unique and historic place and excessive development will turn it into urban sprawl. Will spoil the way of life for the small village of Skelton.	4351/11271	
	Objection – not adequate justification. Optimistic on number of houses to be delivered, 2,000 would be aspirational. Will therefore need to identify additional sites, such as land at Terry’s factory, to meet housing requirements.	4355/11599	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Objection – would mean building on the green belt and represents breaching the ring road to create a new urban sprawl. Huge strain on local infrastructure. Appears to be no proposals to match the proposed housing with the provision of the associated infrastructure and road improvements.	4366/11315	
	Objection – the local roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic and the urban sprawl is not necessary.	4381/11343	
	Objection – would dwarf Skelton by seven. Object to the scale of development, no social or economic reason. The infrastructure to support such developments is totally inadequate. The creation of a dual carriage way on the A1237 is the only way of resolving congestion. There would be a need to create new primary and secondary schools along with extra medical GP provision and facilities. York Hospital would not be able to cope. Queries why green belt development is proposed when there are	4391/11376	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	brownfield sites that could be used to reduce the appalling loss of agricultural land. Will the unique and historic city be as attractive and inviting for tourism once surrounded by urban sprawl and congested roads? Increased traffic flows in Skelton are a concern, drainage in the area is already problematic, what will be put in place to avoid making the situation worse? Will result in the total urbanization of the area from Clifton Moorgate to Moor Lane. Will virtually surround Skelton cemetery thereby creating sensitivities amongst those with loved ones interred in a once rural setting.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the A1237 will be compromised by the planned development at ST14.	4396/11393	
	Comment – the road network must be upgraded before the extra traffic the development will cause is generated. This must be part f the contract with builders.	4429/11455	
	Objection – questions how there can be plans to develop ST14 without corresponding plans to increase the capacity of the ring road.	4466/11471	
	Objection – Skelton will be swallowed up by impenetrable traffic congestion just like the already saturated A1237.	4691/14247	
	Objection – road system cannot cope already, neither can the hospital. Let the city grw slowly.	4693/11982	
	Objection – object to the negative impact on the wonderful, unique city, turning it into a sprawling, traffic locked, and potentially dangerous city. Cannot understand the reasons (social or economic) for such a large increase in housing. Are schools ,shops etc. going to be built also. There is no infrastructure. The ring road cannot cope as it is., will be additional noise and health issues with increase in traffic from the development.	4694/11985	
	Objection – concern over plans to develop the green belt area around Skelton village. Will put a huge train on the existing transport infrastructure which is already overloaded with traffic. Will lead to huge increase in traffic through the historic village of Skelton. Proposed further northern link road at Moorlands Road is very narrow and not suited for heavy traffic. No social or economic justification for such a huge housing development. Another concern is the impact on local wildlife. The attraction of York is that up to now care has been taken to maintain the city’s unique visual and historical character. Do not spoil it with an uncontrolled urban sprawl.	4719/12012	
	Objection – concern over plans to develop the green belt area around Skelton village. Will put a huge train on the existing transport infrastructure which is already overloaded with traffic. Will lead to huge increase in traffic through the historic village of Skelton. Proposed further northern link road at Moorlands Road is very narrow and not suited for heavy traffic. No social or economic justification for such a huge housing	4720/12015	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development. Another concern is the impact on local wildlife. The attraction of York is that up to now care has been taken to maintain the city’s unique visual and historical character. Do not spoil it with an uncontrolled urban sprawl.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – seems disproportionately large. Resultant increase in road traffic would be far too large to be accommodated by the present road system, inevitably resulting in even greater traffic gridlock. High increase in traffic flows	4750/12039	
	Objection – any further development north of the city should be directed towards the existing district centre at Haxby and Wigginton with its proposed new station halt. Should not continue the disastrous non place that is the present Clifton Moor.	4752/12047	
	Objection – the road infrastructure can barely cope as it is without the development of ST14. A development of this size would require shops, schools, doctor’s surgeries, dentists, open spaces etc. Neither developers nor the local authority will want to fund these. York is a unique city, compact, historic and surrounded by open countryside, it does not need the increase in housing forecast. Environmentally it would be a disaster.	4793/12087	
	Objection – York infrastructure is already under massive strain. The ring road is persistently congested. Impinge on potential flood plains and local watercourses that are subjected to regular episodes of flooding.	4797/14283	
	Objection – immense strain on local infrastructure, huge increase in traffic through Skelton from a new access road from Moorlands Road and the loss of Skelton’s surrounding farmland, woodland and green belt countryside along with the animals and habitats its supports.	4816/12131	
	Objection – there would be a vast increase in eh amount of traffic in the area. Where are the people coming from? No expected influx of businesses. What about schools, doctor’s surgeries etc.? No mention of proposals of possible solutions.	5135/12250	
	Support – there is the ability to extend the proposed development to accommodate the houses planned for Haxby. Building from scratch a more than adequate infrastructure of roads, drainage, utilities and other services that would deliver a safe sustainable and reliable infrastructure for its residents.	5139/12259	
	Support – further growth is suitable due to the area’s sustainability credentials. The site is in close proximity to the outer ring road and has frequent bus services to and from the centre of York. It is in close proximity to existing employment opportunities including the Clifton moor retail park.	5163/12455	USS
	Support – strongly support ST14 which should be a world class model of sustainable development.	5178/12326	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Comment – does not appear to allow for upgrading of the local infrastructure and existing services such as the A1237 and the hospital that are already operating close to capacity. Will generate significant vehicular traffic. Considered that the most logical site for a development of this size is somewhere that can absorb the additional traffic flow with the greatest ease, this means to the south of the city on the A64.	5190/12407	
	Objection – alien to the character of the area. Too close to existing developments.	5210/12446	
	Comment – how is the traffic going to be accommodated? The ring road will literally collapse.	5211/12471	
	Comment – ring road is already overloaded, there must be a cast iron commitment to dual carriage way the whole of the outer ring road to be able to cope with the increased demand. Will need additional infrastructure such as shops, pubs, doctors surgeries and schools to provide for new residents needs. Taking away the green belt will take away the habitats of an abundance of wildlife.	5213/12476	
	Objection – all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s Green Belt. Does not think that building a large housing estate separate from York will in any way safeguard York’s heritage, rather than meeting local housing needs it will draw an influx of new people to York which is already struggling with problems of congestion.	5223/12497	
	Objection – opposed to expanding the very important historical city to a great urban sprawl. Single lane ring road was insufficient for purpose as soon as it opened. Poisonous pollutants that standing and moving traffic emit is affecting asthma sufferers and is dangerous to general health. Does not understand how it can be thought of as a good thing to bring an enormous number of vehicles associated with the proposed development into an area of open countryside which is clearly overwhelmed with traffic already. Unless there are a large proportion of small affordable homes with good amenities built in questions how the building of so many homes in green fields can be justified. Country lanes in the area are totally unsuitable making them dangerous. Need for surface water management. Opposed to the impact of the proposals on the way of life of the residents of York’s rural and tranquil cillages including Skelton.	5226/12519	
	Support – support the Council’s housing plans and ST14.	5265/14364	
	Comment – whilst not ideally located could be a compromise assuming no land is available to the west of the river Ouse and that direct access would be straight onto the outer ring road. Assumed that a guarantee would be put in place that the entire length of the outer ring road would be dualled before any approval was given.	5274/14380	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – does not see why a large new town needs to be build on green belt land, would it not be preferable to use existing brownfield sites to cope with the new housing. The A1237 is currently regularly grid locked how could this cope with another town using the road. If the new housing were to be built, what provision would there be for local amenities including shops, schools, and places of worship.	5278/14390	
	Objection – will lead to significant traffic impacts at already congested junctions on the A1237. Will place unsustainable pressures on an already sensitive road network. No social or economic need to increase housing provision to such an extent. Development of such a scale will lead to the loss of hundreds of acres of farmland, woodland and natural habitat. Will lead to urban sprawl. Local infrastructure including public transport, schools and health care will be materially impacted.	5287/14409	
	Objection – no social or economic reason for such a huge increase in housing. There is no demand survey for such a large increase in housing. No impact assessment of local services. Local roads will not be able to cope. The ring road is already at grid lock. Opposed to the loss of greenbelt and unique farmland with variety of wildlife.	5351/14539	
	Objection – how can it be green belt if the Council choose to develop on it? Should concentrate on the character of York rather than modern soulless developments in the country. Skelton is a beautiful and historical village that needs to be protected fro future generations. The term village will be a think of the past.	5356/14547	
	Objection – the local services would not be able to cope due to increased traffic etc. Where would the children be educated? What other services would be available for the people living there?	5359/14557	
	Objection – opposes the loss of green belt when there are still many brownfield sites to be developed. Would detract from York’s unique status. What are the plans for transport/roads? The ring road has been badly managed. No funding for upgrades to the roads. No infrastructure such as schools or healthcare.	5367/14573	
	Objection – there is congestion now on the roads. The infrastructure would not cope. Would result in worse air quality and pollution, damaging the environment and health. Area would be ruined by overdevelopment; sheer scale of the growth proposed would have an adverse impact. Would affect highway safety for children.	5372/14585	
	Objection – will cause severe road congestion, impact on drainage and on existing infrastructure. Need jobs before allowing thousands more people to settle in the area. Also need local farmers to become more productive in growing food not just leaving their land for silage or sell to property developers. This is a disgraceful waste of agricultural land.	5388/14624	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – area is already gridlocked at peak times	5397/14648	
	Objection – infrastructure already stretched to breaking point i.e drain do not takeaway surface water. Sewers are collapsing, there is only one health centre, primary schools are currently over capacity as are the two secondary schools. The exit roads already have long queues at peak times. How will the small country lanes cope with city traffic?	5404/14664	
	Objection – infrastructure already stretched to breaking point i.e drain do not takeaway surface water. Sewers are collapsing, there is only one health centre, primary schools are currently over capacity as are the two secondary schools. The exit roads already have long queues at peak times. How will the small country lanes cope with city traffic?	5405/14666	
	Objection – totally wrong to use green belt land. The character of York is such that a strong and extensive green belt should form an integral park of any local plan. There is no need for any significant development outside the northern ring road. The existing infrastructure and road network i already overloaded and any changes to the network would inevitably encroach on currently underdeveloped areas which should remain untouched. Any access from the north will need to come from Manor Lane a narrow country lane. At the western edge access would come directly through the village of Skelton on a narrow road with right angle bends running close to domestic properties. This road is not suitable for the level of traffic currently using it. Any increase in traffic would be disastrous for the village.	5417/14709	
	Objection – the A1237 is already at capacity, ST14 would bring the north of the city to a standstill. Unless there is parallel upgrading of the A1237 this proposed housing development is unsustainable.	5426/14740	
	Objection – will change the area for the worst for ever. Increased traffic, loss of fields and open space means Skelton would no longer be a quiet rural village and will become part of urban sprawl. Need to protect the countryside.	5429/14754	
	Objection – the roads are already congested, a dual carriage way will make little difference. There are not enough schools both primary and secondary to cope, as long as doctors/dentists.	5430/14757	
	Objection – the road infrastructure is not up to the new demands that would be placed upon it. It is already overloaded. Pollution levels are already well over the legal limits. Major intrusion into the green belt.	5443/14776	
	Objection – transport infrastructure is woefully inadequate to support the housing. Likely to grid lock the A1237. People living in the proposed houses are likely to be	5458/14797	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	employed outside of York and hence travel to the major A roads, unless road infrastructure is improved congestion will be made worse.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – represents a huge destruction of natural green belt. The outer ring road should be a natural barrier beyond which the green belt should be preserved. The Deloitte report has rated the site 2/4 which is the lowest of any proposed site and a reflection of the unacceptable nature of the development.	5480/14832	
	Objection – it is the essential that the major housing developments are located close to strategic employment sites. This is not the case with major developments to the north west.	5485/14843	
	Objection – concerned about new housing on the A1237, it is already backed up at the evening rush hour. How are the children going to get across the road to go to school and will this put a strain on the local schools.	5533/14955	
	Objection – will introduce significant amounts of new traffic along the A1237 which cannot cope with existing traffic levels. Not against building in the green belt but any development in this location must be accompanied by an enhancement of the northern ring road.	5544/14970	
	Objection – wholly inappropriate in the impact it will have on the existing village and dwellings in Skelton. Little account seems to have been taken of the road traffic implications for an already grossly inadequate outer ring road. Why should green belt land be used when there is considerable brownfield land available in the city boundaries.	5577/13068	
	Comment – will the outer ring road be upgraded to del with the additional traffic as the ring road is congested at present.	5584/13083	
	Objection – any plan that has not considered the impact on surface water run off, sewerage and the impact of increased transport on the current road network deserves to be neither considered nor approved. Without improvements to the A1237 how will it cope with additional traffic. The current road struggles. Assumed that traffic will be able to use Moorlands Road. This would have a dramatic and devastating effect on the village of Skelton, both during and after the building stages.	5589/13106	
	Objection – extra housing will make accessing the A1237 even harder. Concerned that businesses and people will not want to live or work in York as access will be so difficult.	5597/13132	
	Objection – extends the urban area substantially north of the outer ring road where there are already traffic problems and no existing services.	5609/13186	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the ring road already struggles to cope, extra cars will cause absolute chaos. The could damage business in the area. How will such an influx of people be dealt with in terms of schooling? Would this require a new school or schools? The existing schools would not be able to cope. Green belt land is what makes York a special and attractive place to live and work. Jeopardising this, potentially forever, would be a catastrophic error of judgement.	5631/13252	
	Comment – should follow the principles of Ebenezer Howard as applied to New Earswick. Should seek to implement proposals by forming a consortium of landowners and developers to share infrastructure costs and rewards.	5689/13407	
	Objection – no proven need for so many homes. Schools and roads are already at capacity.	5704/13437	
	Objection – how is the ring road and local road infrastructure going to accommodate 4,000+ homes as well as the additional pressures on health, schools and other services?	5744/13549	
	Objection – the existing road system would be unable to cope. Skelton is a village and would be overwhelmed by so much additional building and would be changed and spoilt. The whole area would become a building site for years to come. Building on existing green belt would damage the whole nature of the city and destroy the lovely village.	5746/13551	
	Objection – how is the ring road and local road infrastructure going to accommodate 4,000+ homes as well as the additional pressures on health, schools and other services? The proposed link up Manor Lane and Hurricane Way to traffic illustrates how unsustainable the proposal is. Putting it in will do nothing for the quality of life for local residents with noise, pollution, congestion and road safety all big concerns to the community.	5749/13563	
	Objection – inappropriate without significant improvement to the northern ring road.	5775/13660	
	Comment – presume to allocate land without considering where or not the infrastructure can cope with this. Would create havoc and frustration for the people who live in this area. It is bad enough currently. The ring road must be made into a dual carriage way long before building can be considered.	5782/13687	
	Objection – sets an unfortunate precedent. Risk that it will lead to further developments in the green belt with a real danger of the loss of the compact nature of the city. Will further exacerbate road congestion on the ring road and roads into the city.	5783/13692	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – not aware of any new industries coming to York necessitating this amount of new housing. There is already severe traffic congestion. The roads through Skelton to the A19 area all very narrow and in many places only support one way traffic. No infrastructure has been proposed, Skelton primary school for example is already full.	5797/13725	
	Objection – the number of homes to be developed on this land will only exacerbate the traffic problems around an already congested Clifton Moor area and will further impact on traffic problems getting in/out of Haxby. Why can the planners not try some radical thinking and propose a new town positioned to the east of the A64 served by a new road linking to the A64 and for this include all the necessary associated infrastructure. Is there any proposal for compensating home owners for the devaluing of their properties in terms of monetary value and quality of life when the ‘affordable’ section of the new development turns it into a slum.	5854/15105	
	Objection – oppose the development of ST14. It is green belt land and there is an abundance of brownfield sites still to be developed. Congestion will be caused with no guarantees from the Council for improvements on infrastructure. No infrastructure proposals in terms of access, drainage, statutory services, health, education, retail or workplace. Potential loss of the uniqueness of the village of Skelton and its consequential impact on greater York. Object to the intended timescale creating a permanent building site for 10+ years.	5939/15277	
	Objection – if the access road would link Clifton Gate to Moorlands Road by doing the character and tranquil beauty of the heart of Skelton will be gone forever.	6043/15470	
	Objection – See response for art drawn by the children of Skelton who have conveyed the benefits of protecting wildlife and greenbelt from the development of ST14.	6054/15497	
	Objection – seems a more coherent plan than the proposals for site H6. Particularly as the four new railway stations are intended to serve these areas.	6121/15547	
	Comment – essential that the city engages with creating an exemplar of sustainable transport from the start if such developments are to avoid creating more traffic congestion.	6137/15595	
	Objection – concerns regarding the local infrastructure which often struggle to cope as it is	6145/15616	
	Objection – strongly oppose building on excellent arable land. The Council expect builders to provide all the infrastructure necessary to facilitate habitation of the new housing estates including surface and sewerage farms, water, electricity, gas, cables for TV/phones, piping, roads including making the outer ring road a dual carriageway, social and medical facilities. With such a commitment before they start these	6177/15709	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developers would not consider delivery of green spaces economically viable.		
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – object to the development of houses in the greenbelt, particularly at the proposed Clifton Gate. Skelton is a beautiful village protected from urban sprawl by the ring road and housing a wonderful church. Any plans to build at Clifton Gate will add to the strain on the local roads and destroy the rural nature of the village. It is an abysmal plan.	6224/15774	
	Objection – oppose plans to build 4,020 new homes at Clifton Gate. Skelton should be protected from this plan. Would put a great strain on the existing amenities. There are no guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded. Would add thousands more vehicles to the already congested northern ring road. Local schools, roads, surgeries and the Hospital would have immense strain put on them. The visual, noise and health impact of all these extra vehicles would have a detrimental effect on residents and children. Would be losing over 500 acres of surrounding farmland, woodland and green belt countryside along with the animals and habitats it supports.	6225/15778	
	Objection – oppose the plan to build 4,000 houses on the green belt. Main objections include the ruination of Skelton village as a rural community. No social or economic reason in York for a high increase in housing. Local roads will not be able to cope with the associated increase in traffic. The A1237 cannot cope. Hundreds of acres of farmland and woodland and very important wild life habitat will be lost. York is a unique and historic city not to be turned into a massive urban sprawl.	6230/15789	
	Objection – the infrastructure needed would need massive investment. The northern ring road is currently overloaded. If an access road onto Moorlands Road was made this would create chaos in the old part of Skelton where the road is narrow, properties either side where there are always parked cars, they have no alternative parking. Village feel surrounded by the greenbelt would be destroyed with another town on Skelton’s doorstep.	6248/15817	
	Objection – will generate an increase in traffic unless significant improvements to the roads are made. Will add traffic to an already congested part of York.	6249/15822	
	Objection –question the necessity of the planned extra housing on York’s outer greenbelt and the need for the sites. Besides the destruction of the surrounding countryside in Skelton, do not believe that the infrastructure could sustain the extra traffic and citizens this would incur.	6253/15824	
	Objection – it is unsustainable The A1237 is already heavily congested and as there are no plans to provide additional capacity development on the scale proposed will be nonsensical.	6285/15888	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the A1237 is horrendous already. ST14 would add greatly to increased volumes on the A1237. This should not go ahead.	6286/15891	
	Objection – object to the extent of the proposals. Main area of concern is the almost certain increase in traffic on a road network that is already stretched. Increasing the population at Clifton will only increase the number of cars heading towards the centre with knock on effects for noise, pollution, safety and parking. Single carriage way improvements to existing roundabouts is not going to make a significant difference. Concerned that proposals put house building first and provision and concern for the existing population second.	6298/15929	
	Objection – seems to contradict any reasonable set of priorities, would be likely to increase congestion and air pollution on the ring road. Would make sense to site it next to existing public transport links, preferably rail such as the proposed stations at Haxby and Strensall or possibly a new station at Copmanthorpe.	6299/15932	
	Objection – the need to build 4,000 houses at Clifton Gate is based on unfounded statistics, based on a desire to encourage wide scale inward migration into York. To consider large scale building in the agricultural productive land surrounding our historic city is unacceptable. York’s service infrastructure – transport, education, healthcare – is already tightly stretched. Were ST14 to be built there would be an enormous increase in traffic through Skelton.	6310/15952	
	Objection – would represent unrestricted urban sprawl across and beyond the outer ring road.	6319/15970	
	Objection –will bring inevitable pressure to the long established and literally ancient community of Skelton. Inevitable pressure for in fill between Clifton Gate and Skelton.	6375/16102	
	Objection –no social or economic reason. Local roads will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic. Do not want to loose farmland and woodland surrounding York. York should not be turned into an urban sprawl.	6420/16141	
	Objection – does not appear to be the result of joined up thinking, no real consideration of the environmental or infrastructure implications of the proposal. Will cause untold problems to the highways and transport infrastructure. The northern ring road is already badly congested. The effect of loosing so much green belt land will only serve to make York like any other city.	6443/16165	
	Objection – along with proposals at Haxby and Strensall, the proposed development is ludicrous and the Council should listen to the electorate. Do not need 22,000 new homes.	6456/16189	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST14 Land North Of Clifton Moor Continued	Objection – the northern ring road and A64 should act as a rigid boundary against development and so object to ST14.	6493/16221	
	Objection – realise and accept the need for housing but simply plonking 4000+ houses together could overwhelm the existing infrastructure. With no supporting infrastructure this will force the residents into private transport onto already overcrowded A1237, B1363, Clifton Moorgate and Water Lane.	6497/16234	
	Objection – entire stretch of A1237 is very congested. This proposed housing development will add a quite substantial number of cars.	6498/16240	
	Objection – a speculative developer is likely to commence a large housing development on the site without the guarantee of the ring road’s upgrade. This would be disastrous for local traffic congestion which is already critical.	6508/17692	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – would dwarf Skelton and destroy the rural aspect of the land to the east of the village. The associated upgrading of the ring road is speculative and even with the upgrading the increased traffic levels that would use Skelton as a through route from the north of the Clifton Gate development.	6510/16287	Cllr Joseph D Watt
	Objection – major policy departure made without any discussion. There is no argument or evidence to support this change in policy. In the current climate making a new settlement sustainable is almost impossible. A primary school and other community facilities may be feasible but a secondary school, large supermarket or significant employment. In the short term residents would need to travel to access all community facilities until a critical mass of development is reached.	6516/16327	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – no evidence has been provided to estimate the likely traffic impact of ST14.	6518/16446	York Green Party
	Objection – amend the draft plan and save the 330 acres of traditionally green belt protected land to the north of Clifton Moor from the development of 4000 new homes. The proposed development of this portion of land is completely inappropriate on the green belt and entirely unsustainable putting too much strain on the local infrastructure.	Petition 13	
	Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe	Objection- allocation is unsound due to significant adverse effects on the interest features of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and limited ecological evidence supporting its inclusion in plan. Allocation contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework due to impacts on SSSIs.	2/11587	Natural England
	Comment- site lies in flood zone 1, 2 and 3. Development should take sequential approach to the layout. All development to be located in flood zone 1 and green/public/open space on flood zone 2 and 3. Surface water management guidance to be followed. Site located east of Heslington Tilmire SSSI and a strategic green wedge. Site contains number of watercourses and Tilmire Drain crosses southern section of site lies in flood zone 3 and therefore inappropriate for resi development. This area could be used as multifunctional green space, flood storage and surface water attenuation within a Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme and open space. This would create an exemplar sustainable scheme.	3/11740	Environment Agency
	Comment- concern at the lack of information available to prepare a detailed response on this matter which is clearly a significant new settlement of 5580 close to Selby's border. Concern centred around highways impact on congested A64. Selby's own growth will potentially add a significant number of journeys on the A19 to York and without certainty of Whinthorpe's access arrangements Selby cannot properly consider the implications. The broad location has not been fully explored and evaluated in the context of alternative sites.	9/11654	Selby District Council
	Comment- would an approach to focus on significant development to existing settlements, particularly those where new public transport improvements are proposed, be more appropriate? It may be necessary for the council to re-consider the amount of housing that could come forward on this site over the plan period and whether the plan is flexible enough to accommodate a shortfall in housing supply if the high rate of development (312 dwellings per annum if development starts in 2015) is not met. Limited information in the Local Plan on type and scale of services and facilities needed to support the delivery of ST15. No employment allocations are included which could result in an unsustainable pattern of development. Significant levels of development from ST15 are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079-A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. More clarity needed on how ST15 will be accessed and to consider the impact of the large area for future development adjacent to the new settlement. This work needs to be taken forward within the context of the Memorandum of Understanding for the A64 in partnership with Highways Agency and other relevant planning and highways authorities.	10/11664	East Riding of Yorkshire Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Comment- queries the scale of the allocation. The settlement would be significantly larger than most nearby settlements. It is unclear what other serviced are needed or proposed in order to support the urban extensions and ensure their sustainability, and therefore what the related implications are for the A64(T)/ outer ring road (A1237), wider highways network and surrounding settlements might be. Suggested these be subject of ongoing cross boundary discussions with neighbouring Local Authorities.</p>	11/11681	North Yorkshire County Council
	<p>Objection- due to the potential for major impacts on Heslington Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation. ST15 is adjacent to the Heslington Tilmire SSSI which is designated for the tall fen plant assemblage, marshy grassland and the breeding birds associated with these scarce habitats. A new community of over 5000 houses would have the potential to destroy the designated features of the SSSI. if the development were to be allocated it would be essential for the site to be reduced in size and moved northwards, a buffer area between the housing and the SSSI to be created, a detailed funded Environmental Management Plan, extensive hydrological and ornithology surveys to be undertaken to avoid impacts on the Tilmire and lower derwent valley. concern over proposed cycle routes which would follow the edges of the SSSI. There is potential to reroute the proposed cycle path within the proposed buffer zone between the SSSI and development. It is vital that any cycle route in a sensitive area is well shielded from areas important for breeding birds.</p>	42/11701	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	<p>Objection- there is no content relating to the evolution of the Whinthorpe proposals. No evidence in Local Plan that there has been meaningful and constructive dialogue with statutory consultees or infrastructure providers. There has been dialogue but no decisions or guidance given and included in the plan with regards to provision of access infrastructure off the A64. No consideration if the site specific and cumulative effects of infrastructure requirements to gain access to the site and provide services and utilities. Correspondence from Highways Agency indicates that there has been no substantive cost appraisal of delivering ST15 scheme with regards to necessity, phasing and delivery of the necessary road and junction arrangements or the acceptability of the Highways Agency regarding the operation of the Strategic Road Network. Matters regarding flood risk and areas of ecological value and appropriate mitigation strategies are not covered. It is not clear how the site will deliver 5580 homes in the plan period. No housing trajectory. A very ambitious target unlikely to be achieved. Advice from the Homebuilders Federation that locations such as new settlements have a long lead in period. This means it may take up to 4/5 years before</p>	46/12588	Heslington Village Trust

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>an appropriate planning permission is in place for site preparation to start. If this is the case the council would require a yield of around 470 per year for the remainder of the plan period. Given the figure of 312 is ambitious; the higher number cannot be achieved. Therefore the policy approach is not deliverable and consequently is not effective. The proposals for Whinthorpe are not in accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and cannot be deemed consistent with national policy. It is critical that the land to the north of the A64 remains undeveloped and excluded from any new settlement. If one accepts that a new town is necessary to meet housing demand why locate it here? Sites to the south and south west and the A64 corridor were considered likely to increase out commuting to Leeds and West Yorkshire and would not constitute sustainable development. Heslington has chronic traffic and parking problems. Any additional traffic would be a disaster for the village. The Local Plan is on the question of Common Lane with regard to access from Whinthorpe to Heslington. No indication given in the Plan as to how Whinthorpe will connect with the existing road network nor any indication of agreement from the HA that they will allow a new junction serving Whinthorpe on the A64.</p>		
<p>Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection- adopting more realistic housing aspirations would eliminate the perceived requirement for the inappropriate new settlement on good quality GB land.</p>	<p>47/12583</p>	<p>CPRE (York and Selby District)</p>
	<p>Objection- there is no content relating to the evolution of the Whinthorpe proposals. No evidence in Local Plan that there has been meaningful and constructive dialogue with statutory consultees or infrastructure providers. There has been dialogue but no decisions or guidance given and included in the plan with regards to provision of access infrastructure off the A64. No guidance has been given by environmental agencies in respect of the Site of Special Scientific Interest. Equally no guidance in respect of recent extensions to the flood plain which affect 40% of the indicated site. No consideration if the site specific and cumulative effects of infrastructure requirements to gain access to the site and provide services and utilities. Questions over if substantial investigation has taken place into the delivery of Whinthorpe. Correspondence from the Highways Agency indicates that there has been no substantive cost appraisal of delivering ST15 scheme with regards to necessity, phasing and delivery of the necessary road and junction arrangements or the acceptability of the Highways Agency regarding the operation of the Strategic Road Network. Matters regarding flood risk and areas of ecological value and appropriate mitigation strategies are not covered. It is not clear how the site will deliver 5580 homes in the plan period. No housing trajectory. A very ambitious target unlikely to be</p>	<p>48/12597</p>	<p>Heslington Parish Council</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>achieved. Advice from the Homebuilders Federation that locations such as new settlements have a long lead in period. This means it may take up to 4/5 years before an appropriate planning permission is in place for site preparation to start. If this is the case the council would require a yield of around 470 per year for the remainder of the plan period. Given the figure of 312 is ambitious; the higher number cannot be achieved. Therefore the policy approach is not deliverable and consequently is not effective. The proposals for Whinthorpe are not in accord with the NPPF and cannot be deemed consistent with national policy. Air quality will get worse. Putting a major housing site on the A64 will tend to increase the propensity of traffic toward the A1 and West Yorkshire, therefore the site is unsustainable. Planners and sociologists have moved away from development of new towns towards the concepts of building organically on existing communities. Whinthorpe runs contrary to this. If one accepts (with the Parish Council does not) that a new town is necessary to meet housing demand why locate it here? Sites to the south and south west and the A64 corridor were considered likely to increase out commuting to Leeds and West Yorkshire and would not constitute sustainable development. To accommodate 30% of York's housing demand at Whinthorpe is not based on rational analysis regarding access to jobs, transport etc but based upon expediency- the simple availability of one large site under one ownership. The Local Plan is silent on the question of whether Common Lane with regard to access from Whinthorpe and no one from the Council who attended the Public Meeting held in Heslington was able or willing to give an undertaking that Common Lane would not be used for such access. No indication given in the Plan as to how Whinthorpe will connect with the existing road network nor any indication of agreement from the HA that they will allow a new junction serving Whinthorpe on the A64.</p>		
<p>Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection- 1250 new homes per year for next 17 years until 2026 is unrealistic and will transform it into a building site for the next 2 decades or longer. The plan proposes to repurposes 2000 acres of GB land- 430 for Whinthorpe. The plan does not give any details on how local infrastructure will cope with the influx of new residents. The potential damage to the Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest from construction and foot traffic post development cannot be over stated. Much of the site has been subject to flooding for many years. The Local Plan appears to have been put forward without consideration to relevant facts and no consideration for the amenity and concerns of residents it is going to affect.</p>	<p>58/12626</p>	<p>Deighton Parish Council</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- needs more explanation of the infrastructure plans and funding. Opposition from all consulted and Elvington Parish Council.	61/12687	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection- object to the new settlement. Its site is an essential part of the Green Belt around York. The current openness of the site makes a very important contribution to the special character of the historic city as it is highly visible from the A64 and forms part of the Green Corridor through which this strategic road passes through the city. The site is highly valued by Fulford and other city residents for its openness and attractive landscape character. It forms part of the setting of Fulford Golf Club. It also adjoins well used public rights of way including Long Lane, Langwith Stray and the track on the east side of Helsington Common. The proposed settlement would be highly damaging to these highly valued recreational resources. The development would adversely impact upon the wildlife and in particular the designated Helsington Common Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and the Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest. The development would substantially increase traffic on the A19 and increase congestion around Fulford, especially when combined with the development of Germany Beck, the designer outlet and the University. No need for the proposal as the development requirements of the Plan are in excess of those justified by the City's needs. It would be a highly unsustainable development. There has been a total failure by the Council to assess or address the environmental impacts of the proposed new settlement. The proposal should be deleted.	62/12697	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection- the block of land at Whinthorpe will block off the green wedge provided by Walmgate Stray that should stretch out to the countryside.	88/12819	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Objection- site adjacent to sites of biodiversity importance and it is not enough to just mitigate the effects it must be well reasoned in terms of sustainability and the wider effect on natural environment. The area safeguarded for Whinthorpe includes a flood plain which limits the land available for housing, potentially bringing housing p to the edge of the Site of Special Scientific Interest.	90/12835	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Comment – the area identified as Windthorpe is an area where localised flooding events have occurred including in recent past. From consultation it is apparent that the network including Tillmire Drain would be expected to convey surface water from the site with a possible further source towards Elvington. This network has serious capacity issues and ultimately conveys surface water some considerable distance through various settlements before being pumped at considerable expense into the Ouse. In determining the suitability of this site a vigorous test of appropriateness would need to be applied. Watercourses at Elvington often threaten the road network	190/13965	York Consortium of Drainage Boards

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and residential properties. Any development in that area or likely to convey water towards the village must be approached with caution as indeed should development in each of the areas discussed. Issues within the other areas referred would again dictate a cautious approach not just in terms of the development proposal but in terms of the critical drainage infrastructure. Respective Boards could not voice support for any of the development proposals within these areas based on the level of information available although some level of concern must be registered.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – the Inspector in his report on the Green Belt Local Plan in 1994 opined 'It is an area of flat open countryside which forms an important part of the countryside setting of York. Development of such a site would be seen as an intrusion into the countryside which would detract markedly from the setting of the historic city contrary to one of the aims of the Green Belt' Site ST15 lies to the south of the area considered by the Inspector in his 1994 Report. By extending development it will fundamentally change the relationship which the southern edge of York has with the countryside to its south. Notwithstanding the above even if an incursion of this size into 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. Overall development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the City.	238/14046	English Heritage
	Objection – the proposed allocation of a 'new settlement' which is well detached from the urban area (and its associated services and facilities for sustainable day to day living) in the heart of the Green Belt. This is questionable rational to allocate new settlements when there is clearly scope to provide a greater number of sustainable urban extensions which are better related to existing and well established services and facilities for day to day living. The site is assessed in the Technical Assessment as low sustainability/accessibility value explicit.	305/14182	Taylor Wimpey (UK) Ltd
	Objection- proposed development designates a very substantial area (186hs) adjacent to the Tillmire to meet a significant proportion of the Council's projected housing needs. While ST15 excludes the Tillmire Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) any actions (as listed in response) will impact on the SSSI. If the area is not modified the Tillmire will be irreparably damaged and the flora will be severely degraded and the breeding of birds, directly from disturbance or by damaging their habitat, breeding birds are likely to desert this site. To mitigate the impact of development a full hydrological survey needs to be undertaken to establish ground water and drainage inflow, that plans should be drawn to ensure hydrology remains unaffected by	401/16520	York Ornithological Club

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>development and plans needs reviewing and drainage maintained. A substantial buffer zone with a minimum width of 1km needs to be established between the western boundary of site and the Tillmire to ensure disturbance, pollution, excess run off, pets, leisure activities etc can be kept at an acceptable minimum compatible with reserving those environmental assets. The buffer zone could be managed as a top grade arable land under one of the Environmental Stewardship Schemes. There is potential to manage this buffer zone for wildlife, helping the Council achieve its aspirations for the environment. Consideration needs to be given to safeguarding future management of the Tillmire and ensuring that farmland remaining in arable production is viably managed. A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment including thorough year round ornithological surveys should be carried out to determine the potential impact of the proposed scheme alone and in combination with the other proposed developments in Local Plan. Detailed mitigation and a habitat management plan should be provided prior to any determination and this should be agreed Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and York Ornithological Club. The proposal is likely to have significant effect on the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area and RAMSAR site and the council must undertake an Appropriate Assessment of the proposal under Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.</p>		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection- the new settlement is likely to need significant new infrastructure to be constructed. New public transport services will have to be created or existing services re-routed to serve the development. The development would have a long lead in time therefore placing a significant reliance on the site to deliver large proportion of the councils housing requirement. There are reservations about whether the new settlement could be brought forward quick enough to start delivering units in the early part of the plan. The new settlement would not significantly boost the supply of housing in the short or medium term. Question over the deliverability of this site and the number of dwellings it will provide within the plan period. There are significant concerns about the ability of this site to deliver the quantum of housing that is proposed for it in the period up to 2030. Assumptions on the site too optimistic.</p>	432/16544	Church Commissioners for England
	<p>Objection- no detailed assessment on the site. There is no direct access onto any of the main roads. There is no evidence that the site has been assessed positively by North Yorkshire Council Highways Department. If the site is not able to achieve a satisfactory access, the Local Authority will have to seek to find sites to accommodate 5580 new homes elsewhere, which will cause delay to the production of the Local Plan.</p>	451/16601	Linden Homes North & Miller Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>There is a clear lack of information regarding the deliverability of this site and it is also located directly adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and two Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. The technical paper states that significant buffering would be required to ensure the integrity of these nature conservation sites. There is no assessment put forward to show what amount of buffering is required to ensure on-going protection of the SSSI and it may render the site undevelopable or alternatively a reduced developable area maybe an option. It is considered that there must be considerable doubt that the site can deliver in the plan period. Work is required in flooding and drainage issues as the site falls within flood zone 2 and 3a where housing should not be developed. There is a need to carry out work on the landscape impact of the development. Work that is required should culminate in a master plan to show the scale and location of development proposed considering the constraints of the site. The delivery of the site is far from realistic.</p>		
<p>Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection- development is wholly unacceptable. It is too large a scale which will destroy the rural nature of this area. It is too close to the Site of Special Scientific Interest at the Tilmire. Construction will disturb the ground nesting birds. Disagree with creating new settlements that are entirely dependent on the outer ring road for transport links. This is poor environmentally as it will create thousands new car journeys. From a social point of view the proposal would in no real sense be part of York. It will largely populated with commuters working outside of York. Impossible to see benefit to the existing residents of York of building satellite dormitory towns. Development will bring huge increases in car traffic and therefore degraded air quality from this and overstretched local services. Attempts may be made to create public transport links but these will not be widely used. Proposal is unsustainable and a return to the clumsy thinking of the late 1950's. Its overall impact will cause rise in house prices. The development will have no benefit to the city.</p>	<p>458/16616</p>	
	<p>Support- proposals are welcome as need growth beyond outer ring road.</p>	<p>525/16635</p>	
	<p>Comment-should incorporate a specific proposal within the new settlement (R&D proposal), test this out with the University and potential end users. Reallocate the 60,000sq.m Northminster allocation for office and general employment, and the smaller York Business Park allocation.</p>	<p>527/16656</p>	
	<p>Support- support allocation for ST15 Objection- too much of the City's housing requirement directed to ST15. Comment- level of completion over plan period is optimistic. It is likely that ST15 will be brought forward on the basis of an outline planning permission (which will allow</p>	<p>534/16700</p>	<p>DPP One Ltd</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	phased development) and subsequent reserved matters applications. Reduce site from 1500 dwellings to 1000, as the rate of delivery is not justified. Object not the site allocation but to the quantum of dwellings to be provided from the site. The delivery should be reduced to say 2000 dwellings as the current rate of delivery is not justified.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- concerns about the ability to develop in a sustainable manner which would deliver infrastructure in advance or concurrently with introduction of new residents. This is important in relation to primary education and sustainable modes of transport. If the former is not provided up front, small children will need to be decanted to distant schools for an indefinite period. If the latter, it is well established that new sustainable travel modes need to be available for residents as they move to a new development and before previous car-borne habits become ingrained. Site inappropriate in landscape and green belt terms. It is impossible to identify a site in the countryside in York where development would have a worse impact on the character and setting of the historic city.	540/16731	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection- the allocation is inconsistent with development plan policy.	544/16761	
	Objection- development would be totally out of character to its surrounding villages. It is on prime agricultural land and encroaches on to rural public pathways used by walkers and cyclists. No details have been seen as to the infrastructure required to support such a development.	657/16805	
	Objection- the effect of 5580 new houses will be a disaster for both the city of York and Heslington village. No mention of the proposed infrastructure. Heslington Village is already at saturation point due to the vast expansion of the University Campus and any further increase in transport links to the village or university from Whinthorpe would be absolutely impossible. To build a new town on the periphery of York will permanently destroy the rural aspect of the countryside that encircles the city.	670/16814	
	Objection- the target for housing during the plan period should be set at an achievable 850 per year. This means that Whinthorpe development is not required. The development should be dropped, giving more time to prepare a proper, considered assessment of the alternatives. Comment- the development requires a far more thorough approach than that presented in the plan. Consideration should be given to the following: the location should be to the north and east of the city. Any location south will encourage such a development to be a feeder for Leeds along the major trunk road of the A64, reducing its effectiveness as means to supply York with Housing. The development will not improve the problem of traffic movement into the city. If large development is deemed	863/16931	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>necessary, the movement of traffic into the city will be little different if the development were places elsewhere outside York. There has been no examination of the possibility of developing this settlement outside the Green Belt, beyond the city boundary. No identifiable effort to co-operate under the Duty to Cooperate with other Local Authorities to consider the provision of these needs elsewhere. There must be no plan to route any traffic through Heslington and into the City, including public transport. Heslington is a small village that still maintains its village feel, despite its proximity to the University. It has 21 listed villages. The village is largely a conservation area. The village and the infrastructure beyond is not capable of dealing with any increase in traffic. In the Village Design Statement is says "common land and Site of Special Scientific Interest is recognised as a valuable wildlife habitat; any potential development should not impact on it in anyway" and "any development should seek to minimise: Vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the University thorough the University and the pressure on the main village roundabout by Heslington Hall should be curtailed. Heavy vehicles throughout the village should be restricted to access only, and any further traffic resulting from the University and other developments should be routed to avoid impacting on the village itself or any residential streets close to the boundary of the village", and "development which generates major traffic should not be allowed in the Conservation Area". Any additional traffic through the village would be unacceptable including buses. There must be a transport plan. This is not available and therefore it is unreasonable to ask residents to comment at this stage. The proximity to an SSSI and the flood plane is of considerable concern. This is not a deliverable solution. It is unlikely that the discussion, preparation and delivery of the infrastructure will be achieved in the first 4-5 years, making the site unavailable till then. The rate of build normally expected for a new site is 150 units per annum. This means that only 1500 houses can be delivered in the remaining 10 years of the plan period. Therefore policy approach is not deliverable and consequently is not effective. No consideration of the mitigation and landscape works necessary to reduce the impact on the openness of the greenbelt. The proposal is rushed and ill considered. It is supported by clear statements in the Heslington Village Design Statement.</p>		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection- traffic will have to enter York via Hull Road or Fulford Road. These trunk roads are already heavily congested, and there is no opportunity of widening them or creating a new trunk road into York. Several thousand more cars entering York via these routes will cause sever congestion and the council have not put forward a</p>	880/16937	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>solution to this problem. If Common Lane is no longer going to be a route to the area it will mean residents on Long Lane who are currently within Heslington parish will be cut off from the village. This will affect businesses such as Langwith Lakes and liveries. It is not clear how public transport will access Whinthorpe. If via Common Lane the road is currently unsuitable and it would require widening and straightening. It would also mean buses would have to navigate a very busy Heslington main street. If there is an access to the A64, what guarantee is there that the housing will be for York resident and not commuters working in Leeds. Council suggesting re-opening rail stations on the north of York. Therefore this area would be more suitable for a development of this size. Whinthorpe is next to a SSSI. Such a larger development will affect the biodiversity of the area. Whinthorpe is located on a flood plane. Not suitable area for development. How will construction traffic enter the site? Common lane is a single track unsuitable for regular traffic.</p>		
<p>Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection- upset that Whinthorpe has been selected as a result of a single landowner offering their land for development. The council is being very optimistic with its economic growth figures especially in this current economic climate. The local schools will not have the infrastructure to be able to cope with extra pupils from the Whinthorpe estate. Has building primary and secondary schools been looked at? It could change the catchment area of Fulford School to exclude the villages that are now in catchment. The drainage and sewerage system has been put under pressure with the building of Heslington East Campus.</p>	<p>905/16941</p>	
	<p>Objection- how will folk travel to York on already full to capacity roads? It is surrounded by conservation areas, one of which is an SSSI. The management of this particular grassland will be down to grazing animals. How possible will that be with dogs running loose from all the houses? Concern this proposal is a non starter. Object to the whole idea.</p>	<p>1008/17015</p>	
	<p>Objection- the suggested creation of the new village/town idea is ridiculous!</p>	<p>1027/17040</p>	
	<p>Objection- the green belt should be protected, object to Whinthorpe proposal, it will set a precedent for building on farmland around York. 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. If the proposal was to go ahead at least ensure that it is completely separate and do not let it come anywhere near the Tilmire, which would be completely ruined if a large housing development were even visible from there.</p>	<p>1049/17047</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- the A19 through Fulford is already at maximum usage. The application attempts to override the green belt policy using the misguided NPPF and any such development should be rejected on the basis that transport problems make the development unsustainable.	1050/17049	
	Objection- would be difficult to make sustainable and it is prime agricultural land in Green Belt.	1109/17192	
	Objection- far too huge, unnecessary, erosion of beautiful countryside, lots of mature trees, wildlife etc.	1144/17084	
	Objection- site completely inappropriate. Appears to have been driven by a landowner, Halifax Estate, seeing an opportunity to cash in on the need for development land. Difficult to imagine a less suitable site in York area for 4000-5000 new houses. The only access to the site is along a single track dead-end road that passes down the Main Street of Heslington, a conservation area, and then feeds onto University Road and Green Dykes Lane both of which are already saturated with traffic. The development would abut the Tilmire a Site of Special Scientific Interest which is supposedly fully protected.	1207/17108	
	Objection- must not build a new town Whinthorpe: are the roads not busy enough, is York not busy enough, are not the facilities already under considerable pressure?	1259/17138	
	Comment- any future work on the impact of the new proposed settlement should also consider SF3 for longer term development.	1264/17150	Highways Agency
	Objection – Concerns about ST15. Abuts directly on a site of National Important Nature Conservation and also a site of Locally Important Nature Conservation. Yet G12 on Biodiversity says that development takes account of the potential need for buffer zones around wildlife and biodiversity sites. Why no buffer zone here? Or is it intended ST15 should be a walled (and gated) settlement? Large areas of the sit are subject to flood zone 3 designation a sequential test would guide to land North East of this site. A retail hub is suggested , but this would still mean that the likely main shopping trip for consumables would be to the nearest supermarket – in this case either Askham Bar or Monks Cross. How does this fit with a transition to a low carbon future? Look also at 2.59 it leads to the conclusion that the site cannot be made viable in public transport terms. Access to central York would be either by Fulford Road (already subject to AQMA orders) or Hull Road, already overloaded roads. Hopes the Council will think again about this site – why not place it in the triangle between the A64 and Elvington Lane, nearer to easier connections to utilities – water, sewerage, gas, electricity etc. Suggest its development period be long term 10-15 years	1331/17255	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Support – Whinthorpe is available, all 5580 homes proposed can be delivered on land within the ownership of Halifax Estates. Is a suitable location for development – the technical work and assessment of issues undertaken to date which has informed the evolution of the initial masterplan have not identified any insurmountable engineering, environmental or other technical constraints. These constraints will continue to be addressed through the planning and design process. Achievable – there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years from adoption of the Plan (i.e. by 2020, based on the current Local Plan timetable)</p> <p>Comment – In respect of the statement regarding Zero Carbon policy, the policy definition and technical solutions to meet this policy have not yet been confirmed by the Government. It is very likely that off site renewable energy such as that generated by a solar farm is unlikely to be the most commercially and technically viable solution to achieve zero carbon status. The zero carbon policy is being implemented through Building Regulations it is more likely that each dwelling will need to incorporate its own renewable energy generating technologies in order to meet legislation as opposed to utilising off-site energy generating infrastructure. Halifax Estates believes more land should be allocated for development of this site in the Local Plan period and less land safeguarded for development post 2030.</p> <p>Objection – concerned with the 50 dwellings per ha assumed for Whinthorpe this is too high. High densities may be difficult to market and will not meet the aspirations of the council to deliver 70% of the dwellings as houses. A lower density would be appropriate – densities should be realistic and set using credible evidence.</p> <p>Recommend an average of 30-50 dwelling per developable ha. The Local Plan already sets out a specific policy for York Central – the Plan should be amended and include a specific planning policy for Whinthorpe. A suggested Policy wording has been provided by Halifax Estates – see response.</p>	1337/17276	Halifax Estates
	<p>Objection - much of the land identified is category three floodplain, will be unnecessarily subjecting the new homes and the existing nearby households to the risk of flooding. Mitigations could cost the developers considerable investment potentially making the site undeliverable. Land in question is important as a habitat to protected water voles and the Tilmire is a natural conservation site of national importance that should be protected by the Council. Could impact on the parish community causing permanent division as access between Heslington village and Whinthorpe would likely be cut off. Probably 10 years of construction work would place the existing amenities under greater strain and could detrimentally affect congestion</p>	1355/17320	Mr J Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	issues on nearby roads. Impact of the additional thousands of cars on the A64, A19 and A1079 has not properly been assessed. Not clear what schools would serve the children of Whinthorpe.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Comment – if new infrastructure is put in place it should not cause too much inconvenience.	1392/17349	
	Objection – Object due to the potential adverse impacts on birds from the adjacent Heslington Tillmire Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The RSPB is of the view that the development of up to 5580 new houses on agricultural land immediately to the east of the SSSI is likely to result in unacceptable levels of impact on breeding birds or habitats on the SSSI, and/or SSSI birds which rely upon the fields to the east of the site for feeding. Unable to find any information in consultation documents to suggest that potential impacts on the SSSI have been considered or assessed. Also concerns regarding the level of information provided in relation to this allocation and basis of its selection and allocation – note the timescales mentioned are unclear and not consistent with the period of the Plan.	1399/17364	RSPB
	Support – support the proposals for two model towns which should be world class models of sustainable development.	1457/17383	
	Objection – The site at Whinthorpe will require development of all forms of infrastructure including education, health, and community facilities, open space, drainage, utilities, and transportation measures. This will have significant implications in terms of cost, viability and delivery meaning that the scope to provide the number of dwellings within the timescale being suggested by the council is highly questionable. It is questionable whether it is realistic that 29% of the housing requirement can be generated within the plan period at the new settlement. A key consideration in respect of deliverability is the likely build rates achievable on large strategic sites. Even assuming a large site such as Whinthorpe could sustain 5 build plots, this is likely to generate in the region of 200 dwellings per annum. Over the 15 years of the plan period, this would equate to approx. 3000 dwellings, not the 4680 suggested in Policy H3.	1661/9943	Linden Homes
	Support – support the allocation but believe that the level of completions expected in the plan period is over optimistic. Comment – it is expected that there will be a long lead in time as the necessary infrastructure for such large schemes tends to be put in place first and these works are usually substantial. A consortium of developers would be required to bring forward the site at any sort of meaningful completion rate and it will take time to put together. It is	1663/9965	DPP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unlikely infrastructure works will start until 2020. New housing is likely to be at a rate of between 100 (early stages) to 250 pa (later stages) – equates to an actual delivery rate during the Plan period of around 2000 dwellings (maximum) up to 2030. ST15 should be reduced to say 2000 dwellings as the current rate of delivery is not justified.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – believe the proposed development at Whinthorpe is far too big and do not believe that the transport links would be sufficiently sustainable overloading the services of neighbouring villages (such as Heslington) and contributing generally to further congestion and air pollution. Whinthorpe as a Eco-Settlement is a simplistic concept that avoids the complexities of the York Central and British Sugar sites but adds to the ever increasing transport issues that York faces. There would be a major impact on birds at Heslington Tillmire Site of Special Scientific Interest and Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation. Rather than focusing on a flagship scheme such as the proposed Whinthorpe settlement the emphasis should be on doing good sustainable development all across York. The proposed new major developments (including Whinthorpe) will add considerably to the load on NHS and emergency services.	1665/12930	York Environment Forum
	Objection - site will deliver 29% of the overall housing requirement. This is not the most appropriate strategy when tested against reasonable alternatives. It may be more appropriate to build sustainable communities by building extensions to existing urban areas, supporting local facilities that are already there rather than having to create whole new communities.	1705/9780	Gladman Developments
	Comment- provision of new settlement has considerable hurdles to overcome before it could start to make a contribution the housing land supply. Not considered that the site would be some time before it would positively contribute to the five year land supply.	1736/9821	Oakgate Group PLC
	Support –support the allocation but believe that the level of completions expected in the plan period is over optimistic. Comment – it is clear that the delivery from ST15 will not occur during the plan period. This reiterates the importance of delivering the smaller allocated sites in the short to medium term. Objection – object to the assumed quantum of dwellings to be provided from the site -	1801/9894	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Objection – opposed to the large scale destruction of the green belt around York and disagree with the projections for growth that necessitates the need for the Whinthorpe development. The site is poor in terms of environmental sustainability - and should be scored poorly because; development of a Greenfield site would significantly detract	1883/9899	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>from the existing environmental quality and would be detrimental to the environmental quality and would be detrimental to the environmental resources of the area. Development/redevelopment of the site would detract from existing environmental quality (e.g. development would impact on the attractive open countryside) and visual amenity. Green Belt – York has had an established draft green belt in principle for over 50 years. The Council should protect the rural setting of York. Road Infrastructure – In order to have a meaningful consultation it is important to understand how the Local Plan will be delivered within the constraints of the existing infrastructure. No evaluation has been made as to how the local road infrastructure (A19,A1079 and A64) can cope with the inevitable increase in traffic. Each of these routes is over capacity currently and cannot cope with the additional increase in traffic. Setting of York – A new town this size on York’s outer ring road will damage the open character of York’s outer ring road will damage the open character of York’s surrounds. York should remain a small historic city. Building Whinthorpe will destroy the view from the south of York and from the established Minster Way footpath. Environmental Impact – The Tillmire Site of Special Scientific Interest is at serious risk from the development. The surrounding farmland is a key habitat for barn owls little owls and water voles that are a protected species. Flooding is a key risk. The land is high grade agricultural land and should be retained for food production and security for the future.</p>		
<p>Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued</p>	<p>Objection – particularly interested in Grimston Wood, looking at its close proximity and connecting footpath to the first phase of Holme Hill and directly adjacent to the development of the ‘safeguarded land’ it rather appears that it is part of the proposal of ‘Eco-Settlement’ floated in the planning document, is available for public access and is part of the green infrastructure of the project. Of course it is not, and general access would be in direct conflict with the very technique that has changed the plantation to open woodland: grazing bulls, cows and calves. If this development is to go ahead it must mitigate the impact on the woodland try to contain people - open access and promoting wildlife interests do not go hand in hand.</p>	<p>1887/29</p>	
	<p>Objection – clear negative impact on the green belt. The land and infrastructure in and around the proposed location cannot support such a large development.</p>	<p>1894/53</p>	
	<p>Objection – why would anyone think new towns on the very edge of York to be a good idea? Maybe York could cope with new ‘villages’ of maybe 500 homes insensibly chosen locations but not towns of 4000+ homes.</p>	<p>1901/68</p>	
	<p>Objection- large dormitory development within the city is likely to encourage the arrival of more residents who work in Leeds but do not wish to live there. ST15 is of a</p>	<p>2416/6590</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	scale which is difficult to justify, especially in its present location. It would be more sensibly located further from York, preferably attached to one existing village or divided among existing centres much as Tadcaster and Selby with the provision of appropriate employment and social facilities.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- with the city 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 the adequate provision of schools and NHS facilities. The road system is of most concern. Traffic into and out the city on the A19 has become unbearable. The proposal for ST15 will make this worse. The site would be built partially on a flood plain which is madness.	2457/6734	
	Objection- the height of folly to propose two strategic housing sites so close to the A1237 ring road near Clifton Moor and also the A64 at Heslington Common. Road traffic of both the A1237 and A64 is congested in rush hours, any increase to this density would make a bad situation indefinitely worse.	2513/6793	
	Comment- should integrate purpose built traveller sites integrated into ST15.	2518/4367	
	Support- this is the most appropriate way to solve all the housing requirements. Build one comprehensive development to cover all needs, practically and attractively designed with residential properties and industrial and traveller sites appropriately associated.	2551/6862	
	Objection- questions a development of this size in such a beautiful and sensitive area. Any development should protect, enforce and be in harmony with nature and surroundings. This area floods in wet weather; hence the Tilmire is an area of low lying bog.	2578/6906	
	Objection- questions the wisdom of this proposal. There is a lack of accessibility. Only by building a long access road across other Greenfield areas would access improve or by a new connection onto the A64 bypass. How many low cost housing units could be taken up by people who don't drive? What public transport would be installed? Would this really be a mixed housing area rather than a high market end? Safeguards would be put in place to ensure a supply of low cost housing, but would the safeguards have any value/strength when the large house building organisations are able to determine almost at will whether a particular area of building land is adequate or viable. Cumulative effect on the existing transport infrastructure could be catastrophic. Has this been thought through? Roads in the area are already way beyond capacity. How do we absorb more? The answer is that house building has to be considered more easily walkable areas; i.e. brownfield sites York Central, Layerthorpe area, so that	2602/6958	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	extra vehicles do not need to go on our already overcrowded roads. Why not enforce building low cost accommodation at Heslington East and free up housing supply. New building in green field sites might then not be needed.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- the way it has been selected it does not have any practical long term consideration to their development. The A1237 is already congested. The proposals do not have any inclusion on increased facilities to accommodate so many new residents.	2631/6977	
	Objection- this massive housing development is being proposed with no access to York city beyond access to A 64. Need integrated solutions.	2665/7056	
	Objection- development located in a wholly inappropriate area that is entirely open countryside. Drainage from the site is inadequate and will lead to flooding. It will also 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 this housing has not been demonstrated and is based on a presumption that people will move into the area without there being jobs to support them.	2673/7073	
	Objection- it is considered that there is insufficient evidenced based research to back up the delivery of such a scheme. This 29% of the overall housing required for the city should be allocated elsewhere which is already in close proximity to the existing local services and facilities and where it would have a less adverse impact on the Green Belt.	2769/7319	
	Objection- a reduced housing target, combined with the increased use of brownfield sites for housing would make the 'Holme Hill' development unnecessary.	2789/7396	
	Objection- commuter traffic is already heavy and cannot cope in peak times from the A19. Development of this scale will add a further burden on the traffic infrastructure. The proposed site is well known to be in a flood zone. The site is thought to be the site of the 1066 Battle of Fulford. Time should be taken to explore this with English Heritage before building on this land. Building on this on greenbelt land will ruin the countryside and change the character of Fulford and Heslington village. There is not adequate development of schools in the area to cope with a development at Whinthorpe.	2805/7443	
	Objection- York would not be able to cope with such a development. Infrastructure a problem- where is the entrance to be? Is it not time something was done about vacant spaces above shops? They could surely be converted to flats.	2818/7478	
	Objection- the way the site has been selected does not have any practical long terms consideration to its development as far as is able to see. The proposals do not make allowance for the additional social facilities to accommodate so many new residents.	2826/7489	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	New towns of this size should have proper town plans to include town centres, schools, medical facilities, fire and social services and transport systems.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – threat to the quality of life in Heslington. No reference to the strategic road network, lacking in every crucial detail.	2832/7502	
	Objection- the way the site has been selected does not have any practical long terms consideration to its development as far as is able to see. The proposals do not make allowance for the additional social facilities to accommodate so many new residents. New towns of this size should have proper town plans to include town centres, schools, medical facilities, fire and social services and transport systems.	2837/7515	
	Objection- threat to quality of life in Heslington from the proposed plan. No reference to the strategic road network. Were other developments eg. Germany Beck included in the projected housing needs for York?	2902/7616	
	Comment- the south east quarter of greater York is probably the worst of the 4 for both transport and drainage. Transport- in selecting this site the council must have felt the proposed residents of this settlement would be able to access the road network without using Heslington Main Street. Flooding-the presence of housing will put increased strain on the surface water drainage in an area containing parts of flood zone 3a. Sewerage- the sewage pumping station in Main Street Heslington has repeatedly broken down and had to be pumped out in a road tanker. The recently installed sewage system from Heslington East University has already overflowed more than once.	2923/7649	
	Objection- opposed on the grounds of the use of such a large scale development on Greenfield site and the resultant inability of the roads in the area to cope with the amount of traffic this would generate.	2929/7655	
	Comment- looks logical on paper as there is very little residential development on the south side of York. New development would aggravate the traffic problem on the A19 and the Hull road.	2991/7774	
	Objection- this seems a crazy scheme. To have a large area with only 1 access would create congestion on a massive scale.	2994/7782	
	Comment –if the intention is to build 5000 houses with all the necessary new infrastructure which will be planned and implemented for a development of this size. No compelling reasons for blighting the village with new houses and families which bring no benefits for them or existing local residents.	3046/7900	
	Objection – there are so many derelict areas of York that could be put to good use, areas that aren't green belt.	3092/7978	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Comment – will the housing development improve the Elvington bus service?		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – object to the proposed planning of the new development inclusive of 5800 houses proposed between Elvington and York. New developments would impact on the village amenities. Traffic is already very busy in the village. There are HGVs and agricultural vehicles going through the village all day every day. The village school and Fulford schools would become over subscribed. More houses in the surrounding area of Elvington will cause more flooding.	3106/8007	
	Objection – object to the proposed planning of the new development inclusive of 5800 houses proposed between Elvington and York. A significant increase in pupil numbers at Elvington and Fulford would push them above their capacity to the detriment of all pupils. Without the evidence of new jobs there is no need for extra houses. The village of Elvington is often congested with HGVs and agricultural traffic.	3108/8012	
	Objection – objections include massive environmental impact, access problems, jobs need to be created in York in the first place, where will finance come from for infrastructure, schools, surgeries etc. and urban sprawl towards York and villages – they may lose their boundaries and be swallowed up.	3113/8021	
	Objection – this development is disproportionately large – larger than any of the outlying settlements. With the proposed additional 430 acres this could rise to nearly 10000 homes. This would materially change the York area with a large semi- separate satellite conurbation outside the ring road. Without allowing time and space for community facilities this has potential to be similar to Bransholme estate near Hull where significant numbers of houses are unoccupied and boarded up due to an ill-conceived policy. Transport problems will be exacerbated. No rail service to the south east of the city, therefore, there will be increased pressure on already overloaded A1079 and A19. Taking busses through Heslington will have a material impact on the centre of the village.	3121/8037	
	Objection – the green belt must be protected vigorously from all incursions – so a massive no to the proposed Whinthorpe. – it would be a massive blot on the landscape – far more so than windfarms and would always threaten to creep towards Heslington. To connect a whole new town to the A19 as is proposed would be disastrous. The A19 is already overloaded and will become impassable once traffic from Germany Beck is fed into it – and then Whinthorpe too? No thanks!	3242/8308	
	Objection – the Whinthorpe site is good farming land – it has always been presumed to be in green belt and must remain so Population and job growth predictions are far from certain No new housing should take place unless and until every brownfield site	3253/8349	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	within the outer ring road has been developed. If any site is to be included suggest Strensall Common. At present Ministry of Defence Land and could be served by a new rail station on the Scarborough Line.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – this site is on green belt land, development would take up large areas of agricultural land. Major investment in local road network would be essential before building commenced.	3254/8356	
	Support – overall feel much more comfortable with the plans for new villages at Clifton gate and Holme Hill which will be built from scratch with the required infrastructure than with inappropriately changing face and soul of villages like Haxby by over developing them.	3273/8411	
	Objection –especially concerned over proposals of 5580 homes at Whinthorpe together with the developments nearby (Derwenthorpe, Monks Cross and Dunnington). The infrastructure of roads around this area cannot sustain this level of development and increase in traffic.	3293/8451	
	Objection – main concern is the scale of the development proposed on the east side of York. Cannot imagine that the existing road network would be able to cope with the demand of the extra traffic. Apart from the social implications why should so much valuable agricultural land be lost to housing.	3353/8548	
	Objection – remove ST15, a much more cautious, flexible approach to policy development is needed. The expansion of existing settlements well away from the A64/A1237 orbital road is preferred.	3356/8570	
	Objection – particularly concerned with the proposed Whinthorpe and Germany Beck developments and the huge impact they will have on the south east of the city. Main concerns are the increased amount of traffic using the A19, A64 and A1079, the A19 floods whenever the river Ouse floods, these great amounts of land with people houses and all the necessary infrastructure will destroy York, the surrounding villages and roads by the sheer numbers of people and extra traffic.	3360/8616	
	Objection – the sheer scale of the project would inevitably destroy the character of nearby village of Heslington and Fulford as well as destroying green belt land. There is already significant congestion on the A19 and A64. Air quality and congestion are already an issue for the area.	3364/8628	
	Objection –massive negative impact on the rural fringes of York. The historic city is made extra special because of its rural and open setting which would be destroyed. Such a huge development would be completely unsustainable. Building on this scale would bring no guarantee that houses would be 'affordable' for local residents or even	3368/15701	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	purchased by local people. Green belt land must be protected and urban sprawl avoided. A development of this size would require its own infrastructure but if the proposal was adopted building on this land would be done in relatively small phases if the first phase was not a success a cluster of houses would be isolated without any local services and the area ruined forever.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Support – if so many houses are needed why not simply create two new villages as suggested in the plan first.	3372/8658	
	Objection – Heslington is a very attractive village which despite the growth of the University still retains a remarkable rural charm and character. The scale of Whinthorpe is excessive. Were alternatives given sufficient thought? The impact of extra vehicular traffic generated will be enormous on a stretch of the ring road and local traffic system already notoriously overcrowded at busy periods. Substantial road and drainage construction will be required – it is not clear who is going to pay for it. The site should have been chosen more strategically. There are no compelling reasons given as to why 900 acres of green belt land should be taken for this scheme. Development should not intrude significantly into green belt and should be located as much as possible on recycled derelict or unused urban land. The site should be very close to one of the proposed new railway stations.	3480/8919	
	Comment – if we need a new travellers’ site wouldn’t it be more appropriate to incorporate it in to the new build village at Heslington. Where the council could incorporate a site in the new development.	3515/9446	
	Comment – does the Council really think that York’s infrastructure would be able to cope with Whinthorpe (5,580 houses) as well as all the other developments proposed around the city. There is no replacing Green Belt once developed. Also where would all the people find work?	3532/9477	
	Objection – oppose development of Whinthorpe (together with other developments near Elvington) – any development will add to existing congestion and would prove to be more dangerous for children. Main sewer/surface water drain cannot cope in Elvington. Surface water drains are old and regularly become blocked. The schools and medical centre would not cope. Even more heavy goods vehicles using the B1228 would cause problems. There would be a massive impact on York and surrounding area.	3539/9494	
	Objection – concerns around access to the city, access to the A64 and adverse visual impact.	3549/9516	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection - congestion on the A64 will inevitably result from the massive housing development planned. Provision of amenities and general infrastructure need addressing. Schools are already at capacity.	3571/9522	
	Comment – If the Whinthorpe development were to go ahead it would affect a large area of York in a disastrous way.	3598/9579	
	Objection – the main A19 is already extremely busy and with a high level of pollution, therefore, with Whinthorpe (and Germany Beck) will create more traffic and make problems worse.	3908/10449	
	Objection – concerned about the new proposed town of Whinthorpe. This has complex access and infrastructure issues. Why does the Plan propose a new town directly next to the Tilmire a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest? Whinthorpe can only add to the congestion and accompanying air quality issues – has York considered a congestion charge?	4039/10681	
	Objection –the proposed number of homes to be built is far too many and will change the nature of York and have a hugely negative affect on transport. Additional traffic will be added to two of the accesses to York already suffering from poor air quality and that is before Germany Beck and Derwenthope developments have added their traffic. Public transport is infrequent in evenings so cars will be needed to support the city attractions. These will probably in time be an interchange for Whinthorpe but the nearest access to the city will be Fulford and Hull Roads. What will happen when the A19 floods? The Hull Road/Field lane accesses already grind to a halt already. Land at Whinthorpe is very low lying – presumably like Heslington East it will suffer from unintentional ponds unless precautions are made.	4052/10728	
	Objection – concerned what a development of this scale would do to the south side of York. As well as impacting on already busy and overcrowded roads in York, Fulford Secondary School wouldn't be able to cope with the amount of additional pupils the housing would bring.	4086/10772	
	Objection – what is the basis for inserting an area the size of a small town between York and its satellite villages? Where is the history or sense of place? Cities gain and retain their character by gradual and organic development – to which transport and other infrastructures have time to respond. Ill considered mass additions typically damage this process, is this simply a convenient solution to meet theoretical targets for new housing?	4117/10818	
	Objection- object to 5580 new homes on over 450 acres of green belt creating a new town.	4128/10829	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Comment – the proposal for a large new suburb near Grimston Bar simply adds to the future vision of York as a city swamped by sprawling suburbs and wind turbines instead of the urban jewel in a rural sea.	4197/10921	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – Whinthorpe is completely unsustainable with York’s roads, schools, and hospital and the impact and devastation on the green belt is horrendous. How many trees and habitats will be lost? Not to mention hundreds of acres of productive farmland. The use of York’s green fields Whinthorpe new town and inability of roads to cope: 16000 of the 22000 proposed homes would be built on York’s agricultural fields. To concrete over 2000 acres of green belt land to create homes that are socially and economically unnecessary would be disastrous for the city of York, changing its character and appearance forever. The new towns would be completely inappropriate. The council are promising to safeguard York’s green belt for the first time in history but first intend to carve 2000 acres off it to produce cheap land allocation for development. This is underhand. The road networks have an absolute inability to cope with the traffic that would be created by these new towns in the locations selected.</p>	4204/7796	
	<p>Comment – the Whinthorpe proposal appears to have been plucked out of thin air as a simple means of achieving the Council’s target for overall houses. The site seems to have been chosen for expediency because it is almost all in one ownership. Much more detail is required in order to respond properly to this proposal. There are no identified improvements to the south of York. Thus any vehicles wishing to enter York from the new settlement must be expected to use either Hull Road or Main Street Fulford. Traffic on both sides of these roads already exceeds or is close to design capacity at peak hours and both roads have problems with air quality. Air quality will only get worse. Thus people living at the new settlement will be discouraged from entering York and putting a major housing development such as Whinthorpe on the A64 corridor (with no jobs will tend to increase the propensity for traffic towards the A1 and West Yorkshire. This site is therefore unsustainable. Suggest any major housing development for York should be targeted to the north or north-east of York and possibly beyond the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Objection – for developments of such a significant scale there must be a transport plan. In particular access to the A64 either directly or indirectly has not been fully explored with the Highways Agency. The effect on County Council roads has not been explored and the impact on traffic into York via the Hull Road and Fulford Road has not been assessed. Proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and the flood plain is of considerable concern. From advice by the Home Builders Federation the rate of build normally expected for a new site is around 150 units per annum. This means that only 1500 houses can be delivered from this site in the remaining 10 years of the plan period. There has been no consideration of the mitigation and landscape works</p>	4222/10974	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	necessary to reduce the impact on the openness of the green belt. All in all Whinthorpe proposal is rushed and ill –considered. It is inappropriate to include such a proposal in the Plan which is to last 15 years.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – the proposal to provide large scale housing at Whinthorpe contravenes the spirit of Green Belt. The section 'Get York Moving' has the heading 'this section looks at reducing the need to travel by promoting the sustainable through connectivity ensuring new development has access to high quality public transport cycling and walking networks' Policy T1 paragraph ii) states – New development will only be permitted where; it is in a location that is well served by accessible high quality public transport or through obligations, conditions and other means can provide accessible high quality public transport. The Whinthorpe proposals do not meet these requirements.	4281/11098	
	Objection – for a vast housing estate planned at Whinthorpe at the southern limits of Heslington – such planning would have great affect on the residents of Badger Hill and in the meeting held earlier this year at Heslington Church this was totally rejected.	4303/11163	
	Comment – development in this area would require a new junction on the A64. Traffic from this development would be funnelled onto the A19 or A1079 into York neither of which can sustain an increase. Believe that there is potential for a separate service road to link this development to both Grimston Bar and Designer Outlet Park & Ride sites.	4305/11171	
	Objection – object strongly to the proposed plan to build 5500 homes at the Whinthorpe green field site and to the high volume of traffic this would produce o already overcrowded roads. This would be a disaster.	4308/11184	
	Objection – object in the strongest terms to the proposed new town of Whinthorpe on the following points; the road infrastructure around Heslington and Fulford is already congested and further traffic jams would detract from business expansion in the area – business will not want to locate here; if more houses are built on our 'green lungs' that will also drive people away; there are many areas of derelict land which could be used for housing; building on green belt land is environmental vandalism and in this case particularly threatens the wild life on Tilmire Common – a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest; building homes on an area which has been flooded several times in the last 12 months is extremely short sighted; and it is morally wrong of the Council to develop housing on agricultural land, land which could be used to alleviate global food shortages and provides a livelihood for tenant farmers. It would lessen the impact of house building if the developments were small areas around the city.	4314/11195	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – Whinthorpe is completely out of character with the city, unsympathetic to its landscape and disastrous for its green belt. Doubtless others will submit logically constructed objections to these on planning grounds, sufficient to say we add our voices to these.	4327/11227	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	Objection – does not consider adequate justification the new settlements (ST15 Whinthorpe or ST14 North of Clifton Moor) that there is a likelihood of collectively delivering 9500 new dwellings within the plan period. A figure of 4000 would be aspirational. As such the plan will need to identify alternative sites. Comment – delivery on ST7, 8, 14 & 15 is over optimistic. The assumed build out rates are simply too high and are unsustainable/undeliverable.	4355/11600	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Objection – the proposal gives no mention of any infrastructure and to that end can only be objected to. Acknowledge this site could be a positive or neutral effect on Elvington but the level of detrimental effects gives no choice but to object.	4358/11293	
	Objection – object to the draft local plan, in particular the creation of a new village near Heslington (and to the massive proliferation of wind farms). These large scale developments are totally inappropriate to the green belt.	4403/11404	
	Objection – Whinthorpe together with other plans will together destroy valuable green belt in our beautiful city. The English countryside should be protected in the same way as the historical buildings given that once they are gone they will never return. The development will destroy 500 acres of green belt land which is outrageous. The land is vital for farming, wildlife and quality of life. Huge builders’ profits and nasty new builds are not the way to bring prosperity to our city. Green spaces are treasured locally and here we hold great value in the historic resonances (views of the Minster for example) Its tranquillity and of course the wildlife habitat. All these things assist the quality of our health which reduces stress on the NHS each year.	4418/11441	
	Objection – the area in the proposal is the lowest lying land in the area and very prone to deep flooding and totally unsuitable for development. Elvington Airfield, just ½ mile away, is unfarmed and unoccupied, there are no trees and little in the way of wildlife – better for development and would not destroy as many lives and businesses.	4464/11467	
	Objection – development would have a devastating affect on our home and farm which would no doubt be demolished to make way for new roundabout and slip roads onto the A64. Also the neighbouring farm would be affected. How can a further 8000 cars merge onto an already congested A64.	4538/11547	
	Objection – the additional houses will generate huge additional numbers of cars, putting pressure on the ring road.	4693/14251	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – there is a lack of existing infrastructure to support a development of this size. The A64 is frequently occupied by queuing traffic/gridlocked. Cyclists will not be safe. Long Lane is a very picturesque location and should be afforded some protection. The area will be destroyed by the large scale development of housing. The Plan does not include any additional secondary school provision – the Plan fails to address the issue of schooling for existing villages. Environment: Hardmoor Wood – additional use would destroy the habitat home to badgers, deer, foxes etc. No justification for the size of the development.	4735/12027	
	Objection – some of the areas of housing seem disproportionately large, in particular Whinthorpe. The resultant increase in road traffic would be far too large for the present road systems resulting in greater traffic gridlock with a huge increase in traffic flows. Bus traffic is indicated to travel from Whinthorpe to York via Common Lane and Heslington Main Street South. This would be intolerable and totally change the character and rural atmosphere of the area.	4750/12040	
	Objection – this proposal is totally without merit. It has no good communications to the City, development would exacerbate the existing severe backlog and traffic congestion on the A19.	4752/12044	
	Comment – needs to be designed as a small ‘new town’ – not as a satellite of York.	4787/12085	
	Objection – development will place a significant burden on the A64 ,A1237, A1074 and A19. Significant traffic delays and an increase in airborne pollution will result around all the southern villages. The current plans will destroy all the peripheral villages around York and create much higher pollution levels both in breathable air and health affecting noise levels.	4830/12151	
	Objection – strongly object to the Plan particularly the proposal of a new development of 5580 dwellings (and safeguarded land) outside the ring road. The idea of a development such as Whinthorpe on this side of York which would involve using the A19 route is totally impractical. There are already continuous backed up traffic on this road with all the related noise, delay and pollution. This plan fails abysmally to address the current problems of York City Centre or of York’s infrastructure, of flooding, of legacy issues relating to the ring road. Building Whinthorpe would; Seriously degrade further the environment; Would further degrade the health wellbeing and happiness of people already in south York due to greater pressures on all services and infrastructure; Cause social aggravation and strife as a result of the pressure on the existing public space environment and amenity of people living here now; Involve unsustainable production and consumption reducing land available for food and wildlife	5108/12214	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and public amenity through bringing a large number of additional people in an area of already inadequate infrastructure; Add further pressures causing climate change with additional air pollution light pollution noise pollution and increase energy demands both during construction and forever afterwards and rather than creating a sustainable community it would create a dormitory town with massively increased vehicular movements resulting in significant environmental destruction and downgrading of public spaces on this side of the city.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection - concerns for the livelihoods and lifestyles of the tenant farmers and residents of Heslington and south of here, for the flora and fauna of the area where development is proposed. The consequences of such a plan is not sustainable and will be a terrible mistake.	5116/12228	
	Comment – the proposal to develop a completely new area behind Heslington appears to make a lot of sense but why are you not also proposing anything similar to the west of York?	5130/12908	
	Objection – the proposal to build 5000 houses on Whinthorpe will adversely affect the character of York. The A64 is a main link to commuters between Leeds and York and there is a significant risk that the additional homes will be purchased by those currently working in Leeds thereby turning the estate into a commuter town for Leeds. It is the responsibility of Leeds City Council to house its workers not for York to change the character of its landscape to accommodate these workers. In addition the junction near Grimston Bar Park & Ride and A64 is already busy at peak hours of the day. Additional cars from 5000 homes will only add to this congestion. The additional residents of these homes would need additional school places, doctors, space, water, electricity, roads, all of which would put strains on the existing local supplies for the residents of Elvington and bring no benefits for either the new residents of these homes.	5146/12270	
	Objection – the proposal to build 5000 houses on Whinthorpe will adversely affect the character of York. The A64 is a main link to commuters between Leeds and York and there is a significant risk that the additional homes will be purchased by those currently working in Leeds thereby turning the estate into a commuter town for Leeds. It is the responsibility of Leeds City Council to house its workers not for York to change the character of its landscape to accommodate these workers. In addition the junction near Grimston Bar Park & Ride and A64 is already busy at peak hours of the day. Additional cars from 5000 homes will only add to this congestion. The additional residents of these homes would need additional school places, doctors, space, water,	5147/12275	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	electricity, roads, all of which would put strains on the existing local supplies for the residents of Elvington and bring no benefits for either the new residents of these homes.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – strongly object to Whinthorpe development of 5580 homes on 450 acres of greenbelt land on following grounds; This is green belt; The site includes sites very important for wildlife; The size of this proposed development is way too big, way out of scale for this part of York; The increase in road traffic such a development would bring with it would be huge. As it is the A1079 and A19 struggle to cope with existing traffic levels at commuter times and at other times in the day. Pollution levels in and around Fulford are already unacceptably high due to car emissions; Such a development would have implications for the local water table; and instead of creating large scale new settlements on green belt land, the Plan should be focussing on creating many organic, small scale housing projects on brownfield sites wherever possible.	5148/12278	
	Comment – as yet no real information regarding infrastructure to support such an enormous development such as Whinthorpe exists. What additional stress will such a development place on our local hospital for example?	5151/12282	
	Objection – Whinthorpe a 400ha Greenfield site will irreparably damage the setting of York for all future generations. Objections can be summarised as; The target growth aspirations are unrealistic and unsupported; The site selection is poor in terms of environmental suitability; Unacceptable effect on the Green Belt; Inadequate infrastructure to support the development or general expansion; Negative impact on the setting of York; and Environmental impact. No indication has been given as to how the local infrastructure (A19,1079 and 64) can be improved to deal with the inevitable increase in traffic. Whinthorpe will inevitably be attractive to people who live and work in Leeds, Selby, Wakefield and Doncaster etc. and therefore the effective housing available for York residents will be reduced affecting the achievability of the Plan. Development will alter the open character of York’s surrounding countryside irreparably. York is a small historic rural city and should stay that way. The reason that York is so highly regarded and property prices are high is its setting. Building Whinthorpe will destroy the view from south of York from the established Minster Way footpath that borders the bottom edge of the site. If the site as planned goes ahead this area of national importance (Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest) will be destroyed by removing the supporting surrounding farmland as well as by the Tilmire itself unintentionally becoming public amenity land for the new town. A large proportion of the proposed site is situated in flood zone 3a and whilst the proposals	5152/12285	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>take this into account this splits the developable land in half as the flood zone runs north east from the bottom south west corner. The flooding is regular and repeated and building on this land will push the water further afield into drainage ditches that are not capable of handling more capacity.</p> <p>Comment – if Whinthorpe is deemed necessary in some shape or form in order to deliver the required growth for York then its impact should be minimised by reducing its size to a minimum, locating it as possible away from Heslington Tilmire and as far north-east as possible in order to avoid potential flooding issues.</p>		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – strongly opposed to the development on the following grounds; Development would constitute unnecessary loss of green belt; The local road infrastructure is unsuitable for the proposed increase in vehicular movements; Hull Road as a key road into York is already unsuitable and would be unable to cope with additional traffic created; The local public transport system is already inadequate and would be unable to cope with additional traffic created; The current local drainage system is not adequate for additional new housing increasing the flash flood risk; and a wood of mature trees will be destroyed affecting local wildlife habitat and increasing CO2.</p>	5162/12294	
	<p>Objection – the mere thought of this intrusion adjoining A64 and possibly further development is not wanted but also in the wrong place.</p>	5177/12322	
	<p>Support – strongly support the proposal for two new model towns which should be world class models of sustainable development.</p>	5178/12327	
	<p>Comment – net current job growth is negative, below zero in last three years. The plans new housing requirements are base on job growth. New homes in an attractive area like Elvington airfield /A64/Whinthorpe would sell quickly. Working people would move to Whinthorpe dormitory for nice homes not for work and commute to Leeds or further afield.</p>	5179/12377	
	<p>Objection – strongly oppose any developments that would increase traffic on the A19 (Main Street Fulford)</p>	5195/12467	
	<p>Objection – a new settlement of 5800 houses at Whinthorpe – this is far too large a development and would be totally out of character or the city which should remain a compact historic city surrounded by an important green belt of attractive countryside. Furthermore, such a large housing site would increase the traffic congestion to potential gridlock status for the south area of the city – it would increase air pollution. The housing needs have been greatly exaggerated simply in a vain attempt to build our way out of poor growth. This is not the answer to our economic problems.</p>	5209/12443	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – the concept of entirely new settlements outside our ring road is alien to the character of the area and should not be part of the Local Plan. Whinthorpe by not being centred on an existing village/centre would be out of character with the rest of greater York.	5210/12447	
	Objection – this proposal would have a devastating effect on Heslington parish. We need to protect our land for food growth and aim for some kind of sustainability. Where is the evidence showing exactly how many new homes are needed?	5217/12482	
	Objection – as a minimum all land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered York’s Green Belt. Don’t believe that building a large housing estate separate from York will in any way safeguard York heritage, rather than meeting local housing needs it will draw an influx of new people to York which is already struggling with problems of congestion.	5223/12498	
	Objection – such a huge development is going to change totally this part of the city and the entrance into York. There will no longer be open and attractive countryside encircling the historic centre but urban sprawl. The footpaths public rights of way and recreational opportunities will no longer be available to residents. The idea of building our way out of recession shows no imagination at all. It will result in an overcrowded congested small city which will be counter productive as it definitely will not attract potential employers to the area.	5234/12552	
	Comment – it seems incredible this site (Whinthorpe) can be suggested without any idea of the infrastructure. The number of houses is appallingly large in what is not such a huge area, it would result in dreadful suburban type settlement of the lowest quality. How will Whinthorpe manage its access? Surely couldn’t be via the B1228 which cannot take any more. So a medium size new town with only a single access onto the A64 (presumably?).	5235/12555	
	Objection – object on the following grounds; Development constitutes unnecessary loss of green belt; The local road infrastructure is unsuitable for the proposed increase in vehicle numbers; Hull Road as a key road into York is already unsuitable and would be unable to cope with additional traffic created; The local public transport system is already inadequate; Local current drainage system is not adequate for additional new housing increasing risk of flash flooding; and a wood of mature trees will be destroyed affecting the local wildlife habitat and creating CO2.	5237/12559	
	Support- support the development of a new community south of the A64 bypass (ST15) and the development north of the northern section of the ring road (ST14)	5265/14365	
	Comment- the proposed two large scale developments to the north (Rawcliffe and	5274/14381	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	south East (Heslington/Elvington) of the city whilst not ideally located could be a compromise assuming no land is available to the west of the river Ouse and that direct access from both sides would be straight onto the outer ring road. It is of course assumed that a guarantee would be put in place that the entire length of the outer ring road would be dually before any approval was given to the site to the North of the city.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- commuter traffic is already heavy and cannot cope in peak times from the A19 with traffic often at a standstill from Escrick into York and backed up to the A64. A development of this scale will add a further burden on the traffic infrastructure which the plan does not deal adequately with. The proposed site is well known to be a flood zone. Think it is responsible to build houses in an area which is known to flood and where residents are unlikely to obtain insurance for their properties. The site is thought to be the site of the 1066 battle of Fulford. The City Council should be custodians of our rich heritage, not building houses on it. Building on this green belt land around York will ruin the country side and change the character of Fulford and Heslington village to its detriment. Increasing York on such a scale will change the appealing character of the City. There is not adequate development on schools in the area to cope with a development at Whinthorpe. Will devastate housing prices in this area.	5285/14405	
	Comment- at least half the site is on land that regularly floods. There is no detail that such work is planned. Very concerned about its implications for flooding elsewhere in the local environment. The water has to go somewhere. My children use low lane on the way to school, they cycle along it. Am concerned about the increase of traffic that could come along low lane. Additionally increased traffic along Low Lane would significantly increase noise pollution and atmospheric pollution around my house potentially increasing likelihood of health problems. The location of Whinthorpe seems to have been chosen due to Halifax estates being prepared to sell the land rather than practical considerations of where additional housing stock would be best located. 5000 houses trying to get access to York via Fulford area would increase what is already a highly congested area. The houses will be too large to be affordable. The council would be better off working with the University to encourage them to further develop the Heslington East site to accommodate students there are free up family housing in the badger hill area.	5296/14434	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Comment- Elvington currently has good access to the A64. As regard this massive development our main concern is scale. This is attractive Green Bet with rich farmland set close to an already controversial development. Would be a huge blot on the landscape close ring road with the University. Elvington lane is surely too small and busy to cope with traffic from such a large development unless access were to link directly to the A64.	5321/14491	
	Objection- there has been no detail given regarding infrastructure. There are no plans to cope with increased traffic in York. There will be longer delays on mian roads into York there will be buses going through Heslington village centre. There would be destruction of 900 acres of Green Belt land. There would be destruction of 900 acres of productive farm land, there would be possible large wind or solar farms on Green Belt land.	5402/14660	
	Comment- were a new large development still deemed to be required site ST15 may be more logical given that it has dual carriageway access thus it wont worsen the already significant traffic problem about the western ring road. The drawback of this site is the amount of open land to be lost.	5413/14696	
	Support- the location of the proposed village is very good. If some of the sustainability pointers above are included it should be York’s greenest settlement. It maybe worth discussing with the vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group if a new minor injuries unit by the A64 in Whinthorpe may alleviate pressure on York Hospital.	5419/14717	
	Objection- it appears to be ill-conceived in a number of Ways. Tilmire Common a local SSSI that borders the planned development. Much of the planned development is on a flood plain and the entirety of it is on good arable land which is productive. There has been no consideration on the local businesses. There is clearly an over reliance on this development being pushed through as it supplies over a quarter of York councils projected house building requirements.	5421/14723	
	Objection – Whinthorpe will have a clear negative impact on the green belt. Aside from this, the land and infrastructure around the proposed location cannot support such a large development. Whilst agree that York would benefit from new housing such an unsustainable development is not helpful – better to build on existing brownfield sites.	5422/14724	
	Objection – Whinthorpe will have a clear negative impact on the green belt. Aside from this, the land and infrastructure around the proposed location cannot support such a large development. The schools are already over subscribed. Without detailed and well thought out provision of local infrastructure then schools, doctors etc will simply not be able to cope.	5423/14728	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – main objection is the development of the new town on land adjoining Langwith Common. Cannot see how the roads around Fulford can possibly take the amount of proposed traffic. There has been a substantial amount of development on this side of York already with the expansion of the University. The proposed development will see Fulford and Heslington area simply becoming the commuter belt to Leeds on roads already crammed. Must express concern about proposal to shut Common Lane to private vehicles (although this is not to be found in the plan) This would effectively cut access from Heslington for families. It would affect the many businesses who operate from the farm land such as Langwith Lakes and riding stables. Appreciate more housing is needed but there seems to be vast areas of new development, wiping land from around our city and yet all around York you see stalled development and half built estates.</p>	5436/14765	
	<p>Objection – why are there plans to build in a green belt area? A lot of our trees have Tree Preservation Orders on them and it is difficult to cut them down. How can a development as big as 5500 houses near the airfield being considered when cutting down a tree is so difficult to do? The scale of the development id huge. This will create more traffic, pollution, noise, crime. People moved to a village for their children to go to a smaller school.</p>	5439/14773	
	<p>Objection –concerned about proposals to build over 5000 homes south of Heslington. Building on such a large green belt area near a site of scientific interest (especially given large university development on green belt already in progress in the area)., and to traffic access issues.</p>	5448/14783	
	<p>Objections – major objections to Whinthorpe plan – the sheer scale of this proposed site is unimaginable and will have a major detrimental impact on all nearby villages (including Elvington) as well as on local infrastructure and the environment. The city struggles as it is to provide decent local services- witness the state of the roads in the area.</p>	5450/14787	
	<p>Objection – do not like the Whinthorpe development because cannot see anything to deal with the increased traffic in York. The traffic in Heslington is already bad in rush hours the development will make it worse*. The plan causes destruction of 900 acres of green belt land and 900 acres of productive farm land.</p>	5453/14793	
	<p>Objection – dispute that York needs the amount of houses stated. To concrete over green fields that are prime agricultural land is nothing short of stupid, especially when there are plenty of other disused areas available around the city. To encroach outside the natural outer ring road boundary again seems stupid. Traffic in Heslington/Fulford</p>	5456/14795	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Road/Hull Road areas are now at saturation point. The road network simply cannot support the additional proposed traffic. Many of the new inhabitants will move in from Leeds area simply because York is a better place to live and indeed commute back to their place of employment. Already had to put up with the expansion of the University.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – Proposal for the Whinthorpe new town on green belt land does not accord with government green belt policy. Part of the proposed site is on flood plain. Heslington will be seriously affected by the traffic. The infrastructure in York would not be able to cope. Tilmire Common is a nature reserve and would be seriously at risk by major development on its boundary.	5462/14804	
	Objection – the proposed new housing in the green belt at Whinthorpe is not needed, environmentally and socially damaging and will create transport chaos. There should be no major housing development in the green belt.	5466/14813	
	Objection – a huge increase in the number of dwellings would mean further road development etc. Loss of recreational facilities. Threatened loss of designated SSSI. Strain on roads, schools, existing medical facilities other existing social amenities. Loss of green belt, the threat to Heslington Village which is a conservation village. Loss of quality of life.	5469/14817	
	Objection – object strongly to ST15 this will spoil the landscape and such a large development will have a massively detrimental affect on current transport routes into York (Fulford Road A19 and Hull Road A1079).	5472/14825	
	Objection – objects on grounds that there will be increased traffic flow the already busy and congested village of Heslington via Hull Road and Fulford Road. Increased pollution. Impact on Site of Special Scientific Interest (Tilmire Common). Eating into green belt rather than re-developing old properties or using green belt sites is short sighted in removal of recreational and environmentally beneficial land for the local population.	5473/14828	
	Objection – the proposed new development (Whinthorpe) is completely isolated from the city with the two most congested routes into the city either side of the development. Transport, access to schools and other York amenities being the main issues. It is essential that the major housing sites are located close to strategic employment sites. This is not the case here.	5485/14840	
	Comment – not in principle against the development. Concerns with the proposal are concerning the lack of plan whatsoever for transport into/out of the new development. Some indication of how the new development is connected to the A64 should be provided or at least what the options are. One objection to the site is that it will clog	5509/14891	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	up traffic along the A64. See this as a much less bad option than creating more traffic within the ring road and building on field within the A64 ring road.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – feel that the proposal for an ‘eco-friendly’ settlement is admirable but entirely contradictory to such a site as ST15 currently is arable land between a small wood and Heslington Tilmire not the place to be situating an environmentally friendly community. Appreciate that Wheldrake would serve 29% of York’s housing needs yet surely more ideal sites are available closer to the city. 5000 homes would affect the delicate and rare habitat of the Tilmire home to sadly decreasing habitat at present to natural species. How would the Council ensure that breeding birds would not be disturbed? York should not be creating a settlement on this scale so close to this delicate area.	5513/14900	
	Objection – how will people living in the proposed new village (Whinthorpe) get into the city and work other than by road?	5528/14947	
	Objection – this development will put a great deal of strain on local roads and facilities.	5531/14951	
	Objection – brownfield sites have not been fully utilised so if there is need for more housing in York then these areas which have the infrastructure in place would be better. The strain on the city, 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?	5579/13076	
	Objection – Elvington will be particularly affected by development to the eastern section of York. It is a traffic thoroughfare Main Street is bombarded with heavy traffic. Adding pressure to the road system is unfair to existing habitants of the village and must be avoided.	5592/13114	
	Objection – large strategic housing developments proposed such as ST15 are wildly ambitious and would swamp local communities. Do not support these larger developments and would instead prefer greater focus on brownfield sites such as York central.	5599/13137	
	Objection – such a large development is bound to create a much greater traffic impact on the area – there is no traffic plan available so the consultation cannot be regarded as full or fair. The Village Design Statement shows clearly how much the surroundings are valued by residents. It is also worth noting that during Inquiry into the University Expansion the Inspector advocated many of the residents concerns over the possible increase in traffic. This is evident by the many conditions imposed on the University to monitor and rectify any increase in traffic flow. A proposal which goes against the previous inspectors findings would be absurd and must not be allowed to happen. The	5602/13149	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	suggested route through Common Lane appears nowhere on the plan as it stands leaving residents totally ill informed during consultation about the massive impact on their lives. The Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest would be greatly affected by such a development both during construction and afterwards.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – full exploitation of brown field sites should occur before any development of this size is contemplated. The effect on the existing road structure would be catastrophic particularly access to the city via the A1079. No detail is provided regarding infrastructure which would be required to support such large scale development.	5606/13162	
	Objection – ST15 is virtually a new town in the middle of the green belt cut off from the rest of York. It is also close to the important wildlife site of the Tilmire. This proposal should be abandoned.	5609/13185	
	Comment – cannot understand how, for example, the large estate planned near Elvington is going to be anything other than urban sprawl.	5634/13263	
	Objection – no idea is provided of the proposed infrastructure for this site the whole plan appears to be ill thought out. The development does not appear to take into account the detrimental affects on Heslington and surrounding area. Vast areas of green belt are proposed to be lost to buildings, wind farms and solar panel farms. As Heslington has lost already a large area of Green Belt by the development of campus East this development should not go ahead.	5643/13275	
	Objection – the concept of this site ST15 appears wrong – especially given the environmental importance of the Tilmire and its ability to retain floodwater. Hope this site is removed from the Plan.	5645/13280	
	Objection – the proposed land south of Heslington (ST15) is obviously going to contribute to existing congestion on the A64.	5666/13332	
	Objection – the Council have failed to justify the selection of land at Whinthorpe, or provide any evidence about its suitability and deliverability. This is shown be the lack of any evidence to support the proposal of any access strategy to the site and required infrastructure. No consideration has been given to the Site of Special Scientific Interest in this location and its need for surrounding farmed land for the survival and increase in flora and fauna. The Tilmire will be destroyed. The removal of 900 acres of green belt land from a single site is excessive and will have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character. The setting and the heritage assets. There appears to be no evidence that the Council has asked other adjoining councils whether they could accommodate some of the housing growth beyond the excepted Green Belt boundary	5671/13348	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in the form of a new settlement. The Council does not appear to have consulted in any detail with adjoining planning authorities and infrastructure and service providers. The Council has provided no proof of exceptional circumstances. Putting a major housing development such as this on the A64 corridor (with no jobs) would seem to increase the propensity for traffic towards the A1 and West Yorkshire. Selby too proposes to increase housing (no jobs) and this traffic will also use the same roads A1, A64 and A1079.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Comment – Whinthorpe needs much more explanation of the infrastructure plans and funding before any objective assessment can be made, the current plans show only 1 access road in and out of this town	5677/13379	
	Comment – the new settlements should follow the principles of Ebenezer Howard as applied in the creation of New Earswick rather than urban excrescences. The Local Planning Authority should therefore seek to implement its proposals by forming consortia of landowners and developers to share the infrastructure costs and rewards.	5689/13408	
	Objection – the proposed new settlement of 5800 houses at the new town of Whinthorpe will have knock on consequences for traffic congestion in Fulford. Air quality is severely affected. There are serious traffic management and health implications of such a large development feeding into the southern half of the city.	5708/13450	
	Objection – to build a new town the size of Pocklington on the edge of York is unpractical and unsustainable. The land is some of the best productive land around York and a large amount has already been lost to Campus 3. Most of the roads in and out of York are gridlocked at pea time so a big development like this isn't going to help. Where it is situate is ideal for another commuter town to Leeds & west Yorkshire.	5710/13454	
	Objection – Whinthorpe has been chosen entirely down to convenience. This is an amazing beautiful area of green belt with accompanying wildlife. There is no way the infrastructure could cope. Roads cannot cope for a start there will be gridlock increased levels of pollution everywhere. How are the schools going to cope with this massive sudden increase in demand? Much of the land is in flood plain.	5720/13483	
	Objection – with so many empty properties in and around York why does the Council find it necessary to propose to build 5580 homes at Whinthorpe. There will be a huge loss of green belt land at a loss to framing community and wildlife. Road infrastructure is inadequate.	5738/13517	
	Objection – the A19 between York and Selby is so congested that any development along this corridor should be banned until it is better managed. The Whinthorpe development is on a single track county lane and the A64 what are the proposals to	5753/13579	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	serve this development – over more green belt? Fulford and Heslington already have lost/are losing green belt with the University Campus East development and Germany Beck – Whinthorpe should be located elsewhere.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – this development seems a very intrusive incursion into the green belt and probably unnecessary. The key thing is that services, especially schools, roads, cycle paths and amenity space are planned and high quality.	5754/13588	
	Objection- objection to the proposed Local Plan to remove and develop Green Belt around Elvington/Wheldrake and further expansion of housing in Elvington and the built of Whintroppe.Detrimental impact to the character of the village of Elvington and the close community values and atmosphere due to the high number of housing propped, traffic safety and congestion to an alkyd struggling busy route through Elvington. The schools which are very credible history of great education will not cope with the additional influx of housing, and most likely be affected and thus the high level of education will suffer- the roads of beck side and Church Lane will not cope. York villages and surrounding country side should be something to be very proud of and so why would York Council look to destroy something that many other cities would be jealous of.	5774/13658	
	Objection – 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 Greenbelt; although traditionally not a considered to 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 on the Local Plan consultation.	5776/13664	
	Objection- understands that half of the proposed Winthorpe development is on a flood plain which has been subject to flooding in recent times. There must be requirement to build significant transport infrastructure- principally roads- around Winthorpe since the existing infrastructure is already under considerable stress. There is no plan for Whinthorpe road traffic to have access to York through Heslington itself. However it appears that a public transport link or links from Winthorpe through Heslington may be put in place. If such a link or links delivers pollution and crowds and reduces the value of Heslington as a conservation village the plan would contribute to a decline in the attractiveness of the University as a working environment for staff and students. It	5779/13673	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would do the same for other residents. There is some doubt that the proposed development id deliverable within the plan period.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- part of this is the lack of urban sprawl outside the outer ring road. The placing of a new settlement in effect a small town at Whinthorpe does not enhance nor maintain this character. It is started that the plan should reduce flood risk by ensuring that new development is not subject to or does not contribute to flooding.	5780/13676	
	Comment- should ensure that buildings can be done on all Brownfield sites in the area before committing the local plan to anything else. Without considering whether or not infrastructure can in any ways cope with this. The ring road must be made into dual carriage way long before any thought for building here can be considered. These roads are small narrow and not meant for heavy traffic. Drains in this area must be upgraded. High water table area will cause a lot more flooding. The local schools are already full. The local transport buses us adequate but there would have to be a smaller hopper type buses. Our local health practice is great and has 13 doctors but will take at least one or two days to get an appointment. There is only a small number of police to cover the area.	5782/13688	
	Objection- the baseline scenario looks to be much more realistic and is itself a bit optimistic. The preferred number of dwellings per annum is based on dubious assumptions and is grossly unrealistic. Housing density the chosen density level appears to be very high with only minimal green space. the proposal to build two major developments ST14 and 15.	5783/13693	
	Objection- green belt and is an area of great natural beauty. Development of this area would have an extremely detrimental effect on the local wildlife. Having a harmful effect on the village’s overall character and a very adverse effect.	5792/13720	
	Objection- without taking large areas out of the current green belt. Likely to increase traffic. There is no infrastructure whatsoever on the rich agricultural land south of the A64. Inappropriate and should be abandoned.	5801/13737	
	Objection – Whinthorpe will undermine the natural integrity of Heslington Common and Heslington Tilmire and will disrupt local ecosystems. It will undermine the Council’s attempts to maintain the historic low-profile approaches to the city. ST15 (and ST14) will greatly increase the level of road traffic. The Council must do everything to ensure developers design housing sites which place the emphasis on pedestrian and cycling activity and deter car usage and must try to influence the architectural design and the housing schemes to reflect 21 st century needs.	5809/13745	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – should not develop any green belt land until brown field sites have been used. Traffic will bring roads to a standstill from sites of this size. No demonstration as to why so many houses are needed. The site will be used by commuters to Leeds, Sheffield etc. Road safety issues will need addressing.	5818/13770	
	Objection – overall the scale of the plan is completely inappropriate in relation to a city of this size especially when it impacts the green belt so significantly. Concerned about the impact overall on local infrastructure. Traffic on roads will struggle to cope. Impact on Heslington. Eradication of green belt land. Congestion and pollution on local roads.	5838/13815	
	Objection – 5600 homes would significantly affect the village of Elvington. The surrounding area does not have the infrastructure to support the development. Both the A64 and A1079 have congestion issues. Additional schools will need to be built. The site is green belt. The site does not have suitable access.	5842/13821	
	Objection – oppose creating of a new town (Whinthorpe) in the green belt on prime agricultural land due to following facts; The green belt needs protecting to retain York’s inherent beauty and setting; Neither Arup or Ekosgen reports support house building on this scale – even Arup say 850 new houses per annum will be a great challenge; It will destroy 2000 acres of grade 1 and 2 prime agricultural land at a time when the UK needs food security for economic and food miles purposes; The scale of the building at this new town will probably suck in Leeds/Bradford commuters and possibly lead to ribbon development along the A64 such as blights many industrial areas in England; Whinthorpe traffic will further challenge the over used roads A19/A1079; Fulford and Hull Roads will experience more gridlocks and cause more emergency service delays; Flood events increase in severity and frequency building new houses on a known flood site is reckless in the extreme; Whinthorpe will border Tilmire Common a famous bird site; The Universities are steadily creating better and more student lettings, more of the infill and brownfield sites should be used for this purpose and the biggest single driver in population growth will have been satisfied. Comment – existing bus routes service existing brownfield sites without the set up and subsidy cost of providing new public service routes to Whinthorpe, especially if it pulls in Leeds commuters wanting to live in York, as is expected.	5874/15158	
	Objection – it is impossible to assess the impact of this proposed development because of lack of any detail around the general infrastructure of the development such as access, new schools, doctors and other amenities. Until these issues are addressed object to this development.	5878/15167	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Comment – both the A1237 and A64 are a challenge without more homes. For the volume of houses additional schools, shops, doctors and lots of roads will be required.	5885/15181	
	Objection – if 5,580 houses are built at Whinthorpe presumably there will be half that number at least as major wage earners. Where are they going to work? There are not 2,000 to 3,000 job vacancies waiting to be filled in York.	6033/15441	
	Objection – Whinthorpe should not be built. The roads are too congested as it is and there is enough brownfield sites in and around York to use first.	6035/15447	
	Objection – believe that a new town on over 460 acres of green belt land would have drastic effects on the erosion of the green belt, the environment and on the volume of traffic in an already congested Heslington area. There are numerous areas throughout York that could accommodate new housing projects and conversions which would also remove the many unsightly parts of the city.	6037/15450	
	Objection – should prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through provision in villages subject to levels of services. Advocate this approach because it would require allocation of a number of small and medium sites. This would also remove the need to allocate Whinthorpe. Believe this allocation (ST15) is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons including impact on the green belt, highways network and infrastructure requirements.	6046/15475	
	Objection – object to the reliance on the delivery of 29% of York’s housing need through Whinthorpe. Do not support the Council’s reliance on this site as a strategic housing allocation. As this is to be a new settlement which does not adjoin an existing settlement there will be substantial infrastructure costs in its delivery and no evidence this site has been tested or is viable. It is maintained the work undertaken by the Council as part of the site selection process does not address the issues of deliverability. Relying on this site for 29% of its requirements is high risk due to high costs of putting into place all the required infrastructure the delivery of this new settlement is unviable. The Council will have insufficient sites to meet its objectively assessed need contrary to National Planning Policy Framework. With the site selection process focusing predominately on technical constraints such as highways and flood risk whilst also relying on an assumption that sites will deliver over 3000 dwellings will be able to deliver all associated services that would be required such as retail, doctors, dentists, schools, public transport. To be found sound the Council must assess the deliverability and viability of this new settlement and associated services that it would also need to deliver. Separate from York the new settlement would not be assisting in the economic growth of the city. It is questioned how the development would meet	6062/15512	ID Planning

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	principle viii which seeks to maximise integration, connectivity and accessibility to and from the site giving priority to sustainable travel options. The site is not in a sustainable location and even if the public transport provision is delivered the site is geographically remote from the centre of the centre of York and therefore all residents will be taking substantially longer journeys to access jobs and services in York City Centre compared to strategic urban extensions. The sites relative remoteness from York main urban area and city centre mean that residents would highly unlikely to access the city by foot/cycle. Public transport options are unknown – the realistic outcome is that most journeys will be by car, contrary to part ix and x of Policy SS4.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Support – if there is to be new housing in a green location it make sense to be provided all in one location for the following reasons; Since much of it would be used on a dormitory basis it makes sense to locate it close to the southern ring road for easy access. A counsel of perfection might say t site it near a rail line would be desirable but that, naturally, restricts land availability and also consideration must be given to the difficulties of trying to provide additional rail services within the York area; If all such green field development is kept close to good road links the additional pressure on the northern ring road would not come about; and the provision of green field development within the one location affords the economy of scale in terms of highway structure, schools, local services and the like. It helps cure the problems of the domino theory.	6135/15584	
	Comment – the local Plan is seeking approval for the creating of new towns especially Whinthorpe. It is 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. Similarly the 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. Lie to see s tram or monorail similar to London’s Docklands light rail system.	6137/15596	
	Objection – great concerns over this proposal. No information has been provided how education will be provided for secondary school.	6157/15649	
	Comment – 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 other percentages increased to compensate. We support the allocation but believe that the level of completions expected in the plan period is over optimistic and feel that the delivery should be reduced 1000 to 1500 dwellings as the current rate of delivery is	6160/15663	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	not justified.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- totally unacceptable. Such a large scale development will be a huge blot on the landscape so close to the Ring road, University Heslington and Elvington. There is no mention of any proposed infrastructure plans or traffic/ road planning in the already congested roads on the A1079 from Kexby into the University and City area. This huge development will not be required if a more realistic new houses target is set. Totally against the removal of 5% of the Green belt.	6229/15788	
	Objection - unattractive project were to be carried out on Green belt land it would mean further aggravated levels of congestion. York's elementary communications infrastructure is already overstretched, especially with respect to its vital hospital and railway station both of which at rush-hours are difficult to access.	6231/15792	
	Objection- opposed as the local infrastructure is not capable of handling the proposed development.	6276/15861	
	Comment- Heslington Tilmire will be negatively impacted from ST15.	6277/15865	Friends Of Rawcliffe Meadows
	Objection- such a development would totally contradict the National Planning Policy Framework which explicitly states according to your own document that "Local Planning authorities should recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their visibility and vitality. The particular problem of Whinthorpe consists in its close proximity to a flood zone as evidenced in one of the plan's charts. Moreover the increase of traffic into the city via Fulford Road and Hull Road would be unsuitable. A fair distribution of small growth areas around the city would be far more practical than one big new settlement, Whinthorpe with a small of 450 acres.	6280/15873	
	Objection- to consider a further development of approximately 5800 residential properties around Grimston does not bear thinking about. The roads leading to the A64 could not cope with additional traffic as the present situation is intolerable. The area within the City of York Council is at present reducing employment by at least 1000 jobs per year so how will be purchasing these proposed properties.	6281/15875	
	Objection- the Whinthorpe development is absurd. Whinthorpe will particularly affect Heslington, already beset by the University expansion and Germany Beck. Neither of these developments was necessary or desirable given the availability of numerous brown field sites.	6291/15901	
	Objection – two major strategic sites near Clifton Moor and adjacent to the A64 seems to contradict any reasonable set of priorities. Would make more sense to site them	6299/15933	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	close to existing public transport links, preferably rail, for example locating them near the proposed stations at Haxby and Strensall or possibly new station at Copmanthorpe.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection- it does not seem wise to plan a very large development (5580 dwellings) to the south of the A66 at Whinthorpe a 'green field site' without any proto-urban infrastructure or direct road or rail connections to link it to the City of York-how will this development benefit York. This will have an effect on the natural environment, sites of special scientific interest and the approaches to the City.	6303/15940	
	Objection- there are no plans detailing the road infrastructure for the Whinthorpe site. Were unable to obtain any information on where the access routes for the settlement will be, how this will impact on our access to Heslington from our property and the impact of traffic on Heslington village. In addition to the infrastructure for heslington and access to and from our property there are no detail on ho this settlement will impact on road infrastructure for the A64, A1079 And A19. The Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest is at serious risk from the development. This area of national environment importance will be destroyed. The surrounding farmland is habitat for owls and water voles that are also protected species. Concern over the flood risk on this proposed development site, only last year we saw flooding on many of the fields that are within the development. The proposed development is on high grade agricultural land and would destroy the current farming and food production in the area, with the development proposals for Grimston, Murton and Germany Beck as well as the development of the university. This is taking too much farmland and countryside.	6317/15967	
	Objection-how will people in this town get into York. how will people in this town get out of the village? Heslington out gang is not an option this road and main street are not suitable for heavy traffic. Elvington would become a choke point daily and make the village unattractive to people to live there, if the town excited onto the A64 then this will become a choke point at peak times. What services will be provided in the town. What school options will there be for the children.	6338/16020	
	Objection – concerns in ability of Whinthorpe to develop in a sustainable manner. That is in a manner which delivers infrastructure in advance of or at least concurrently with the introduction of new residents – particularly primary education and sustainable modes of transport. Object to this new settlement with adjacent land safeguarded for future development as it is wholly inappropriate for development in landscape and green belt terms. Impact on the setting and character of York could not be worse.	6339/16008	The Merchant Taylors Of York & R & M Gorwood

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – concerns in ability of Whinthorpe to develop in a sustainable manner. That is in a manner which delivers infrastructure in advance of or at least concurrently with the introduction of new residents – particularly primary education and sustainable modes of transport. Object to this new settlement with adjacent land safeguarded for future development as it is wholly inappropriate for development in landscape and green belt terms. Impact on the setting and character of York could not be worse.	6341/16014	
	Objection – concerns in ability of Whinthorpe to develop in a sustainable manner. That is in a manner which delivers infrastructure in advance of or at least concurrently with the introduction of new residents – particularly primary education and sustainable modes of transport. Object to this new settlement with adjacent land safeguarded for future development as it is wholly inappropriate for development in landscape and green belt terms. Impact on the setting and character of York could not be worse.	6344/16024	Escrick Park Estate
	Comment- support the allocation but believe that the level of completions expected in the plan period is over optimistic. It is likely ST15 will be brought forward on the basis of an outline planning permission and subsequent reserved matters applications; this is likely to be a lengthy process. It is anticipated that a consortium of developers would be required. It is clear from the above that the full realisation of delivery form ST15 will not occur during the plan period. This reiterates the importance of delivering the smaller allocated sites in the short to medium term. We support the allocation of ST15 but feel that the delivery should be reduced 1,000 to 1,500 dwellings, as the current rate is not justified.	6349/16033	Linden Homes North
	Objection – concerns about Whinthorpe to develop in a sustainable manner which delivers infrastructure in advance of or at least concurrently with the introduction of new residents. Especially in relation to primary education and sustainable modes of transport. Object to the allocation of land at Holme Hill as a new settlement with adjacent land safeguarded for future expansion – the site is wholly inappropriate for development in landscape and green belt terms. It is impossible to identify a site or area in the countryside surrounding York where development would have a worse impact on the character or setting of the historic city. This is the main purpose of the York Green Belt as set out many years ago in its national policy document (The Green Belts 1988)	6383/16115	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
	Objection – Concerns about Whinthorpe to develop in a sustainable manner which delivers infrastructure in advance of or at least concurrently with the introduction of new residents. Especially in relation to primary education and sustainable modes of transport. Object to the allocation of land as a new settlement with adjacent land	6384/16121	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Linden Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	safeguarded for future expansion – the site is wholly inappropriate for development in landscape and green belt terms. It is impossible to identify a site or area in the countryside surrounding York where development would have a worse impact on the character or setting of the historic city. This is the main purpose of the York Green Belt as set out many years ago in its national policy document (The Green Belts 1988)		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – Whinthorpe is not an option which has been reported in the Sustainability Appraisal with regards to discussions with adjoining authorities. Deliverability and viability are key considerations to be addressed in bringing forward individual proposals and strategic sites. No guidance has been given with regards to the provision of access infrastructure off the A64. There is little or no evidence supporting the site selection process for Whinthorpe. Proposed Policy SS4 is prescriptive in that some 29% of the City’s future housing requirement along with provision beyond the plan period for safeguarded land will be provided at Whinthorpe. In being prescriptive it is assumed that the Council has undertaken a substantive investigation into deliverability of the Whinthorpe scheme. In the absence of any infrastructure delivery programme question whether this is the case. Correspondence from the Highways Agency would indicate that there has been no substantive cost appraisal of delivering this scheme. Similarly regarding flood risk (Environment Agency) and areas of ecological value (English Nature) and appropriate mitigation strategies are not covered. There is no housing trajectory explaining how the Council anticipates that the site will deliver the housing numbers provided. Once established such sites are unlikely to achieve in excess of 150 units per annum. It may take up to 4 or 5 years before an appropriate planning permission is in place and for site preparation works to start and for the first house to be built. On this basis the policy approach is not deliverable over the plan period. And is not effective. Impact of the proposals on Heslington – various policies in the Village Design Statement adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance stress the importance of the green spaces together with the views out of the village to open farm land. This new town nearly twice the size of Pocklington should be seen in context of the 1947 Planning Acts, the New Towns movement and the lessons subsequently learnt from them. It is not unreasonable to expect Whinthorpe, like Poundbury (the garden village in Dorset through consultation with the Prince’s Trust), but over twice the size will become an unsustainable dormitory commuter town with residents driving to work in York, Leeds, Selby and beyond. If a new town is necessary to meet York’s housing demand why locate it here? Whinthorpe is not based on any rational analysis of the most appropriate location based on	6439/16159	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	transport, infrastructure, access to jobs, sustainability and other aspects of good town planning but expediency: the simple availability of one large site under one ownership. Traffic and Access – Common Lane is a narrow rural lane that runs south of Heslington and continues for a mile or two providing access to farms, a fishing lake and a few houses. Heslington already has chronic traffic and parking problems. No indication is given in the Plan how Whinthorpe will connect with the existing road network – this is simply not acceptable and renders much of the Consultation meaningless.		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	Objection – the northern ring road and A64 should act as a rigid boundary against development	6493/16225	
	Objection – the sustainability of the development is a concern. Traffic is also a key concern. Common Lane as currently constructed would not be able to cope with regular public transport while Main Street is already struggling to cope with the variety and volume of highway users. The Heslington Village Design Statement talks about restricting traffic through the conservation area (which includes Main Street). Under no circumstances should Common Lane be used for construction vehicles during building. Surface water and sewerage are also key considerations. Should development go ahead design proposal should demonstrate it will not exacerbate drainage problems both on site and in surrounding areas. The Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest needs to be protected.	6511/16293	Cllr David Levene
	Objection – the inclusion of ST15 Whinthorpe (and ST14) as new settlements is a major policy departure. This proposal has been made without any discussion. In the current climate making a new settlement sustainable is almost impossible. Providing a primary school and other community facilities in the long term might be feasible but it would not support a secondary school, large supermarket or significant employment. In the short term residents would need to travel to access all community facilities until a critical mass of development is reached. There is no argument to support this change in policy.	6516/16328	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – the arterial routes in this sector of the City have some of the worst congestion in the county. It is remote from the major employment development sites and there is no obvious – affordable- route into the City centre for non road transport.	6517/16355	York Central Liberal Democrats
	Comment – if the new settlement of Whinthorpe is to be built support the aspiration or ‘ambition’ for it to be developed as an eco-settlement and to be carbon neutral. However, it is hard to see how this could be achieved when there seems to be no specific measures in this Plan to mitigate the transport impact of the development. Also interested in the reference that this development ‘will incorporate a high level of	6518/16368	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>affordable housing’ – does this imply that an affordable housing level above the 30% average for green field sites will be sought? Is this specified elsewhere in the document? Re: Green Infrastructure policy – agree with aspirations of this policy, however, concerned about lack of consistency here with housing allocations, specifically Whinthorpe abuts directly onto Heslington Tilmire Site of Special Scientific Interest whilst both the Tilmire and golf course are both Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. The Sustainability Appraisal identifies negative consequences. If Whinthorpe development goes ahead there should be a high quality accessible bus shuttle service linking both Grimston Bar and Designer Outlet Park & Ride services to limit the traffic impact of the development.</p>		
Site ST15 Whinthorpe Continued	<p>Objection – amend the plan and save traditionally green belt protected sites from being developed upon. Want to see character of villages surrounding York protected.</p>	Petition 15	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST17 Nestle South	Comment – part of this site lies within the Nestle/Rowntree Conservation Area. Development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.	238/14059	English Heritage
	Objection/comment- the most appropriate designation for Nestle South is as a Strategic Mixed Use Site. This would give flexibility which is needed when it comes to making final decisions about the use of the site. Support/Comment- the site is a sustainable location for mixed use development, it has the potential to meet the city’s aspirations for economic and housing growth.	461/16621	Cass Associates LLP
	Comment – recommend that the Council does not rely too heavily upon complex brownfield sites such as the Former British Sugar/Manor School site in maintaining a 5 year supply of housing land and instead relies on less complex and available sites that can be delivered on the ground now. Also recommend that reference is made at Policy SS4 and Policy H3 to what is likely to be delivered over the phasing timeframe from the complex brownfield sites such as the Former British Sugar/Manor School site York Central and land at Nestle South.	659/15073	Persimmon Homes
	Objection- ST17 seems unsustainable and likely to impose significant demands on infrastructure and transport services.	2416/6608	
	Support – Policy H2 of the Plan sets out that the council will grant permission, if it lapses during the plan period, for a number of sites provided there has been no material change (this list includes Nestle South (ST17)). This policy is supported.	6349/16041	Linden Homes North

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H2 Existing Housing Commitments	Support – agree with the proposal in relation to existing commitments.	59/12645	Dunnington Parish Council
	Comment – some care needs to be taken in respect of the existing commitments figure as not all these commitments are likely to be implemented and a review of the included sites suggests challenges to deliver some, this notwithstanding the aims of the policy to positively support renewal of these commitments, if sought. The Plan needs to ensure it is not double counting commitments with allocations within the Plan as there is no one single table listing commitments and allocations.	452/16608	Miller Homes Ltd
	Support – this policy clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions. Such circumstances could include continued non-delivery.	534/16707	DPP One Ltd
	Comment – Policy H2 should be amended as follows ‘as part of the Annual Monitoring Report the Council will maintain an up to date housing trajectory on sites that have planning permission’ Objection – concerns in relation to the assumptions and approach taken within Policy H2 of sites either under construction or have unimplemented planning permissions. Object to the Council having not prepared a detailed 5 year (or longer term) trajectory to indicate delivery timescales from individual sites which is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 47). There is no clear evidence that the sites have been assessed against the criteria that they are available, in a suitable location now and be achievable with realistic prospects of delivery in 5 years.	659/15079	Persimmon Homes
	Support – agree with the proposal in relation to existing commitments.	1457/17403	
	Objection – historic housing sites should be subject to scrutiny and consultation prior to being identified as developable over the plan period otherwise the Plan cannot be considered sound. Where there is uncertainty over delivery or large permitted sites which may be subject to phasing CYC should consider providing additional deliverable sites to meet requirements in the early part of the plan period	1661/9950	Linden Homes
	Support – this policy clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to	1663/9963	DPP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	renew these planning permissions. Such circumstances could include continued non-delivery.		
Policy H2 Existing Housing Commitments	Support – support the policy particularly the inclusion of the Derwenthorpe site	1668/15035	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection – an unnecessary policy, query why this has been included within the Local Plan Preferred Options	1705/9783	Gladman Developments
	Support – this policy clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions. Such circumstances could include continued non-delivery.	1801/9893	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Comment – building appears to be the flavour of the month and building to the scale suggested will create 21 st Century ghettos	2512/6789	
	Comment – Hungate should be referenced appropriately within Policies H2 (and H3)	5167/12904	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
	Support – agree with the proposal in relation to existing commitments.	5178/12345	
	Support – this policy clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions. Such circumstances could include continued non-delivery.	6160/15671	
Comment – do not disagree with this policy in general, although do not support the location of the Germany Beck development.	6518/16388	York Green Party	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST22 Germany Beck	Objection- the site should be considered in light of the outcome of the High Court Challenge. Further information contained in response.	62/12699	Fulford Parish Council
	Comment- it is a flooding area. Hope the Council has an insurance policy to cover claims.	1210/17117	
	Objection - with the city 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 the adequate provision of schools and NHS facilities, the road system are of most concern. Traffic into and out the city on the A19 has become unbearable. The proposal for ST15 will make this worse. The site would be built partially on a flood plain which is madness.	2457/6733	
	Objection- the whole development of Germany Beck is a huge mistake.	2935/7673	
	Comment – Germany Beck (ST22) seems sadly to be a fait accompli, but whatever happens it need not and must not, must not encroach on or harm the site of the Battle of Fulford (1066). It is a historical place and important for possible archaeological research.	3242/8310	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposed building of houses surrounding York on green belt land especially Fulford, a historic site. York is a beautiful historic city – do not spoil it with massive housing developments.	3303/8475	
	Objection – if this proposed development goes ahead the family business will be badly hit as the building will put off fishermen from using Langwith Lakes fishing complex.	3313/8493	Langwith Lakes
	Objection – particularly concerned with the proposed Whinthorpe and Germany Beck developments and the huge impact they will have on the south east of the city. Main concerns are the increased amount of traffic using the A19, A64 and A1079, the A19 floods whenever the River Ouse floods, these great amounts of land with people houses and all the necessary infrastructure will destroy York, the surrounding villages and roads by the sheer numbers of people and extra traffic.	3360/8617	
	Comment – the Germany Beck development, which the Council despite local feeling have approved will impact negatively on the village of Fulford – is a conservation area in name but not it appears in fact.	3364/8630	
	Objection – flooding issues. A bridge to raise the A64 above flood level paid for by the development should be considered.	3549/9515	
Objection – opposed to impact of Local Plan on Fulford. Feel Fordlands Estate ought to stay within the green belt to maintain the character of Fulford Village. Building will increase the risk of flooding, create more severe effects of flooding and also possible flooding of drainage systems for the area. The A19 is extremely busy already and with	3908/10448		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	a high level of pollution so both the Germany Beck and Whinthorpe developments will create more traffic and make problems worse.		
Site ST22 Germany Beck Continued	Objection – the number of houses to be built is far too many. It will completely change the nature of York. Additional traffic will be added to two accesses to York already suffering from poor air quality and this is before Derwenthorpe and Germany Beck developments have added their traffic.	4052/10729	
	Objection – concerns in regard to more vehicles going into/out of York. The road is badly congested as it is. Are there any discussions regarding accessing the A64 at a different point?	4448/11461	
	Comment – land south of Germany Beck, land south of Heslington village and east of the University playing fields and Fulford Golf Course has development potential.	4752/12050	
	Comment – permission should never have been given for Germany Beck development – an utterly unsustainable project located on the flood plain.	5108/12216	
	Objection – flooding when development starts is a concern.	5172/12310	
	Objection – the proposed construction of houses on Germany Beck flood plain site beggars belief. The site was almost completely under water last summer to this spring!	5547/14979	
	Objection- in removing the area from the Green Belt will completely change the character of the area. At the moment a pleasant area to walk in and one can connect to various places along rural footpaths. This will all disappear. Development on the Fordland’s Road estate will exacerbate the problem of flooding in the area and put further strain on sewerage system. The proposed new settlement of 5800 houses at the new town of Whinthorpe will have knock-on consequences for the traffic congestion in Fulford. The air quality is severely affected.	5708/13449	
	Objection- deciding to build over a site that they recognise in the 1066 battle of Fulford, are ignoring a key heritage asset planning to destroy not only the heritage asset but also the community’s environment. Are not conserving or enhancing the heritage asset, they have contrived to destroy an asset that people nationally have demonstrated their pride and interest in by visiting the battle site. Building a road over the place where the two shield wall faced each other cannot be regarded as promoting good design. Plan to destroy rather than conserve, enhance or add value the site that is recognised as the 1066 battle of Fulford. The plan permits the heritage asset to be ‘sustainably harmed’ it is difficulty not to also point out how they have recently allowed the view of the Minster from the south to be blocked by the Germany Beck plan when they make so much of the importance of preserving minster views.	5713/13462	Fulford Battlefield Society

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST22 Germany Beck Continued	Objection- flood plain issue. These developments can be considered when the infrastructure around them is not there and is not included in the Local Plan.	5753/13580	
	Objection- against the development of Germany Beck both because of the loss of Green space and because of the flooding risks and traffic problems which have been well documented already.	5775/13662	
	Comment – if more houses are built in Fulford it would; Create more congestion (traffic)/pollution; Put pressure on local schools’ and Less green space for children to play. We should protect our green belt, houses could be built elsewhere. Flooding has created problems too in Fulford for local residents this needs to be addressed in the plans for Germany Beck.	6034/15443	
	Objection- feel dismayed that the medieval flood defences at German Beck are to be taken away this will cause houses at Fulford to be flooded as well as the surface water and soak ways at German Beck.	6200/15736	
	Objection- Germany Beck is vulnerable to flooding. Producing rush hour traffic jams extending all the way along the A64.	6231/15791	
	Comment- this site should be shown as Green Belt land. The green belt boundary has erroneously been drawn along the red line boundary for the development site. Instead it should exclude the green corridor consisting of all land to the south of Germany lane.	6284/15885	
	Objection- why the archaeologists are not being allowed to complete their work is beyond me. Flooding issue	6322/15980	
	Support - support this policy as it clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions.	6349/16042	Linden Homes North
	Objection – do not disagree with policy H2 in general, however, do not support the location of the Germany Beck development.	6518/16389	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST23 Derwenthorpe	Comment- significant levels of development from ST15 are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079-A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange.	10/11669	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection- how is the council going to stop flooding?	2683/7127	
	Objection – the number of houses to be built is far too many. It will completely change the nature of York. Additional traffic will be added to two accesses to York already suffering from poor air quality and this is before Derwenthorpe and Germany Beck developments have added their traffic.	4052/10730	
	Comment – there is great scope for further development land east of Metcalfe Lane and Derwenthorpe.	4752/12049	
	Support- supports this policy as it clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions.	6349/16043	Linden Homes North

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site ST24 York College	Objection – object most strongly to the further developments proposed for the Dringhouses area of York. This area has now become very built up already. Especially in terms of traffic congestion and safety. This would create over development and over crowding in one of the nicest areas in York. Urge to reconsider on grounds of overcrowding and poor infrastructure.	2757/7288	
	Objection –increased traffic at tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout – if the proposed sites go ahead (in this area) the traffic situation can only get worse even if the relocated Park & Ride takes some of the cars off the road.	4284/11109	
	Objection – extremely concerned about the impact that the proposed developments to the south of Moor Lane in Woodthorpe and around Tadcaster Road in Dringhouses will have on the area’s already failing infrastructure. The roundabout at the junction between Moor lane and Tadcaster Road is particularly hazardous and stressful. Public transport offers no realistic alternative. The P&R is a useful service during daytime, however, it stops at 8pm. This is an area of greenbelt. Concerned about the impact of the proposed development on wildlife and the environment. A housing development will have a significant impact on the wider catchment’s ability to cope with flooding.	5541/14964	
	Comment –further development off Tadcaster Road will again significantly affect existing volumes of traffic and affect access to Racecourse Stables and to Dringhouses Bowls Club.	5855/15110	
	Support - support this policy as it clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew these planning permissions.	6349/16044	Linden Homes North

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H3 Housing Allocations	Objection – Foss Bank Farm should be developed for residential use.	60/13846	Earswick Parish Council
	Comment – if really have to have more development in the green belt then it needs to be quality building, not more of the same. Distinctive, aspirational high quality architecture.	88/12797	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Objection – policy should state that an application for an allocation of development in advance of its phasing will only be approved if it can demonstrate mitigation for environmental sustainability in the context of climate change.	90/12836	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – the provision that an application for an allocation in advance of its phasing will only be approved if it meets the bullet points in the policy is considered unsound. Phasing has been based on current market conditions and assumptions about future delivery. Whilst consideration of when a site is likely to be delivered is acceptable to enable the identification of a 5 year housing land supply and trajectory this should not be used to artificially constrain development. It should be left to the market to bring forward allocated sites as required. Artificial constraint of sites through this phasing policy will inhibit council's ability to achieve its own housing targets. Recommend that the site phasing criteria be removed from the policy.	145/13865	Home Builders Federation
	Objection – the lead in times to provide the necessary infrastructure to facilitate development of strategic sites will be considerable. In addition the lead in time in terms of submission and approval of applications and site preparation mean that completions on these sites will not be achieved for several years. It is that likely achievable completions on these sites is some 5,444 less than plan's estimate. Additional land will therefore have to be allocated to make up this shortfall.	187/13919	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Objection – seek allocation of additional land adjoining site H30.	304/14177	Shirethorn Ltd
	Objection – Land at Malton Road, Huntington (site reference 180) should be included as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.	305/14140	Taylor Wimpey (UK) Ltd
	Objection – to the anticipated yield from some housing sites in the plan period. The plan overestimates the number of completions on some strategic sites during the plan period that leads to an incorrect high assumption about the yield from those sites in the plan period. Consequently additional sites need to be allocated to ensure the minimum requirement of 1,090 dwellings per annum can be achieved.	431/16538	Shepherd Homes Ltd
	Objection – the assumptions about the delivery of Whinthorpe and North of Clifton Moor are too optimistic, as an alternative the plan could consider identifying a number of other smaller sites around the city. Smaller sites would require less infrastructure to support their delivery and would therefore be quicker and easier to develop and bring forward much needed housing to maintain the supply of housing land.	432/16548	Church Commissioners for England

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Comment – allocations have heavy reliance on the 5 urban extension sites and the new settlement proposal. Whilst support the plans aims, it is essential that efforts are made within the plan to ensure delivery as some of the required average annual build rates from these sites are challenging. A wider range of smaller to medium sized sites will support delivery, as would the early release of phases of the larger urban extensions.	452/16609	Miller Homes Ltd
	Comment – housing beyond the outer ring road looks good in principle but needs stronger transport links.	525/16647	
	Objection – SF4 is suitable as a housing allocation and should be allocated under policy H3.	534/16718	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – given the market conditions since the start of the economic downturn the deliverability of these sites, particularly in the timescales suggested in policy H3, is unsound. The authority should reconsider sustainable urban sites that were discounted in the site selection process. In the current economic climate, the allocation of smaller sustainable sites which are more likely to come forward and be developed should be sought.	536/16727	KeyLand Developments Ltd
	Objection – the Council has consistently underestimated the lead in times for all types of large scale developments despite incontrovertible evidence to the contrary. Approach is unrealistic in terms of allocations delivering a meaningful number of houses in relation to the annual target until well into the plan period (5 years +) giving rise to a shortfall in delivery in the early years of the life of the plan. The likelihood is also that the later/final stages of the development of large sites will not occur until some time into the next plan period leading to a shortfall in meeting the overall plan target. This is contrary to NPPF guidance which requires authorities to meet objectively assessed needs for housing. The number of small and medium sized residential development sites should be significantly increased. Where the boundaries of housing allocations can be extended in a sustainable manner without harming the character or setting of York, the opportunity should be taken to do so.	540/16730	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection – the assessment on site capacity is too ambitious and does not reflect the realism required by the NPPF in respect of delivery. To achieve delivery at an appropriate rate, there is a need to have more individual sites and/or less large block housing allocations.	544/16778	
	Objection – to the use of a phasing approach in the plan. The phasing of sites seems to be based on current market conditions and assumptions about future delivery.	659/15080	Persimmon Homes
	Objection – there is no trajectory to indicate delivery timescales from individual sites,		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	notably the strategic sites – this is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 47. Also no site specific viability work has been undertaken to understand the deliverability and viability of each site. The larger sites with multiple ownerships will take time to come on stream. Practical and personal reasons will ensure other allocated sites will not deliver houses in the short term. It should be left to the market to bring forward sites as required. The criteria in H3 should be deleted and recommend that an application for an allocated site can be submitted at any time in the plan period.		
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Objection – the following sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Sept 2011) have had their site capacities unreasonably reduced: city central; British sugar/manor school; Bootham Crescent; Barbican; Brecks lane; and Sessions. The plan has therefore allocated an excessive amount of green belt land.	668/16807	
	Comment – where is the criteria used to decide whether a site is short term or long term? Are these criteria defined by legislation?	1009/17038	
	Objection – the plan identifies several very large strategic sites which raise questions of deliverability. Sites of this nature tend to require significant lead-in times to plan, to provide basic infrastructure and will take several years to build out. The key issue is therefore the identification of sites which are suitable, available and deliverable in the short term in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework – this is not done appropriately in the plan.	1140/17076	
	Objection – very few of the sites have been properly assessed for either need or suitability and without a full environmental assessment of the whole of outer York and the surrounding authorities.	1170/17091	
	Comment – not currently in a position to be able to consider if allocations are acceptable as adequate analysis has not been provided on the impact of policies. Propose to continue to work in partnership with the Council in order to establish the implications of the Local Plan on the Strategic Road Network. How will the phasing fits with the planned provision of infrastructure. Want to understand the evidence and justification for the combination of phasing and the use of the 'lifetime of the plan' as a phase, particularly given that these apply to 94% of the allocated dwellings.	1264/17157	Highways Agency
	Support – the inclusion of Whinthorpe as a housing allocation.	1337/17286	Halifax Estates
	Objection – not sufficient small and medium sites identified to deliver in the immediate years following adoption of the plan. Plan should allocate a greater proportion of small and medium sized sites if it is to deliver the annual housing requirement. Small and medium sized sites generally face less practical challenges and take less lead in time	1346/17305	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	before construction can commence.		
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Objection – in order to significantly reduce the development burden on York’s green belt, the Council should reprioritise brownfield sites for housing rather than employment-based development, as has currently been proposed.	1355/17317	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – question whether breaking down potential housing sites to phases of release represents a sufficiently positive approach. This would not be a reason for objection if it was used solely to demonstrate a sufficient supply of land to meet identified housing needs across the plan period. However, object to the inclusion of site H1 within ‘medium’ term on basis of phasing element of policy H3. Phasing element of this policy should be deleted or completely redrafted.	1361/17340	National Grid
	Comment – any future housing development in Dunnington will require comprehensive highway assessment surveys and significant investment to rectify the already inadequate sewerage drainage and pumping capacity, surface water disposal and low water pressure supply systems which effect residents across the village.	1457/17404	
	Objection – site 13 The Buffer Depot/Wheldrake Station should be allocated for residential development. (Detailed reasons included in response).	1539/17624	
	Objection – need to provide evidence that ST5 and ST17 can be sustainably and viably delivered in the plan period in order to rely on their provision in a sound plan. Key consideration in respect of deliverability is the likely build rates achievable on large strategic sites – at most Whinthorpe likely to achieve a rate of 200 dwellings per annum. In reality the new settlement and other strategic sites are likely to require a longer lead-in time (i.e. not commence in 2015). Significant infrastructure requirements may also need to be addressed before residential units can be occupied. The suggested yield of sites is based on density assumptions which overstate the number of dwellings achievable. Council should reconsider the number of dwellings which may be achieved on the allocations. The sites need to be supplemented by further viable and deliverable sites in order to provide sufficient flexibility for the housing requirement to be met.	1661/9951	Linden Homes
	Objection – ST13 should be allocated for delivery in the short term (1-5 years) and not the short to medium term as it is available for immediate development.	1663/9964	DPP
	Objection – the capacity of sites may have been overestimated and this would mean that not enough sites have been identified. Object to the requirement for applications to accord with the estimated phasing. Phasing should only be required to demonstrate that an adequate supply of housing can be met over the plan period, it should not be used for development management or as a tool to prevent sites coming forward earlier	1668/15036	Barratt & David Wilson Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	than expected. As only 'estimated' it is not a rigorous or sufficiently detailed basis to monitor delivery effectively and is unsound. This approach could great hinder housing growth. Phasing timescales should be indicative or removed from the policy to offer the flexibility required in the NPPF. The second bullet point should be amended to include an appropriate buffer of 5% or 20% in addition to the five year supply of deliverable sites to ensure the policy is in accordance with the NPPF. Alternative approach – to rely on the NPPF to guide housing related development – should be taken.		
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Objection – phasing policies should not be used to arbitrarily stop development that is considered to be acceptable from coming forward.	1705/9784	Gladman Developments
	Objection – It is pointless leaving 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 that area.	1791/9876	
	Objection – totally disagree with all sites on the map.	2322/6524	
	Objection – there are many eyesores within the City of York (Piccadilly is one) that could de used for housing.	2406/6563	
	Objection – to the development of any green belt land.	2512/6790	
	Objection – saddened at the scale of the proposals set out in Policy H3.	2635/6986	
	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.	2988/4528	
	Objection – land to east of Earswick, including land to rear of 112 Strensall Road should be allocated for a new community/housing.	3992/11760	
	Objection – the plan needs to identify additional locations for new housing development to fully meet the objectively assessed housing requirement.	4355/11606	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Objection – the deliverability of the sites, particularly in the timescales suggested is unsound. The authority should reconsider sustainable urban sites that were discounted in the site selection process.	4363/11743	Gregory Property Developments (Haxby) Ltd & Biorad
	Support – additional housing on a smaller scale which would not destroy the visual impact in Dunnington.	4474/11490	
	Objection – Hungate should be referenced appropriately within policy H3.	5167/12905	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
Comment – should any of the housing developments proposed for Dunnington be taken forward they will require comprehensive highway assessment surveys and significant investment to rectify the already inadequate sewerage drainage and	5178/12346		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pumping capacity, surface water disposal and low water pressure supply systems which effect residents across the village.		
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Comment – council wrongly believes that the majority of people wishing to live in the outer-city area do not own cars. The streets around many developments are choked with parked cars. Any housing development should include provision for parking of at least one car within the boundaries of the property for each individual dwelling.	5578/13073	
	Comment – there are other parts of the city (than Haxby), with better links to the ring road and which need the investment which a larger housing stock would bring – these have not been examined thoroughly.	5585/13092	
	Objection – there is no rationale or justification for the location and precise size of each proposed development.	5622/13223	
	Comment – the council should compulsorily purchase brown field sites in the City at Agricultural Land prices, clean up the ground and then sell it on to developers at housing land prices. This profit could be for the community to fund care for the elderly etc... It also removes traffic, uses the scarred land and revitalises the city centre, especially if the likes of John Lewis are only allowed to build in the city and not on the periphery which merely accentuates the need for car travel.	5633/13308	
	Comment – given the reduction in business occupancy currently at Clifton Moor, there maybe scope for conversion to residential. Concerned about the increase risk of water run off and flooding as a result of the proposed housing developments (the Clifton Moor area in particular).	5754/13589	
	Comment – the area around Monks Cross could be developed further without too much intrusion into the green belt.	5775/13663	
	Objection – land at Elmpark Way (ref 245) should be allocated for housing development.	5793/14439	City Of York Hockey Club
	Objection – the assumptions are incorrect about the likely chance of some of the strategic sites coming forward in the short term. It is the smaller sites that are most likely to be delivered in the short term. The plan should allocate a greater proportion of small and medium sized sites to stand any chance of delivering the annual housing requirement. These size sites generally face less practical challenges and take less lead in time before construction can commence. It is contrary to the NPPF to include the completion of dwellings beyond the plan period in the plan period. The NPPF requires either a 5 per cent or 20 per cent buffer to be applied. York has not met the annual housing requirement for a number of years for a number of reasons which are not just because of market conditions; in the circumstances it is appropriate to apply a	6046/15478	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	20% buffer.		
Policy H3 Housing Allocations Continued	Objection – land at Common Road and Hassacarr Lane, Dunnington should be allocated for residential development with recreation and amenity space.	6160/17226	
	Comment – reassured that the areas designated for housing development will have a 60/40 split between buildings and open space.	6307/15945	
	Comment – if proposed sites are considered to be undeliverable or rejected then equivalent housing numbers will be required elsewhere.	6327/17650	
	Support – it would appear that the various options for satisfying the housing need have been objectively assessed.	6349/16038	Linden Homes North
	Objection – the western side of York (ref 20) should be further investigated for housing development as it is near amenities, does not affect any wild habitats, is not in the flood plain, would not be visible from the ring road and would keep a green wedge – unlike site 22.	6386/17244	
	Objection – the plan fails to identify many other Brownfield locations which could offset any demands for Greenfield developments (examples given – see response).	6517/16353	York Central Liberal Democrats
	Objection – do not support all of the housing allocations and would like to see an alternative approach based on lower numbers and higher sustainability. The target should be lowered to 640 dwellings per year and windfalls included.	6518/16390	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H1 Former Gas Works, 24 Heworth Green	Comment – site adjoins the Heworth Green/East Parade/Huntington Road Conservation Area and 26 Heworth Green is a Grade II listed Building. Development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.	238/14072	English Heritage
	Objection – whilst support the residential allocation of the site, object to the fact that the allocation does not wash over the entirety of the site – there would appear to be no justification for excluding the north western corner of the site from the residential allocation. If it is linked to the former ‘employment’ use of the site, the site is not required to meet the employment needs of the city and it is difficult to envisage an isolated section of the site being sufficiently attractive to the market to support a stand alone office development.	1361/17339	National Grid
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6609	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H2 Sites By Racecourse, Tadcaster Road	Comment – the Pinfold is a Grade II Listed Building and the site lies within the Tadcaster Road Conservation Area. Before allocating there needs to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these assets and what affect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance.	238/14073	English Heritage
	Objection – strongly object to the loss of the bowling green on Tadcaster Road, we would like to know where re-provision will be made.	387/14209	Active York
	Support – the allocation of this site.	431/16536	Shepherd Homes Ltd
	Objection – the historic core and conservation area are under threat. Access onto the main arterial road further impeding traffic flow. Restricted difficult access to and from Cherry Lane, a hazard for all including school children walking alongside an already busy road. The Pinfold – the historical significance must not be lost nor its surrounding green space encroached upon. Dringhouses has limited sporting facilities – bowling green will be lost. Danger of creating a concrete corridor along probably the finest approach road into the City if York.	854/16928	
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6610	
	Objection – area very built up already. It is almost impossible to get across the roundabout at rush hour, it can take 20 minutes to drive 100 yards. Proposed over development and over crowding will ruin what is one of the nicest areas in York. Reconsider on the grounds of overcrowding and poor infrastructure.	2757/7285	
	Objection – associated problems of access and increase in traffic. Bowling club is long established community facility. Racing Stables are local heritage asset.	2929/7661	
	Objection – building will disturb wild birds. Increase traffic which is already bad in this area. Local schools are already full.	3548/9512	
	Objection – impact of all development proposed in this area on Woodthorpe, Tadcaster Road and Dringhouses. Road floods at corner near children’s nursery. Traffic density has increased. Gardens at rear of houses flood regularly. Mains water pipes seem to burst on an almost annual basis. Woodthorpe school struggles to accommodate children. It is unlikely that builders will provide all the many forms of infrastructure required to fulfil 50% of Local Plan.	3839/10319	
	Objection – impact of all the proposed developments in this area on the traffic situation at the Tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout.	4284/11106	
	Comment – essential that no further vehicular access is allowed from either site ref 625 or the land at cherry lane (ref 132) due to existing traffic volumes in the area and the busy and sometimes dangerous junction of St Edward’s Close and Cherry Lane. It	4368/11318	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	is essential to maintain the existing character of this area, any houses on this site should therefore be either dormer style or a bungalow. Low density should also be maintained. In the interests of safety the building line of site ref 132 should be moved further towards Tadcaster Road.		
Site H2 Sites By Racecourse, Tadcaster Road continued	Objection – development would have an adverse effect on the Dringhouses Conservation Area.	4468/11483	
	Comment – no reference is made to a need for demolition and relocation/replacement stabling facilities. Believe that other possible locations adjacent to the racecourse would generate serious transport issues. Notes make reference to access via Cherry Lane but make no mention of the existing access direct from Tadcaster Road. Cherry Lane is not a suitable access; any changes to it would destroy the nature of the lane as a green and pleasant asset to the area.	5224/12514	
	Objection – stables are buildings of significance to Dringhouses and York and Yorkshire. Stables were designed by Walter Brierley with the earliest drawings dating from 1913. They remain largely as they were built. As far as aware the stables are the only ones designed by Brierley and thus they have a unique place in his range of buildings. Stables should be retained on this site.	5470/14818	Dringhouses Local History Group
	Objection – impact on area’s already failing infrastructure, particularly roundabout between Moor Lane and Tadcaster Road which is congested and hazardous. Public transport offers no realistic alternative. Park and Ride is good but stops at 8pm so cannot be used for evenings out in the city.	5541/14965	
	Objection - these are a popular recreation area and much needed green space in the area. Assumed that the area was registered as a village green, if not, it ought to be, given the legislation on what constitutes a village green.	5652/13295	
	Objection – the bowling green and allotments have been on this site for coming up to 80 years and is used by many in the local community, this is a village green in our community and propose it is legally recognised as such.	5653/13297	
	Objection – this is a well established local bowling green which has and is being used by the local community for around 80 years, there are also allotments on this site. Is there not some bylaw that if an area has been used by the public for a certain period of time this is protected under the village green preservation act? The Tadcaster Road in this area is already difficult to cross to access the shops, vets etc the number of extra housing proposed would compound this.	5655/13301	
	Objection – concerns related to the provision of local services for an increased population. There is no doctor’s surgery nearby and the local primary school is at full	5822/13778	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	capacity. The proposal also suggests loss of community facilities as there is a bowling green and allotments on the site.		
Site H2 Sites By Racecourse, Tadcaster Road continued	Objection – further development off Tadcaster Road will significantly affect existing volumes of traffic and affect access to Racecourse Stables and to the Dringhouses Bowls Club. An in-depth traffic survey and subsequent road improvement proposals must be undertaken to highlight the potential problems that will be encountered on Tadcaster Road.	5855/15108	
	Objection – this will double the volume of horsebox traffic as they will have to come in to drop off the horses, go out to park and then come back to collect.	6055/15502	
	Objection – although close to bus routes, a library and shops other facilities are lacking, the primary school is full and there is not doctor’ surgery in Dringhouses. There is no information about the relocation of the stables – this would be a major development and the effect of any associated traffic movements will need to be carefully considered. There will be a loss of community facilities as there is a bowling green and allotments on the site. Groom’s accommodation is also used by school parties when there is no racing. Site lies in draft green belt. Community facilities and infrastructure in the ward are already overstretched and residents are concerned that these developments will bring new residents but not the investment in new school and roads that is needed.	6515/16316	Cllr Ann Reid

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H3 Burnholme School (Existing Building Footprint)	Objection – no consideration seems to have been given to future school needs in the Derwenthorpe area.	2416/6611	
	Objection – why is Burnholme school included for housing development? Has it not been designated for elderly care?	6169/15692	
	Comment – school is closing in summer 2014. Currently considering a mix of uses on the whole site, not just the built area. Further consideration should be given to the following on the whole site: additional housing allocation; community facilities (including healthcare); retail (local neighbourhood shops); dementia care home; and open space with enhanced facilities.	6507/16267	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H4 St Josephs Monastery	Comment – The sisters’ house, church, externs’ house, priests’ house, and precinct walls of the Convent of St Joseph, Lawrence Street have recently been listed grade II. Before allocation there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these buildings and what affect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of these assets.	238/14074	English Heritage
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6612	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H5 Lowfield School (Existing Building Footprint)	Comment – develop the whole site as a retirement village.	2418/6691	
	Comment – support the concept of a retirement village, however delays in implementation, taken with the apparent duplicity on the Our Lady’s site, now raises concerns about the scale of development which will eventually emerge at Lowfields. There is a strong feeling amongst local residents that the green space (former school playing fields) on this site should be put to constructive recreational use.	5759/13617	
	Comment – as a dementia care home is being provided on the site, the area for consideration for housing should be extended to include some or all of the playing field. Any existing sporting use or identified need could be re-provided on the land at the rear of Westfield School with enhanced facilities as agreed with CYC Leisure.	6507/16275	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road	Support – the inclusion of H6 as allocation for housing.	1400/17371	The Wilberforce Trust
	Objection – the site has always been referred to as green belt. Development of this site would alter significantly the idea of the design of The Square. To put an access road through The Square would totally change the concept and style of the development. There are far more suitable sites around the city. Return this land to green belt.	1726/9806	Nixon Homes
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1835	NFU
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6614	
	Objection – area very built up already. It is almost impossible to get across the roundabout at rush hour, it can take 20 minutes to drive 100 yards. Proposed over development and over crowding will ruin what is one of the nicest areas in York. Reconsider on the grounds of overcrowding and poor infrastructure.	2757/7286	
	Objection –the Square was specifically designed as a cul de sac , if access is taken through The Square, this intensification of use would be dangerous – particularly as designed to be used by children playing. Junction with Tadcaster Road is already at capacity. The layout of parking and houses would lead to safety and visibility issues. Field is pristine parkland with two strategically planted clumps of trees, along with an area of woodland on the southern boundary, which need to be protected. Approximately 25% of the land is pristine ridge and furrow of historical and probably archaeological interest. Area is important for wildlife. As raised land and heavily treed it has a softening effect on the urban landscape which can be seen from the cycle track, footpath and ring road – for this reason alone it should not be removed from the green belt. Destroy environment for hospice patients.	3066/6051	
	Objection – green belt function. Environmental impact and TPOs. Proposed access through The Square is dangerous, given the road was designed to serve a cul de sac and its relationship with the hospice junction and Tadcaster Road junction which is already at capacity.	3129/8057	
	Objection – increasing the quantity of housing in the immediate vicinity will exacerbate road safety issues. Turning the cul de sac into a through road will make vehicular access to existing properties on The Square unsafe.	3300/8470	
	Objection – field currently green belt and contains mature, varied trees and evidence of medieval farming with ridge and furrow profile. Trees and field are healthy and provide significant benefits to the area, including the hospice. Area should not be lost, significant areas of brownfield exist.	3393/6451	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road continued	Objection – building will disturb wild birds. Increase traffic which is already bad in this area. Local schools are already full.	3548/9513	
	Objection – impact on traffic flow and access to the A64 – it is already a very hazardous manoeuvre. Concern over St Leonard’s Hospice – denying opportunity for future expansion and losing beautiful and uninterrupted view over the field for their patients.	3644/9656	
	Objection – only access would be via The Square. The junction of The Square with Tadcaster Road is already difficult to negotiate and any increase in traffic will very much increase the chances of an accident.	3676/9692	
	Objection – currently designated as green belt land. Loss of good quality agricultural land in what is an important green buffer zone between Dringhouses and the A64. Land has a number of mature trees, retains vestiges of ridge and furrow farming and supports a variety of wildlife. Development will have significant impact on traffic generation on Tadcaster Road. If access is taken via The Square it would be seriously detrimental to the quality, integrity and safety of the current development – it is doubtful if the current configuration and capacity of roads in and adjacent to The Square could cope with any additional traffic generated. Concentrate attention and effort on those larger sites of strategic significance which are most likely to deliver the Council’s longer term objectives.	3811/10261	
	Objection – land is green belt. The Square is visible from Sim Balk Lane and the ring road and H6 slopes steeply down towards both of these viewpoints – consider that the whole site should be maintained as green belt as development would detract from the ‘open landscape character and setting of the city from Sim Balk Lane and the ring road’. The historic boundary of the ‘open landscape’ in this particular spot was set by two past buildings which became brownfield sites (old York College and Wilberforce Home) – those original boundaries which define H6 as green belt should be preserved. Development would cause significant further traffic problems on the Tadcaster Road. The Square shares its access with the hospice and was designed as a cul-de-sac and could not possibly accommodate the extra traffic generated by this development – the access would have to be off The Grove. The present low volume of traffic provides relatively safe play areas for children – this would be lost if access went through The Square. Large area of pristine ridge and furrow shows evidence of medieval farming. Several large mature trees on the site, along with considerable biodiversity – providing a green lung. Development would prevent further expansion of the hospice and would totally enclose it – removing views of open countryside for the patients.	4190/10915	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road continued	Objection – impact of all the proposed developments in this area on the traffic situation at the Tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout.	4284/11107	
	Objection – unnecessary use of green belt land when brownfield sites are available. Area is already overdeveloped with very poor access to Tadcaster Road. Possible loss/damage to trees – some over 100 years old. Wildlife will also suffer.	4289/11124	
	Objection – hard to envisage access to this site being feasible through The Square. Volume of traffic using this section of Tadcaster Road would be further increased by the considerable extra traffic which would be generated if this proposal went ahead. Over many years the site has secured a significant biodiversity of many types of animals and insects as well as significant number of mature trees planted over 100 years ago. Delete this site from the plan.	4342/11259	
	Objection – inadequacy and dangers of creating access across The Square. Problems of traffic generation on/near to Tadcaster Road. Environmental concerns about the use of green belt land.	4343/6475	
	Objection – this section of Tadcaster Road is congested. The volume of traffic, multiple bus stops, pedestrian crossings and entrance roads means there is regularly queuing traffic and the road is hazardous. The roads in The Square were only designed to serve the number of homes it currently supports, not as a through road with potential of having to accommodate 130+ extra vehicles – too narrow, reversing vehicles, children playing, line of sight issues. Site identified as green belt in 2011. The open and traditional park landscaped environment boasts pristine ridge and furrow, which should be protected. There is a mature tree cluster planted some 120-150 years ago. Multiple Tree Protection Orders in place. The area has not been intensively farmed and due to this retains and supports an extensive variety of wildlife and biodiversity. Outlook from the hospice provides a valuable and peaceful outlook to patients.	4347/11266	
	Objection – there is considerable traffic using the junction from Tadcaster Road into The Square, need no further traffic using this road. Access to the hospice also needs to be taken into consideration. Spoil The Square which won a prestigious award in 2009 for its design and construction.	4374/11332	
	Objection – area should continue to be designated as green belt given the critical environmental and highways issues which do not appear to have been taken into account. Highways infrastructure is insufficient to support additional housing in this location. Further inevitable pressure on the Tadcaster Road infrastructure at this location which would result from additional residential property cannot be sustainable	4377/11335	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>from either a highways capacity or safety perspective. The road within The Square is not designed for through traffic and has property which directly stands on the road edge. Given that children use the area to play, an increase in traffic is likely to significantly increase the risk of a road traffic accident. The land was identified as green belt in 2011. It provides an open and traditional park landscape environment dating back to Victorian times and incorporating extensive ridge and furrow and mature and magnificent tree clusters dating back 120-150 years. The boundaries of this land also comprise rare specimens of tree and there are multiple tree protection orders in place. There is extensive wildlife incorporating many species and it is an important and vital green lung between the built up residential areas and the intensively farmed land and college recreational space. Site also provides a valuable and peaceful outlook and therapeutic amenity to patients and visitors of the hospice. Other more appropriate brownfield and greenfield sustainable sites should be used to meet the future housing demand for the city.</p>		
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road continued	<p>Objection – confused by the desire to add further housing into an area which already suffers from a congested road network i.e. Tadcaster Road. The additional traffic accessing through The Square would decrease the safety of children playing. Why seeking to destroy the character of a development which was awarded a design award?</p>	4406/11414	
	<p>Objection – ignores the many precedents created by council’s deliberations relating to green belt. Declassifying this area as green belt is inconsistent with National Planning Policy Framework guidelines on planning positively for networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Site appears never to have been cultivated in recent time, although visible ridge and furrow marks show evidence of medieval farming. There are several large mature (125-150 year old) trees. The site has a considerable biodiversity with a range of animals. It thus forms a green lung for the adjacent houses as well as the hospice. This development would have the effect of totally enclosing the hospice, preventing any further expansion of the hospice and its work. This is inconsistent with paragraph 2.43 of the local plan. Neither The Square nor the hospice road can be modified to meet the standard required for a through road and the junction with Tadcaster Road is already dangerous and cannot accommodate further traffic capacity. The Square is used as a play area and the development would lead to a high risk of pedestrian/vehicles conflicts. Site should be reconsidered with a valid and transparent site scoring system.</p>	4417/5059	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road continued	Objection – proposed building plans for Woodthorpe and Dringhouses is totally inappropriate for the size of the area and the existing facilities. The developments would mean hundreds more families relying on the existing facilities and more cars adding to the congestion. This site would cause problems for the hospice as the only access is through The Square which also serves the hospice.	4468/11484	
	Objection – development should not progress due to the traffic flow and access onto the A64, hazardous access to the Tadcaster Road, loss of trees which have been there for over a hundred years. Loss of tranquillity for hospice.	4493/5196	
	Objection – land is green belt. The junction onto Tadcaster Road is completely inadequate and would cause dangers to life if the volume of traffic were to be increased. The Square was not constructed to be a thoroughfare, children play in The Square and there are inadequate pavements and off road parking to enable this to be a safe access. There is significant wildlife in the area. The hospice needs this open space for the health and care of its patients.	4544/11548	
	Objection – inadequate and dangerous access across The Square due to its layout, design and technical characteristics. Won design award – why planning to spoil it? Designed as cul de sac and not a through road, no raised kerbs, only pavements on one side, reversing vehicles, children playing, visibility issues, and properties directly abut the road edge. There are already parking issues in The Square with no visitor parking. Problems created by increased traffic generation on and near to Tadcaster Road – junction already provides problematic access. Impact on environmental issues and concerns regarding the use of green belt land. Land has several features and characteristics that support its continuation as green belt. Identified as green belt in 2011. Area is unspoilt, open and typical traditional park landscaped. The land is home to several species of wildlife and biodiversity. Many mature and magnificent trees which are well in excess of 100 years old. It provides a rural buffer and landscape from the A64 and screens the built-up skyline of this part of York. Green lung between built up areas. Area provides an excellent outlook for hospice. Site boundary is made up of mature planting of mixed trees, shrubs and hedges, including several Tree Preservation Orders.	4727/12024	
	Objection – access onto Tadcaster Road is already problematic and is not suitable for further traffic capacity. The (award winning) layout, design and technical characteristics of The Square inhibit the use for vehicle access to the new development. Built as a Georgian square and cul de sac, not as a through road, no raised kerbs, only pavement on one side of the road, reversing vehicles, children	4779/12071	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>playing, visibility issues, and properties directly abut the road edge. Land has several features and characteristics that support its continuation as green belt. Identified as green belt in 2011. Provides an open and traditional park landscaped environment incorporating pristine ridge and furrow, mature and magnificent tree cluster planted some 120-150 years ago. Site boundary is made up of mature planting of mixed trees and shrubs, including multiple TPOs. Retains and supports an extensive variety of wildlife and biodiversity. It provides a rural barrier and landscape character from the A64 and hides the built-up skyline of this part of York. Green lung between built up areas. Provides peaceful, pastoral outlook and amenity to hospice, this development would cause housing to completely enclose the hospice. More appropriate brownfield and greenfield sustainable sites should be used to meet future housing demands.</p>		
<p>Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued</p>	<p>Objection – the design of The Square was one of communal living in a terraced row with little traffic due to the design, as a result the area is used as the common play area for the children on the development. The proposed development would fundamentally alter its original purpose and present dangers which have not been envisaged.</p>	<p>4788/12086</p>	
	<p>Objection - access onto Tadcaster Road is already problematic and is not suitable for further traffic capacity. The Square received an architecture award for its design, it is a Georgian square and cul de sac not suitable as a through road. It is too narrow to take through traffic. Reversing vehicles, properties that directly abut the road edge, visibility and children playing raises safety concerns. Land has a number of significant features and characteristics that support its continuation as green belt. Provides an open and traditional park landscaped environment incorporating pristine ridge and furrow and a number of mature trees plated approximately 120 – 160 years ago. Site boundary is made up of mature planting of mixed trees and shrubs, including multiple Tree Preservation Orders. Retains and supports an extensive variety of wildlife and biodiversity. Provides a valuable peaceful outlook to the hospice.</p>	<p>5122/12230</p>	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposed withdrawal of green belt status of this land. The junction into The Square is regularly the cause of delays. The road within The Square is narrow and not constructed to be a through road. The pavement area is restricted which is not conducive to larger volume of traffic. Cars are required to reverse onto the road which will further contribute to safety issues if traffic volumes increase, particularly given the number of children that play in the area. Destruction of the environment seems inconsistent with the architecture award that The Square won. Hard to believe that there are not more appropriate brownfield sites available. Land</p>	<p>5169/12306</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	provides a great landscape, has a significant number of mature trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife. This gives a great outlook from the hospice.		
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued	Objection – strong case can be argued for making this site permanent green belt. With mature trees, mammals and birds it is intrinsically valuable as a green lung to the area. All potential accesses would lead onto the already busy Tadcaster Road. The road into The Square is narrow. At present children can play there in relative safety, increased numbers of vehicles would change that. Should be seeking to conserve all agricultural land while encouraging building on brownfield and non-agricultural sites.	5193/12413	
	Objection – to development of Greenfield site and suggested access via The Square of the hospice. Issues already exist regarding traffic safety and congestion at the junction with Tadcaster Road. Development would increase vehicle volume to an unworkable extent and cause compete grid-lock. Cul de sac currently provides safe play area for children; traffic access to proposed development would put an end to the safety of the area. Site was identified as green belt in 2011. The field is a green lung of natural relief in an increasingly built up area. It provides a natural habitat to many forms of wildlife. It has trees that are approximately 160 years old. Greenfield tranquillity is beneficial to hospice.	5199/12421	
	Objection – part of this Greenfield area has well preserved medieval ridge and furrow, one of the very few remaining in Dringhouses. This evidence of the history of the farming community should be preserved.	5470/14819	Dringhouses Local History Group
	Objection – impact on area’s already failing infrastructure, particularly roundabout between Moor Lane and Tadcaster Road which is congested and hazardous. Public transport offers no realistic alternative. Park and Ride is good but stops at 8pm so cannot be used for evenings out in the city.	5541/14966	
	Objection – field is the only green space for residents of the hospice to enjoy. It contains some magnificent trees, as well as sheep and lambs grazing. It must not be destroyed.	5586/13094	
	Objection – building on this field would have the same intrusive effect on the green belt as seen from Sim Balk Lane as site ref 248 and should therefore also be given the same ‘natural environment asset’ status. It is also a sanctuary for wildlife, whereas site ref 248 is a modern intensively cultivated, chemically sprayed field. Proposed access is either through the award winning The Square or the hospice which is a private road and the hospice would not allow this. The Tadcaster Road entrance is already extremely busy. It is very difficult and often dangerous to exit The Square	5598/13133	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>turning right. Any increase in traffic volume would be unacceptable. The roads, kerbs, pavements and house layout around The Square were designed as a cul de sac and would not be fit for purpose with the proposed access. It is currently a safe 'street play area' for the children that live there, the impact of more vehicles would be extremely dangerous. The field is a unique natural environment asset as a meadow and a green lung, it acts as a 'wildlife staging post' for the area. The view of the meadow is part of the palliative care of patients in the hospice, the extension of the hospice was specifically designed to blend into and view the green belt meadow. All approved and guided by Council planners at the time.</p>		
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued	<p>Objection – meadow should be protected as essential green belt land for York's environment. Wildlife treasure with some trees under preservation orders and an impressive list of species of birds, butterflies, bees and other insects. The Tadcaster Road is very congested.</p>	5639/13269	
	<p>Objection – the residents of this hospice currently have lovely views.</p>	5652/13296	
	<p>Objection – impact on the traffic on Tadcaster Road is a huge factor. Water pressure in the area has dropped significantly since all the new houses were built on the college site. The road floods at the entrance to the Hospice/Square. Hospice bedrooms face out onto the land, providing peaceful surroundings for patients. Where are the plans for schools, doctor's surgeries, playgrounds etc? Will they have to expand Dringhouses school onto more of the playground losing valuable play space?</p>	5655/13302	
	<p>Objection – main junction onto Tadcaster Road and the smaller ones within The Square are inadequate for access to the proposed extra housing. It is currently an uncultivated field, which is a haven for wildlife. Loss of view and tranquillity that the field provides to the patients at the hospice. Green belt land.</p>	5811/13751	
	<p>Objection – regarded as green belt land in 2011 assessment. More suitable brown belt areas along with numerous derelict sites. Site provides a space between urban areas (York and Bishopthorpe). Tadcaster Road is constantly busy. Children already not able to attend local schools. Area of tranquillity and amenity to hospice community.</p>	5821/13775	
	<p>Objection – land has always been considered green belt. The Square was not designed to act as a through-road and the road layout would not easily accommodate such a large increase in volume of traffic. Adverse impact on Hospice, which would be surrounded by development and busy road. When College site was considered planning committee was keen to ensure that the housing was kept as far away from the hospice boundary as possible.</p>	5822/13777	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued	Objection – the increase in cars will contribute to congestion in the area. Development would mean the destruction of numerous mature trees with dramatic effect on wildlife. Question the demand for new housing in this area, The Square continues to have vacant properties. Development to the north of the city with the planned new stations seems a more coherent plan, further development at H6 seems extraneous to the overall plans. Development here will surround the hospice and limit the chance of expansion to meet future needs.	6121/15542	
	Objection – access junction to The Square from Tadcaster Road is already problematic, additional traffic will only increase the problem. The Square does not appear equipped to accommodate through traffic and is regularly used by children playing – an obvious safety concern. Vehicles regularly reverse out of driveways directly on to the road. Site was identified as green belt land as recently as 2011 and should be endorsed as such.	6127/15553	
	Objection – site was identified as green belt in 2011. Land has a number of significant features and characteristics that supports its continuation a green belt. Number of mature trees on the site which are over 100 years old, shrubs and wildlife. There are more appropriate brownfield and Greenfield sites that can be used to meet future housing demand in York. Development would completely enclose the hospice. Junction with Tadcaster Road already presents problematic access, and is not suitable for further traffic capacity. The layout, design and technical characteristics of The Square inhibit the use of the current road layout for vehicle access to any new development. Children regularly make use of the road in The Square as a play area, so increased vehicles would be a huge safety concern.	6138/15599	
	Objection – this site should be allocated to meet the future needs for health care facilities in York. Housing development would have an adverse impact on the operation and function of the hospice. Loss of the fields would seriously compromise the caring environment of the hospice and would be contrary to policy CF4 by failing to protect existing community facilities. Constraints on the site – overlooking from hospice and mature trees means the number of homes is likely to be less than the 61 units in the plan. This will result in inefficient use of land. There is increasing demand for the services offered by the hospice, if this site were designated for health care it would provide the opportunity for expansion or for complementary health care use.	6142/15611	St Leonard's Hospice
	Objection – site should continue as green belt on the basis of key environmental and access issues. Identified as green belt in 2011 plan and is Greenfield site. Provides open, set, traditional park-landscaped environment. 20% of the area is pristine ridge	6216/6155	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and furrow. 20% of the area is mature, magnificent tree clusters planted as park land of the Dringthorpe estate some 120 years ago. Multiple Tree Protection Orders. Area has not been intensively farmed and therefore retains and supports an extensive variety of wildlife and ecology. Provides a rural barrier and landscape character from the A64 and hides the built up skyline of this part of York. Provides a valuable peaceful outlook and amenity to the patients and visitors of the hospice. Provides useful green space between current built up areas. Release of this area will open up pressure for encroachment and use of further fields beyond. Junction with Tadcaster Road is already problematic and not suitable for further traffic. As a consequence of traffic volume, nearby bus stops and pedestrian crossings this section of the road regularly contains queuing traffic. The layout, design and technical characteristics of The Square inhibit the use of the current road layout for vehicle access to any new development – Georgian square and cul de sac, no raised kerbs, safety for children playing, route not designed for through traffic and has property which directly abuts the road edge.</p>		
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued	<p>Objection – important access and environmental aspects. Identified as green belt in 2011 plan. The area provides a vital open aspect and provides a rural barrier and landscape as viewed from the A64 and conceals a great deal of the built up skyline of York. Almost half the area comprises excellent ridge and furrow land and a plethora of fine trees planted in the Victorian era. Also the boundaries are made up of established trees and shrubs. The land has not been intensively farmed and many varieties of wildlife are sustained and protected within the fields. Land provides an essential peaceful vista for the patients and visitors to the hospice. Development will risk further plans for building developments on fields beyond. Access via the junction onto Tadcaster Road is already difficult to negotiate due to the current volume of traffic and would be severely exacerbated should more properties be permitted. The layout, design and technical characteristics of The Square inhibit the use of the current road layout for vehicle access to any new development – Georgian square and cul de sac, no raised kerbs, safety for children playing, route not designed for through traffic and has property which directly borders the road edge.</p>	6221/15766	
	<p>Objection – the access road through The Square is totally inappropriate. The Square was designed as a cul de sac, not a through road and poses safety issues in relation to lack of visibility and kids playing. The road is not wide enough to be used as an access road. The junction onto the Square is already at capacity and more traffic will cause queuing to get out of the junction and make it unsafe to turn right. Loss of a</p>	6247/6174	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	fantastic example of ridge and furrow which is of historic access and should be preserved.		
Site H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road Continued	Objection – The Square is not designed for through traffic. The roads are too narrow and have pavements on one side only. There are also safety implications given the design and layout of the houses and driveways. Traffic has problems at present joining or leaving Tadcaster Road, adding further vehicles would take this from inconvenient to unsafe. Making the road a thoroughfare would make it unsafe for children to play. Land is largely ancient ridge and furrow and provides a useful buffer from the intensive farming further towards to the A64. Magnificent trees probably planted together as part of a parkland scheme some 165 years ago. Form impressive visual amenity as well as haven for wildlife. Non green belt or Brownfield sites should be built on instead.	6250/6175	
	Objection – to the proposed change from green belt. Area was never designed for through traffic and is too narrow, with pavements on one side only. There are also safety implications given the design and layout of the houses and driveways. Traffic has problems at present joining or leaving Tadcaster Road, adding further vehicles would make this not just inconvenient but unsafe as well. Making the road a thoroughfare would make it unsafe for children to play. Field has several old and beautiful trees all of which date from the 1850s. Ancient ridge and furrow land should also not be destroyed as it forms a wildlife habitat.	6254/6180	
	Objection – the field behind the hospice will destroy tranquillity for patients, an important nature reserve, ruin the purpose of The Square and the traffic generated will overwhelm the road system.	6269/15844	
	Objection – impact on the setting of the city and the open landscape from the A64. Destroy productive agricultural land and encroach on land that has always been considered as green belt. Access through The Square is inadequate as this was not considered when the road layout was designed. Access onto the Tadcaster Road would have difficulty in coping with an increase in traffic. The detrimental effect on the hospice, which is an oasis of calm, is unacceptable – when the college site was considered the planning committee were very keen to ensure that the housing was kept as far away from the boundary as possible. Development on this site would hem the hospice site in. Site lies in draft green belt. Community facilities and infrastructure in the ward are already overstretched and residents are concerned that these developments will bring new residents but not the investment in new school and roads that is needed.	6515/16315	Cllr Ann Reid

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H7 Bootham Crescent	Support – supportive of allocation of H7 for 69 dwellings.	659/15060	Persimmon Homes
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6615	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H8 Askham Bar Park and Ride	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6616	
	Objection – area very built up already. It is almost impossible to get across the roundabout at rush hour, it can take 20 minutes to drive 100 yards. Proposed over development and over crowding will ruin what is one of the nicest areas in York. Reconsider on the grounds of overcrowding and poor infrastructure.	2757/7287	
	Objection – who would want to buy a house with a congested bridge on one side, the railway line on the other, Tesco and its car park on the other side with a view of the petrol station on another?	2802/7438	
	Objection – impact of all the proposed developments in this area on the traffic situation at the Tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout.	4284/11108	
	Objection – impact on area’s already failing infrastructure, particularly roundabout between Moor Lane and Tadcaster Road which is congested and hazardous. Public transport offers no realistic alternative. Park and Ride is good but stops at 8pm so cannot be used for evenings out in the city.	5541/14967	
	Objection – impact on the traffic on Tadcaster Road is a huge factor. Water pressure in the area has dropped significantly since all the new houses were built on the college site. Where are the plans for schools, doctor’s surgeries, playgrounds etc? Will they have to expand Dringhouses school onto more of the playground losing valuable play space?	5655/13303	
	Objection – grave doubts about the suitability of this site for housing being as it is sandwiched between a railway line, 24 hour supermarket, petrol station and two busy roads.	5822/13779	
	Comment – additional housing will affect volumes of traffic on Tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout. An in-depth traffic survey and subsequent road improvement proposals must be undertaken to highlight the potential problems that will be encountered on Tadcaster Road.	5855/15109	
	Objection – developments proposed in this area will have a serious effect on this already busy roundabout.	6055/15501	
	Support – allocation for 50 houses.	6507/16271	City Of York Council Property Services
Objection – both employment and houses are probably acceptable use although both will add to the traffic accessing this busy radial route. It is not a very attractive site for house, sandwiched between the East Coast mainline, 24 hour supermarket, petrol station and 2 busy radial roads. The market will dictate its eventual use.	6515/16317	Cllr Ann Reid	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H9 Land Off Askham Lane	Objection – there are serious drainage issues in the area. Damp and drainage are a problem in a number of properties, with one property currently uninhabitable. During periods of heavy rainfall the problem is exacerbated with many nearby properties having to be sandbagged. Culvert at the top of Foxwood Lane is full of water in the winter months. The area has a very high water table. Yorkshire Water have accepted there is a major issue in the area. Foxwood Lane pumping station is now over capacity. Land has at least two rights of way across it which have been in use for at least 30 years and can be verified. Land is used for informal recreation by residents and there is a lack of informal recreation space in the area. Land is set on a high ridge, forms a green and open setting to the city from which can be seen the Minster, Howe Hill water tower and other landmarks.	118/12868	Foxwood Residents Association
	Objection – support the identification of this site for short to medium term housing development, however strongly object to the proposed boundary. The site boundary does not follow any natural boundary and there is no logic to the boundary proposed. Propose that the boundary be extended to follow a natural boundary (plan attached to response). This would increase the potential yield for the site to 135 units.	528/16662	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – destroy the green belt and hurt the rural setting of the area. It would be better to develop other areas rather than this area in which horse graze and people walk. The local infrastructure will not cope.	1906/82	
	Objection – land is currently used to graze horses and provides an informal recreation facility for residents.	1909/89	
	Objection – the last thing this area and the city needs is more suburban sprawl.	1910/90	
	Objection - There are alternative previously developed now derelict sites which could be used. This has been in the draft green belt for decades.	1921/126	
	Objection - Site contributes to rural setting of city; also land grazes horses and provides informal recreation area for residents.	1922/132	
	Objection - Building on green belt land should be last resort after all brown field sites have been exhausted. Field at top of Foxwood Lane because of its height and position would unduly block and overshadow present housing and spoil open approach to area.	1924/136	
	Objection – Acomb Moor has been in (draft) green belt for several decades. Area has been protected to avoid the local community being overlooked by development near the 'Great Knoll' highpoint and to ensure the skyline of the city is not compromised. It has important ecological features which should be conserved. Council described it as recently as 2011 as contributing towards the rural setting of the city. Land provides informal recreation facility for residents and grazing for animals. There are alternative	1926/138	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	previously developed now derelict sites which could be used.		
Site H9 Land Off Askham Lane continued	Objection - Object for all reasons in Focus newsletter of Foxwood.	1927/139	
	Objection – Object to the site.	1929/141	
	Objection – site has been considered green belt for many years. One of the few places from which everyone can view the whole city skyline from Holgate Windmill to Terry’s and the racecourse. Contributes to the rural feel of the otherwise solid suburban area of Foxwood. Used for informal recreation for nearby residents. More houses means more cars, more pollution, more waste, more people in already crowded city.	2008/599	
	Objection – site has been in the (draft) green belt for many years. Council described it as recently as 2011 as contributing towards the rural setting of the city. Land provides informal recreation facility for residents and grazing for animals. Plenty of brownfield sites which could be used for housing. Area has been protected to avoid the local community being overlooked by development near the ‘Great Knoll’ highpoint and to ensure the skyline of the city is not compromised.	2051/921	
	Objection - Land has been in green belt for several decades and protected to avoid overlooking by development near great knoll high point and ensuring that city’s skyline is not compromised. Provides an informal recreation facility for residents.	2313/3274	
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6617	
	Objection – Acomb Moor has been in the draft green belt for several decades. Area needs to be protected to avoid local community being overlooked by development near ‘Great Knoll’ high point and to ensure city skyline is not compromised. Important ecological features should be conserved. Land is currently used to graze horses and provides an informal recreation facility for residents. Area was described as recently as 2011 as ‘contributing towards to rural setting of the city’. Wildlife such as deer are seen here. Problems may be encountered with the road infrastructure and drainage. TPOs on Foxwood lane. Public rights of way are part of this land and should be preserved.	2722/7216	
	Objection – the field floods, development of the land would decrease the drainage and cause more flooding problems. Currently a lack of open space for recreational activities. Development would decrease the amount of natural wildlife in the area. Development would increase noise, traffic and pollution. There aren’t enough resources locally such as schools and shops.	3016/7851	
	Objection – the site should not be developed and should remain in the green belt.	3119/8034	
	Objection – to building on green belt land. Area is so built up already. Foxwood Lane is a busy road now, further housing would increase this.	3141/8088	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H9 Land Off Askham Lane continued	Objection – building will create more drainage problems. Field is used daily by ramblers, dog walkers and nature lovers. This is the highest point in York to view the city. Building on higher ground will impact on privacy/light for nearby residents. Loss of grazing land and wildlife. Propose build on area across the other side of Askham Lane – flat, unused land.	4104/10807	
	Objection – loss of green belt and agricultural land. Foxwood needs open country-space, such a small awkwardly shaped site should be left as green belt.	4124/4834	
	Objection – to removal of site from green belt and build homes there. Green belt designation was confirmed in 2011. The land was the site of the former Ainsty Hunt kennels – a reminder of the hare coursing which took place on Acomb Moor. Subsequently the land has been grazed for over 40 years. There are significant drainage issues in the area and builders have commented on the high water table in the area. There are at least two rights of way across this land which are used daily and have been in existence for over 35 years. The land is used as informal recreation by residents, ramblers, dog walkers and children. Any development would destroy the wildlife habitats for foxes and deer besides numerous species of birds and flowers. Land is one of the highest points in the city, any development would mar the view across the city and the approach to the city – this was recognised in 2011 and must still be the case. Any access points would be on a hill, on a bend with reduced visibility and inevitably there would be harm to existing mature trees. Brownfield sites should be used instead.	4334/11250	
	Objection – field has been used for grazing for at least 50 years. Previously it supported the kennels of the York and Ainsty Hunt and in the 18 th century, the moor was used for horse racing. A public right of way crosses the field in the direction of the Great Knoll. The area is extensively used by residents for informal recreational purposes – no assessment has been made of the field’s recreational value. Land is included in the (draft) green belt as assessment previously concluded that this land contributed to the rural setting of the approach to the City. Land has a significant gradient. There have been no planning applications to develop Acomb Moor or the area surrounding it. Should continue to be included in the green belt due to its contribution to the transition from rural to urban landscape; the topography of the land; the need to preserve the skyline of the city; the need to avoid dominance of nearby properties; the requirement for informal open space; conservation of flora and fauna including the contribution to the green wedges in the area; and drainage issues. There are various windfall alternatives (outlined in response).	4372/11610	Save Acomb Moor Campaign

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H9 Land Off Askham Lane Continued	Comment – the proposed development is only 1.3ha of one field. It is at the lower end of that field requiring improved management. The area would have no impact on the city skyline as it falls well below the domes on the development at the top end of Foxwood Lane. It takes up such a small area of that field that there would still be room for the current horses to graze. The proposal is a way to provide the increase housing, provide increased business for local shops, and improve the visual effect of that designated area without detracting from any ecological benefits of the Moor. Any development should be in keeping with the local area. In addition it would be great if there is a way to manage the area designated as a moor to make better use of the land whilst retaining it as a great way for local residents to enjoy exercise for themselves and their dogs.	4807/12115	
	Objection – field is used daily by animals, dog walkers and nature ramblers. Proposed site is the wrong shape. A link road would cause chaos. Will be a problem in trying to relocate horses. Building at the top of the field near the roundabout would be more common sense as the ground is much flatter, there would be easier access to the roundabout and it would leave a path of green belt to break up the sprawling buildings. There is a huge drainage problem in this area. New builds must fit in with their surroundings. The field is a well known vantage point used by walkers and recreationalists as a viewing area to see the whole of York and the surrounding area.	5180/12378	
	Objection – Opposed to any development at Foxwood Lane Field. The field has irreplaceable recreational benefits. The area is partially protected having tree protection orders in place and development will destroy the habitat of flora and fauna. Environmental issues such as more traffic more pollution more noise. Lack of infrastructure to accommodate more people and more children. The spoiling of a scenic route. Dedicated housing trust estates generally cause an increase in noise mess and antisocial behaviour.	5487/14847	
	Objection – development will affect the beautiful skyline view of the city. There are many other options without building on green belt land such as Our Lady’s primary or Lowfields School sites.	5497/14869	
	Objection – to development of green belt land.	5525/14940	
	Objection – site allows beautiful views over Acomb to the Minster. Need to preserve the High Knoll. Wildlife is abundant, the habitats of which would be destroyed. Land is very elevated and development would cause overlooking and loss of light. Field has so much to offer everyone in Acomb, dog walkers, grazing, and open space.	5693/13416	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H9 Land Off Askham Lane continued	Support – this is a good proposal and a good area to provide housing, the field appears un-kept and straggly, houses would tidy it up a little.	6271/15854	
	Objection – the loss of the Foxwood and Woodthorpe green wedge in the 1990s meant that the loss of the green corridor around the edge of Foxwood/Acomb will be keenly felt. Provides a key recreational area for walking. Sloping nature of the land means any development on this site will have overlooking impact on existing residents and will have an impact on the approach to the west of the city. There was sufficient Brownfield land in 2011 to provide housing for the plan period.	6288/15894	
	Objection – to the inclusion of part of Acomb Moor as a development site in the plan. Believe that the site should continue to be included in the green belt as it protects the rural setting of the western approach to the city and avoids the dominance that any buildings near the Great Knoll would have on the surrounding area. The moor is an important recreation amenity for local residents and this should be recognised in the plan.	Petition 2	
	Objection – to the inclusion of part of Acomb Moor as a development site in the plan. Believe that the site should continue to be included in the green belt as it protects the rural setting of the western approach to the city and avoids the dominance that any buildings near the Great Knoll would have on the surrounding area. The moor is an important recreation amenity for local residents and this should be recognised in the plan.	Petition 12	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H10 Barbican Centre (Remaining Land)	Comment – site lies opposite the City Walls. Great care would need to be taken to ensure that the elements which contribute to their significance are not harmed.	238/14075	English Heritage
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6618	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H11 Land At Frederick House, Fulford Road	Comment – site adjoins the Fulford Road Conservation Area. Development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14076	English Heritage
	Objection – whilst support the allocation of this site and its suitability for housing, it could also serve other uses. The site should therefore be identified in the plan as one that could accommodate a range of uses including: housing, education/nursing home (C2), medical facility (D1) and/or hotel (C1).	1401/17374	Shepherd Construction
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6619	
	Objection – the existing green infrastructure should be protected in any development for housing. The woodland at the eastern end of the site adjacent to Walmgate Stray and gardens on Kilburn Road should be protected as part of open space provision.	6518/16391	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H12 Land	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6620	
RO Stockton Lane/Greenfield Park Drive	Objection – proposed housing is inappropriate, will impact on unique character of Heworth Without and would put immense strain on local infrastructure. Development on brownfield sites should be maximised. Will cause severe congestion and air pollution.	3603/9589	
	Objection – development would harm the unique character of the area, cause severe congestion and air pollution. The area of Heworth has virtually no local facilities, the only junior school is at capacity and the only secondary school has been removed along with bus services. How would Hopgrove roundabout cope as it is already not fit for purpose. How would the two sets of high voltage lines running across the site be overcome?	5752/13577	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H13 Our Lady's Primary School (Existing Building Footprint)	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6621	
	Support – housing on Our Lady's School ground.	2418/6693	
	Objection – whilst the plan states that only 29 dwellings will be built on the brownfield footprint, an application has been made for 56 dwellings. Object to this increase in the quantity of dwellings. Site is surrounded by Hob Moor Nature Reserve and sensitive wildlife areas. Over development of the site, removing all trees, will impact heavily on wildlife. The development will put extra burdens on local amenities and would not retain the grassy spaces and open spaces characteristic of this area.	3245/8323	
	Objection – level of development proposed by Yorkshire Housing conflicts with the assurance in 2010 that only the footprint of the build area would be redeveloped. It appears that the playing fields and the small nature reserve would be incorporated into the development. The proposals assume a density far in excess of those proposed in the draft Local Plan. Principle of development on this site and the need to maximise affordable housing availability is understood. Together with the nearby development on Newbury Avenue these high density developments would be a challenge and should be conditional on major improvements to local community facilities including bus frequencies, playgrounds, and road layouts and parking arrangements.	5759/13616	
	Objection – although the plan indicates that this site could be developed for 29 units based on the built footprint of the school, at the same time a consultation was undertaken on a proposal for 56 dwellings across the whole of the site, including the wildlife buffer area. This does not seem to be in the spirit of proper consultation. It further compounds the issues in the area with restricted road infrastructure.	6288/15895	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H14 32 Lawrence Street	Comment – there is a row of Grade II listed dwellings at Ellen Wilson Hospital to the east of this site and the church of St Lawrence is also grade II listed. Development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.	238/14077	English Heritage
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6622	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H15 Beckfield Lane Depot	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6623	
	Support – allocation for 18 houses.	6507/16272	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H16 Sessions, Huntington Road	Comment – sad to lose Sessions, but housing is a good use of land.	258/14150	
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6624	
	Objection – question the scale of development proposed for Huntington. Provision of schooling must be an integral part of development. New provision of community facilities, including spaces where church services can be held.	3584/9547	Church Of England Parish Of Huntington, Earswick & New Earswick
	Objection – this is already a heavily saturated area with few green spaces. Residential streets in the area are now used as cut-throughs from Monks Cross to other parts of the city; more residents feeding onto these roads will make it impossible for people living on those streets. No more flats needed.	5789/14438	
	Objection – oppose building 2000 houses in Huntington and New Earswick Ward.	Petition 1	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H17 Burnholme WMC	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6625	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H18 Land Of Woodland Chase, Clifton Moor	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6626	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H19 Land At Mill Mount	Comment – the site lies within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area. Development proposals for this area need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the area are not harmed.	238/14078	English Heritage
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6627	
	Objection – welcome and support the allocation for residential but given its location it is considered the site could also serve other uses such as medical, hotel or leisure use. The site should therefore be allocated in the plan for a range of uses including housing; education/nursing home (C2); medical (D1); and hotel (C1).	4390/11749	Shepherd Engineering Services Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H20	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6628	
Oakhaven EPH	Support – allocation for 15 houses.	6507/16278	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H21 Woolnough House EPH	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6629	
	Support – allocation for 11 houses.	6507/16279	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H22	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6630	
Heworth Lighthouse	Support – allocation for 13 houses.	6507/16273	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H23 Grove House EPH	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6631	
	Support – allocation for 11 houses.	6507/16277	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H24 Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road	Comment – site adjoins the Fulford Road Conservation Area. Consort House is Grade II listed. Development proposals for this area need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.	238/14079	English Heritage
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6632	
	Comment – welcome development of this contaminated site for housing, although consideration could be given for community use given its location.	6518/16392	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H25 Heworth Green North (Remaining Land)	Objection – propose that the whole of the Heworth Green North site (between the River Foss to the west and the access road to the former Transco site to the east and from Eboracum Way in the north to Layerthorpe in the south) be allocated for mixed use development including residential, student residences, hotel, retail, restaurant, public house and drive through restaurant uses.	1041/17042	Tiger Developments
	Support – this allocation is acceptable.	2416/6633	
	Objection – would add pressure to the road system.	5592/13115	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington	Objection – in 1994 the planning inspector decided that this land must be designated as green belt. Proposal will substantially disadvantage high performing school, changing delightful rural location. It will exacerbate traffic problems outside the school. Unlikely to result in any additional bus services and therefore lead to a significant increase in private car travel on an already very busy road. Site could be evaluated for very small scale development if absolutely necessary.	61/12685	Elvington Parish Council
	Comment – this site is within 200m proximity of the operation boundary of Elvington Waste Water Treatment Work (WWTW). Given the proximity of existing residential properties and the small scale of the WWTW there may be no issue however the layout should reflect the proximity and potential for nuisance.	295/14168	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection – a large housing estate of this size is not at all in keeping with the surroundings and is out of proportion to the character, shape and form of the rest of the village. Development would present problems of access and exacerbate the already problematic traffic conditions, especially around the school area. Bus service is currently very unsatisfactory. Should at least be reduced in scale.	657/16804	
	Comment – this proposal has merit in consolidating the centre of the village but several issues to resolve. Is 97 houses too many for the site? What % will be low cost? Will the bus service be upgraded to allow a proper and convenient rush hour service to and from York? Access is a problem (Dauby/Kexby Lane – choke points at school and waterworks) – if on to main road that a mini roundabout might be useful in helping egress as well as slowing traffic approaching the school. School is already well subscribed, what plans are there to enlarge it?	1008/17014	
	Objection – seem determined to change the character of villages, in Elvington intend to build approx a fifth more houses. This development is too large and will surround the school, a school which is in no way large enough to cope with such a large number of new incomers. Construction will create noise and dust for school environment.	1259/17135	
	Objection – it is necessary to undertake more detailed assessments of the potential increases in recreational disturbance to the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area/Special Area of Conservation resulting from this allocation. This will determine whether any mitigation is required and feasible. Requirements for mitigation should then be incorporated into the policy wording. If mitigation is not possible then the allocation should be removed.	1399/17366	RSPB
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1836	NFU
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6634	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Support – agree with possible more housing, main concerns are the level of traffic through the village and safety. Would like traffic lights and pedestrian crossing at the junction of Dauby Lane and Elvington Lane and paths made wider.	2658/7037	
	Objection – local infrastructure can barely cope now, development will cause more run off and make drainage and flooding problems worse. School is at capacity and parking around the school is bad. Roads and congestion – accessing the A1079 and reduced traffic safety around the school. Public transport virtually non-existent. Use brownfield sites instead.	2720/7213	
	Objection – infrastructure is already at full capacity. Teaching space at the school is already at bursting point with no/limited space/funds to expand. Extremely busy surgery. Elvington is prone to floods; building on green belt will only increase the risk of flooding. Road access to the village is poor.	3011/7847	
	Objection – infrastructure is already at full capacity. Teaching space at the school is already at bursting point with no/limited space/funds to expand. Extremely busy surgery. Elvington is prone to floods; building on green belt will only increase the risk of flooding. Additional traffic on terrible B1228 road.	3031/7879	
	Objection – infrastructure is already at full capacity. Teaching space at the school is already at bursting point with no/limited space/funds to expand. Extremely busy surgery. Elvington is prone to floods; building on green belt will only increase the risk of flooding. Additional traffic on terrible B1228 road.	3046/7899	
	Objection – new developments would impact on the village amenities. Traffic is already very busy with HGVs and agricultural vehicles. Additional traffic could prove dangerous. School would become oversubscribed. Building more houses would cause more flooding.	3106/8005	
	Objection – the shape of the village with tight inset boundary and size of the community support the local businesses well and village life is thriving. Significant increase in pupils would push school above capacity. Without the evidence for new jobs there is no need for the extra houses. The village main street is already often congested with HGVs and agricultural traffic, any addition to the number of vehicles in the village would be detrimental.	3108/8010	
	Objection – increased traffic. Impact on services and drainage. Village would spread losing its well defined boundaries; Elvington would no longer be a characterful village. Impact on the school. No guarantee of more jobs in the York area and therefore the need for this housing.	3113/8020	
	Objection – present infrastructure is already operating at full capacity. Development	3135/8074	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would alter for the worse the rural character and form of the village.		
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – in 1994 Inspector stated that site should remain in green belt. Development would disproportionately damage the character and setting of the village and is contrary to established green belt policies. The centre of the village is a conservation area and tight green belt boundary has a positive role in maintaining and protecting the character of the village. Development would be contrary to the established shape and form of the village. Elvington should thus be considered an inset village only ‘of limited growth’ for future planning purposes. Further development will impose additional traffic problems upon the already dangerous B1228 through the village. There is no apparent local need for significant housing in Elvington.	3220/8284	
	Objection – more development in Elvington will make accessing and leaving the village impossible at peak times. Roads are very narrow in the centre of the village and more traffic would be dangerous. Dauby Lane is narrow and poorly maintained. Sewer and surface water drain does not cope now in heavy rain. Medical centre struggles to cope with existing patient numbers and the school is full.	3532/9480	
	Objection – will add to existing congestion on the B1228 and surrounding areas. Road is very narrow through the village and would prove even more dangerous with increased traffic. Sewer and surface water drains cannot cope now in heavy rain. School and medical centre would not cope with number of new people.	3539/9495	
	Objection – will add traffic to the B1228 which already struggles to cope at peak times. Road surface is appalling. The main sewer and surface water drains do not cope at times of heavy rain. Medical centre struggles to give an appointment. School would need extensive work to enable it to cope with more children.	3598/9580	
	Objection – increased traffic. Current amenities would be placed under pressure (school). Impact on rural location.	3909/10451	
	Objection – infrastructure in Elvington already at full capacity (school, GP, B1228 and anti-flood systems).	3936/10483	
	Objection – land around Elvington must remain green belt to maintain the village integrity, keep natural surface drainage and help prevent future flooding (drainage systems cannot cope with flash flood and heavy rain), prevent over stretching of local services (doctors and school), prevent overstretched B1228 becoming even more hazardous to local pedestrians and commuters.	4181/10913	
	Objection – developments would have too great an impact on the village structure and its way of life. Development would be put of proportion to the rest of the village and its character. Loss of green belt land. Dauby Lane is already overloaded with the	4348/11267	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	volume of traffic, so an increase in traffic would only exacerbate the problems. Would the village infrastructure be able to cope – with the increase in pupil numbers at the school and the increase in runoff and flooding? Development is not designed for local needs but for a net immigration to the village.		
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – the number of homes proposed for this site is simply over development. Rural feel of the school and village as a whole would be lost. Increased number of vehicles round the school would be incredibly dangerous as well as causing traffic problems generally.	4358/11292	
	Objection – concerned about impact upon Elvington school. There are limited funds for spaces, expansion and the school is already at bursting point. The doctor’s surgery is extremely busy with no additional resources planned for additional patients. Additional traffic on the poorly maintained B1228. Village is prone to floods, building on green belt land will lead to less land that is able to soak up rain. Without any investment in the infrastructure creating a poorer quality of life for current and new residents.	5146/12268	
	Objection – concerned about impact upon Elvington school. There are limited funds for spaces, expansion and the school is already at bursting point. The doctor’s surgery is extremely busy with no additional resources planned for additional patients. Additional traffic on the poorly maintained B1228. Village is prone to floods, building on green belt land will lead to less land that is able to soak up rain. Without any investment in the infrastructure creating a poorer quality of life for current and new residents.	5147/12273	
	Objection – unnecessary loss of green belt. Neither Dauby Lane nor Main Street are appropriate for the extra vehicle movements that will be created. Conflict between pedestrians and vehicles adjacent to school will increase to unsafe levels. Lack of footpaths on Dauby Lane and one side of Main Street. Current drainage system is not adequate for the addition of new housing, increasing the flash flooding risk. A wood of mature trees will be destroyed, affecting the local wildlife habitat and increasing CO2.	5162/12293	
	Objection – all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s green belt.	5223/12499	
	Comment – if building has to take place in Elvington, this site would be better, although the number of homes is too high. Suburban style density is inappropriate for the village setting; it would have a huge impact on terms of traffic and environment. A much more modest number would be preferred.	5235/12554	
	Objection – current proposals are way in excess of what the village can cope with.	5259/14350	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Developments would require a doubling in size of the school. Amount of traffic around school is already a hazard. Queuing traffic at Hull Road junction would also increase. Insufficient public transport into York. Blight the nature of the village, middle of which is a conservation area. Residents would use Elvington as a dormitory town so no benefit to village community. No facilities for older children. Surgery would be unable to cope with large increase in patients. Drainage could be a serious problem, the junction of Dauby Lane and Elvington Lane floods in heavy rain.		
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – whilst would not object to some houses, an additional 97 is too much. This would detrimentally affect the rural nature of the village, taking a large proportion of the green belt land in the village. Access both to Dauby Lane and Main Street would be problematic. Housing may benefit workers from Leeds rather than York due to good access to A64.	5321/14490	
	Objection – Elvington is prone to floods and building on green belt land will only increase the risk of flooding. Additional houses will add pressure to local infrastructure, especially the school and doctor’s.	5422/14727	
	Objection – Elvington is prone to floods and building on green belt land will only increase the risk of flooding. Additional houses will add pressure to local infrastructure, especially the school and doctor’s.	5423/14731	
	Objection – level of growth would change the whole balance in the village – losing its status as a village. It should not grow much beyond its current size. Infrastructure is already under pressure (roads, doctors, schools) and this would be exacerbated by growth proposed.	5450/14788	
	Comment – do not object to the proposed housing development.	5472/14823	
	Objection – would remove land from the current green belt which would detract from the rural character of the village and overturn a number of inspector’s decisions. The village would have to completely change to sustain this level of growth, the amenities including the school would have to significantly change. Traffic is an issue in the village due to access through to the M62 and backs up from A1079 in the morning, growth of this scale would exacerbate the situation. Location of Elvington means that increased housing is more likely to create homes for commuters rather than support York.	5571/13055	
	Objection – would remove land from the current green belt which would detract from the rural character of the village and overturn a number of inspector’s decisions. The village would have to completely change to sustain this level of growth, the amenities including the school would have to significantly change. Traffic is an issue in the	5572/13058	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village due to access through to the M62 and backs up from A1079 in the morning, growth of this scale would exacerbate the situation. Location of Elvington means that increased housing is more likely to create homes for commuters rather than support York.		
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – proposal will land-lock the school and prevent its further development, this will affect the long term viability of the school.	5592/13119	
	Objection – access roads would have to come off already very busy roads, further increasing the risk of accidents. The water table is extremely close to the surface with the area at significant risk of flooding. Building would only transfer the risk of flooding onto the main roads thus overcoming the existing sewerage and drainage systems which already flood in times of heavy rain. Wildlife in the area (listed in response). Natural England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, the Forestry Commission and DEFRA should be contacted for their input on this site.	5595/13124	
	Objection – proposed development in Elvington would increase number of homes by over 25%, thereby changing the rural nature of the village, putting strain on infrastructure and exacerbating the drainage problems that already exist.	5606/13160	
	Objection – any further significant developments in the village will adversely affect the community and character of the village. In 1994, the inspector decided that this site must be classified as green belt. There have been no material changes in the circumstances affecting this site and the neighbouring area. Proposal will substantially disadvantage the high performing school, changing its delightful rural location. It will exacerbate traffic problems outside the school. The village has very poor public transport and if these developments go ahead it will increase the number of cars on an already busy road.	5677/13377	
	Objection – proposals will impinge on green belt around the village and will transform the village into a small town. With further developments at Whinthorpe and Dunnington there will be no clear boundaries and the villages will merge into the metropolitan area of York. Increase in the volume of traffic. Potential increase in the number of cars using the village roads of 250 cars. The village school is already over capacity. This development would restrict further expansion of the school. It is already extremely difficult to get an appointment at the medical centre, the developments would increase the number of potential patients. The village has a history of flooding, the proposals would hugely increase the waste and surface water into a drainage system that cannot cope currently.	5738/13515	
Objection – the local roads are already full to capacity and there is not enough room at	5741/13540		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the school for any extra children. The local drains would not be able to cope with any extra water. Totally wrong to develop green belt land.		
Site H26 Land At Dauby Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – to removal and development of green belt land around the village. The high number of houses proposed will have a detrimental impact on the character of the village and the close community values. Traffic safety and congestion to an already struggling busy route. Great school will not cope with influx of housing and education will suffer.	5774/13655	
	Objection – village infrastructure is already at bursting point – school is full, no further room for expansion of the surgery, no train station and the bus service is mediocre, B1228 is over used road, flood defences have only just started being effective. This new development will remove land that is crucial to the removal of water thus alleviating the amount the flood defences have to cope with, this will cause the defences to be over burdened and the village will flood again.	5792/13719	
	Objection – the ring road is jammed and it often takes 10-15 minutes to get out at Grimston Bar, the proposals will massively increase the amount of traffic. School does not have capacity.	5816/13760	
	Objection – developments would damage the rural character of the village. Houses proposed for Elvington would be much better incorporated into a slight enlargement of Whinthorpe, where proper infrastructure can be planned for their residents.	5820/13774	
	Objection – extra houses will put an extra strain on already busy roads in the village.	5858/15119	
	Objection – added disruption from traffic, traffic is already an issue around the school and a danger to children.	5878/15166	
	Comment – whilst no objection to this site, the number of homes should be reduced and a much lower density used.	6229/15787	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H27 Land At The Brecks, Strensall	Comment – grave doubts that the Robert Wilkinson Primary School can cope with the additional children from any of the proposed developments in Strensall.	77/12770	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – parts of this site are within a 400m proximity to Haxby Walbutts Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) operation boundary which should be taken into consideration when designing a layout. Recommend that the tree buffer beyond the eastern site boundary should remain in place to help mitigate against any adverse effects from this WWTW.	295/14169	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection - Land not identified as safeguarded land despite it being currently classified as this.	1710/61	
	Comment - Loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1837	NFU
	Objection – Strensall has too many houses already. Congestion. School full to capacity. Traffic is already a safety issue. Local health services, the school and shopping facilities cannot possibly cope with this level of new housing, not to mention the sewerage works.	2404/6559	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6635	
	Objection – all new housing in Strensall and Towthorpe must be minimised in numbers. Green belt must be protected at all costs. Brownfield sites within the ring road must be developed before any green belt is considered. Both the Strensall/A1237 road and the A1237 cannot cope with existing, far less any more traffic.	2846/7544	
	Objection – Strensall does not have the infrastructure to support any further growth. Main concerns are traffic congestion and loss of green open space.	3062/7922	
	Objection – primary school already has highest number of pupils in the York area. Loss of green belt land. Traffic generated by the developments proposed in Strensall will be considerable.	3295/8461	
	Objection – Strensall is already overdeveloped. There is no significant infrastructure and facilities are stretched. Parking is a problem in several places, making it difficult for buses to get through at times, no off road parking for shops and library. More houses will simply mean even more parking, congestion and blockage.	4139/10849	
	Objection – Strensall’s infrastructure can not support further growth. Traffic is very busy and at times unsafe. More houses would mean a further strain on infrastructure. Need to preserve green belt.	4150/10861	
Objection – further development in Strensall will destroy the very attractiveness of the place. It one of those small settlements that has already grown to be so large that it affects its very attractiveness.	4242/11007		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H27 Land At The Brecks, Strensall continued	Objection – to build additional housing in Strensall on the scale envisaged must mean that current facilities, particularly drainage, roads and school which are already over stretched would not be able to cope.	4703/14253	
	Comment – before any further building is allowed in Strensall, a plan should be produced for the village. The Walbutts Sewage Treatment Centre already stinks and there appear to be no plans to improve this facility. There are no plans to improve the infrastructure, particularly traffic flow through the village, to cope with the increased demand which will result from proposed housing developments. Although Strensall is surrounded by green fields, open public access space within the village is limited.	5189/12401	
	Objection – development will transform quiet country village into dormitory town whose main roads cannot cope now with extra traffic flow. Houses on the Brecks estate are on the opposite end of village to school, shops, medical centre creating traffic problems and problems for access of buses during rush hour.	5325/14498	
	Objection – Strensall’s infrastructure (drains, roads, schools) cannot cope with this amount of development.	5492/14858	
	Objection – do not overdevelop Strensall. How will the infrastructure cope? The local primary school is full, the doctor surgery is full, the roads are full, the Victorian drains are full.	5494/14864	
	Objection – there are no facilities in Strensall to encourage the building of new houses. Traffic on the main road through the village is already a major problem.	5961/15318	
	Objection – there is far too much traffic coming through the village as it is and the school has more than enough pupils.	5962/15322	
	Objection – impact on road safety, community facilities, local wildlife and the historical character of the village. The proposed developments are inappropriate on the green belt and will put immense strain on the already struggling local infrastructure of the area. Another primary school in walkable distance to the new developments must be imbedded into the plan.	6152/15640	
	Objection – Strensall has three level crossings and has a rural feel. The green belt should be maintained for posterity. Any further housing would create more cars and more traffic congestion and thus worsen the air quality further in the Vale of York.	6456/16186	
	Objection – Strensall does not have the infrastructure needed to support any real further growth. The main street becomes extremely congested, drainage and roads all struggle to cope. New developments will put greater pressure on the main village street and there is only one access into the Brecks estate with no prospect of any additional route given the railway line. The plan makes no promises about any	6514/16306	Cllr Paul Doughty

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure improvements or whether the primary school can accommodate significant increases of children. Huntington Secondary will already be under extra pressure from potential future housing developments in Huntington and the Monks Cross area.		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake	Objection – a large proportion of the area contains unimproved grassland, species rich hedgerows and mature trees. There is also a rich diversity of animal and bird species. Area is the only remaining ‘green wedge’ in the village. Site has local interest and is environmental asset to the village – HRA indicates that the ward already has a deficit of natural and semi natural areas. Development would be counter to the objective of reducing reliance on car based transport. Current capacity for school places is insufficient. There is only one shop and there are significant ongoing problems with customer parking. Access to the development is likely to be via existing narrow and quiet residential streets. Surface water drainage is likely to be routed via an existing residential area to the north east which has suffered periodic water logging in recent years – a flood risk assessment must be undertaken.	79/12786	Wheldrake Parish Council
	Support – the allocation of this site for housing (further info on site availability, suitability and achievability is set out in response). The key diagram in so far as it relates to this site accords with good practice and fairly reflects the policies and proposals set out in the plan.	534/16706	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – this land should not be taken out of the green belt for development. Land is a wildflower meadow and therefore a haven for wildlife. The hedgerows are ancient (1700s) and therefore of great significance. North Lane would become increasingly dangerous of the proposed access to the estate was used. Congestion at the school already, a higher volume of cars and pedestrians would make conditions even worse as there is only one footpath. The school is already full; there is only one shop and limited medical surgeries. Parking at the shop is already a problem.	1188/17098	
	Objection – loss of community spirit as a result of new development. Removal of site from the green belt would be loss to village and its environment. Whole area is a haven for wildlife – owls, buzzards and other birds. Site is mostly a wildflower rich meadow. Only wildlife habitat left in the village, the village has no village green so the area is very important as an open rural space and a finger of land into the urban setting. Some of the hedges were planted in the 1700s as part of the Enclosure Act and therefore of historical significance.	1200/17101	
	Objection – why develop an area which will place increasing pressure on the school, surgery and other facilities, plus considerable increased congestion on local roads at rush hour. Surely development should be only where adequate work is available locally?	1210/17113	
	Objection – it is necessary to undertake more detailed assessments of the potential increases in recreational disturbance to the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection	1399/17367	RSPB

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Area/Special Area of Conservation resulting from this allocation. This will determine whether any mitigation is required and feasible. Requirements for mitigation should then be incorporated into the policy wording. If mitigation is not possible then the allocation should be removed.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake continued	Comment - Loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1838	NFU
	Support – allocation for 75 units, including 30% affordable housing is supported.	1801/9883	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6636	
	Objection – community and parish council do not want development. School cannot take anymore pupils. If it does go ahead 2 or 3 access routes will be needed, all current possible access points are too narrow and would cause health and safety issues. Suggest a new road to be built along the north side from Broad Highway or house owners on North Lane or the Cranbrooks to sell part of properties to enable development or widening of access points. Use brownfield, ex industrial or totally new sites instead. Wildlife would be deprived of habitat.	2595/6954	
	Objection – site should not be taken out of the green belt. Land is valuable asset to the village with wildflower meadow and hedges which provide habitat for birds and animals. Wheldrake already has a deficit of natural and semi natural open space. Proposed access off North Lane is totally unsuitable as it is a busy and narrow road, with no footpath for most of its length - safety of pedestrians and vehicles would be put at risk. Access to A19 would become further polluted and congested. Infrastructure would be adversely affected – the school is already full and increase in population would put pressure on the surgery and local roads.	2649/7021	
	Objection – development would destroy view from The Cranbrooks. Fields and woodland are home to much wildlife. The field and land north of North Lane and adjacent to The Cranbrooks has drainage problems. Homes would increase traffic on small village streets, especially near the shop. Further development could destroy archaeological evidence. School already at capacity.	2680/7116	
	Objection – no access has been confirmed and main concern is that all the extra traffic will pass through the centre of the village. Site is one of the last green areas left in the village consisting of many trees and wildlife. Look at potential site at Station Yard to the west of the village instead.	2699/7156	
	Objection – development will have a strong environmental impact. Old Station Yard would be a more beneficial site for development for access reasons.	2700/7157	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake continued	Objection – one of the few remaining natural green areas with the village with lots of trees including 100 year old oaks, ponds and much wildlife. Access issues to the site, increasing traffic in the village and risks to school children. Station Yard site has better access, causing less traffic through the village and would have much less environmental impact. Ecological expert should look at both sites to see the benefits of Station Yard as opposed to site H28.	2716/7209	
	Objection – development would have a detrimental effect on the village as a whole. Huge problems arising from an additional 120 vehicles in the village. Access off North Lane and Valley View seems dangerous, impractical and problematic. Parking outside the shop and surgery is already causing congestion. Wildflower meadow, trees, hedges and pond would be lost. Wheldrake already has a deficit of natural and semi-natural open space. Already pooling problems in heavy rain in Valley View. School full.	2825/7486	
	Objection – reasons not to build any more homes in Wheldrake. Cars and traffic congestion: not enough parking outside village shop; queues already getting out of the village at rush hour at Crockey Hill or Grimston Bar roundabout. Lack of amenities. School full. Sewerage system cannot cope. A lot of wildlife (including bats) living on the land concerned, trees would need to be felled. If extra homes are needed they should be built in the towns, villages and countryside should be left alone.	2831/7501	
	Objection – green belt land under threat. If more development continues it will no longer be a village but urban sprawl – a dormer facility for York, it is already too big and any more building would destroy a lovely village. Need to preserve at least some meadow land to protect wildlife and natural plantlife. Access off North Lane would be unsuitable because it is very narrow; it is already hazardous driving along the lane. Increased traffic and access to A19 would be affected, Main Street already struggling to cope with traffic. Congestion and parking problems near the shop and surgery is very dangerous. Doctor’s would struggle with more patients and school is full. Pressure would be put on drainage, electricity and all other utilities. If development is absolutely necessary there is a brownfield near the industrial estate where access would be easier.	2905/7619	
	Objection – Wheldrake has had considerable development over recent years. The village does not have the infrastructure to sustain further development – small shop and post office and school is full. Access off narrow North Lane would cause considerable loss of amenity for existing residents.	2913/7624	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake continued	Objection – this land should not be taken out of the green belt. Would result in the loss of a natural secluded area including a pond with nesting moor hens and coots and other wildlife. Loss of natural land drainage in this area of high water table – road gully’s already overwhelmed during periods of heavy rain. Unacceptable increase in traffic along North Lane and/or Valley View. School is full. Parking at shop/post office and surgery is already difficult causing dangerous congestion. Additional pressure on already busy surgery.	2981/7761	
	Objection – taking land out of the green belt and destroying the habitat for local wildlife. North Lane is totally unsuitable for any increased traffic. Public transport in the form of buses passing through the village is very limited.	3347/8534	
	Objection – loss of valuable green belt, including uncultivated meadow land which provides a wildlife sanctuary. Would lead to deterioration in the nature of the village which appears to contradict the strategy to prioritising protection of the environment. Large increase in vehicles, with existing problems caused by parking on Main Street and North Lane only increasing the possibility of accidents. Effect on an already overloaded A19.	3535/9485	
	Objection – Valley View is totally unsuited for the amount of traffic it will generate. Disturbance of flora, fauna and wildlife. A better alternative would be a brownfield site, namely the Old Station Yard.	3547/9510	
	Objection – village is already a sufficient size, further development will detract from its rural nature. Access into Valley View will create a ‘rat run’ and is unsuitable due to being narrow. Access off North Lane – Lane is already a busy road and difficult to negotiate at times due to parked vehicles. Any increase in traffic would cause more congestion and potential danger especially to pedestrians. There is no footpath on most of one side of North Lane. Loss of natural environment will be a detriment to the village and area. Lack of local facilities will be heightened by increase in population. Local roads, particularly the A19 are heavily congested. This land should not be taken out of the green belt.	3570/9518	
	Objection – knock on effect of extra traffic would hit both North Lane and Main Street. Impact on trees and wildlife. Site at Station yard should be investigated further – it is on the edge of the village and would be much safer – with less impact of traffic on Main Street and North Lane.	3578/9534	
	Objection – present infrastructure (water, drains, sewers, school) cannot cope with so many extra houses. Road to village is already very busy. Valley View is not wide enough for extra traffic especially emergency services and there is a very dangerous	3624/9639	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	bend on the road. Green belt needs conserving. The area is a haven for wildlife and flora.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake continued	Objection – loss of valuable wildlife and meadowland. Dangerous access proposed from North Lane. Increased pressure on the schools and doctors surgery causing an adverse effect on the infrastructure of the village. Extra pressure on land drainage and sewerage.	3680/9702	
	Objection – land designated as green belt. Should this green belt be plundered, in spite of the detrimental effect to wildlife, some open spaces should be preserved within the development. There is a lovely range of trees, a perfect habitat for the birds and a great contribution to the healthy environment. The mature horse chestnut tree should have a preservation order. Development would be a source of hazard on already busy roads.	3763/10167	
	Objection – on the grounds of destroying the local natural environment. Removal of land from green belt. Destroying the only wildlife enclave in the village. Field is a rare hay meadow and combined with the mature mixed trees provides a precious haven for wildlife and attracts a great variety of flora and fauna and creatures (listed in the response).	3849/10335	
	Objection – village has more than enough homes already, any more would put strain on village services and local roads causing further congestion and prolonged wear and tear. Area is very low lying and subject to water logged gardens in rainy periods. Land is a wildlife haven both of mature evergreen trees and many birds and animals. Properties around the site are bungalows, therefore overlooking is a concern.	3864/10380	
	Objection – total destruction of the environment. There are plenty of brown land sites to be developed without encroaching on the green belt.	3882/4552	
	Objection – environmental impact on this site is staggering, trees removed, wildlife and ponds disturbed. Impact on Valley View if becomes access road. Suggest Station Yard is used; no trees would need to come down, and no wildlife disturbed as this is brown agricultural land so there would be no environmental impact.	3883/4553	
	Objection – congestion on North Lane. Parked cars cause obstruction. Infrastructure of the village will not sustain this development. School is oversubscribed. Detrimental impact on the A19 and A1079. Safety for pedestrians as roads not wide enough so vehicles need to mount pavements to pass parked cars and obstructions. Proposed accesses are in highly dangerous positions. Impact on wildlife.	3920/10459	
	Objection – concerned about impact on school, which is struggling with numbers now.	3979/10580	
	Objection – proposal will take away the last green lung within the village. Access has	4083/10769	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	not been identified. School is at capacity. A19 and A1079 already extremely busy, further housing will add to the congestion.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued	Objection – school is oversubscribed. Loss of trees and wildlife.	4086/10771	
	Objection – school is full. Access by North Lane (limited pavement and blind spot) and Broad Highway (school and village hall traffic) would be problematic. Area is deficient in natural and semi natural open space, this development will reduce them further.	4094/10782	
	Comment – seems a logical completion of the village footprint but would mean that the school playing field would be the only green space of significant size remaining within the village. Preservation of green belt and views from the village becomes even more important. Development should be dependent on assessment of ability of school to absorb population increase. Facilities in the village are quite limited – what consideration has been given to encouraging facilities such as cafe to support village and its growth?	4117/10821	
	Comment – considerable expansion of the school would be essential. Only one food shop with limited parking. Valley View is narrow with right angled bend. North Lane is narrow with limited footpath. Would the infrequent bus service be increased? Development of village infrastructure would be essential.	4162/10885	
	Objection – preservation of green belt. Meadow land haven for wildlife and wildflowers. Increased traffic on already busy village roads and A19. School already over capacity. On street parking problems. Preserve villages – don't need to become small towns.	4163/10888	
	Objection – not the infrastructure (school) to support more housing. Increase in traffic. Loss of trees, ponds and vegetation for wildlife.	4175/10906	
	Objection – access will cause many problems and disruption problems as the surrounding roads are not capable of providing access for the increased traffic – quiet, narrow lanes which regularly have cars parked. All of the proposed access points are unsuitable. Flooding and drainage problems – the fields currently take some of the water but once developed will increase the water run off problem.	4182/10914	
	Comment – why does Wheldrake need this number of houses and for whom are they intended? What sort of housing is proposed? This could have a significant impact on the volume of traffic. Density needs to be considered carefully to provide adequate green space in keeping with the rest of the village. School is already full. Increase in population would put additional pressure on other amenities such as the shop (parking is already serious hazard) and medical facilities. Development would generate additional traffic – access routes are narrow and impractical.	4197/4900	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued	Objection – area has a diverse range of flora and fauna which would be lost. Development is likely to exacerbate the problems of water drainage. Development will put further intense pressure on places at the village school. The roads adjacent to the development already experience a relatively high volume of traffic for a village community; new housing would cause additional strain on these roads and increase the risk of accidents. Additional housing would put strain on the village’s existing facilities. Impact of additional noise and activity on tranquillity of area.	4375/11333	
	Objection – this is the last bit of green area in Wheldrake. Thus field drains the surrounding area, historically known as Pond Field. If it is cemented over then expect local flooding. Wheldrake is already overloaded – drainage and the school is oversubscribed.	4428/11454	
	Objection – the village infrastructure (roads, school, drains and sewerage) are under stress already and would crumble with such a large expansion to the village. Nature of village would also be eroded turning into a more town like status.	4635/11765	
	Objection – to development on green belt. The school will become overcrowded. The Old Station would be a far better area to develop as it would not intrude on green belt and would keep the traffic away from the centre of the village.	4734/12026	
	Objection - local infrastructure will not be able to cope with such as large number of additional houses. Village school has only just been extended and still lacks capacity for local children. The A19 and A1079 are the only routes into the village and both routes are currently very congested, the extra traffic would cause considerably more congestion.	4753/12054	
	Objection – development constitutes unnecessary loss of green belt, there are no special or exceptional circumstances to support this. The site is land locked with no suitable access available. North Lane is not appropriate for the extra vehicle movements. Conflict between pedestrians and vehicles adjacent to the primary school will increase to unsafe levels. Pedestrians on North Lane will be at risk due to the lack of footpaths on both sides. The local current drainage system is not adequate for the addition of new housing, increasing the flash flooding risk. A wood of mature trees will be destroyed, affecting the local wildlife habitat and increasing CO2.	5162/12295	
	Objection – all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s green belt.	5223/12500	
	Objection – development constitutes unnecessary loss of green belt, there are no special or exceptional circumstances to support this. The site is land locked with no suitable access available. North Lane is not appropriate for the extra vehicle	5237/12557	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>movements. Conflict between pedestrians and vehicles adjacent to the primary school will increase to unsafe levels. Pedestrians on North Lane will be at risk due to the lack of footpaths on both sides. The local current drainage system is not adequate for the addition of new housing, increasing the flash flooding risk. A wood of mature trees will be destroyed, affecting the local wildlife habitat and increasing CO2.</p>		
<p>Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued</p>	<p>Objection – development could mean an extra 75-150 cars which would cause a greater emission of pollutant gases. This means more cars coming and going from the village and queues onto the A19 and A1079 will only get worse. Both Valley View and The Cranbrooks are far too narrow to be access routes and the former has a very tight bend. This raises noise, pollution and safety concerns. Drainage system in Valley View already has problems. School is full and would have implications for Fulford School too. Village is already stretched in the amenities it provides – problems with parking at the shop. There are few jobs locally so this would add to the number of commuters and the number of cars as the bus service is inadequate. Land is currently a wild field which goes back to medieval times. To lose this historic site would be a great shame. The footpath which crosses the end of Valley View and goes to North Lane is an historic lane which should be preserved. Area forms an oasis of grassland, species rich hedgerows and mature trees along with all the animals that inhabit it – including otters. This is the only remaining ‘green wedge’ in the village. The Habitats Regulation Assessment indicates that the ward has a deficit of natural and semi natural space and this would decrease it further. It would also mean the loss of a significant CO2 sink. This is green belt land and there are small brownfield sites within the village that could be used without having such a drastic effect.</p>	<p>5560/13039</p>	
	<p>Objection – the services in the village are only just able to cope with the present population, if the proposals go ahead not sure how the local amenities can manage. The school would not be large enough to take extra pupils, there is only one small shop with no chance of expanding it. The number of cars using the village roads would rise enormously. Land is an area of natural growth and wildlife habitats that should be within the green belt.</p>	<p>5614/13195</p>	
	<p>Objection – development would result in the loss of meadowland, and the wildlife habitat. Impact on the local schools, the school is already operating at maximum capacity. The development would require a fundamental and significant change to the current school. Fulford is also running at or close to maximum capacity, and this development would also put that school under unnecessary pressure.</p>	<p>5616/13200</p>	
	<p>Objection – green belt should be protected. Roads that would be affected are</p>	<p>5637/13268</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	inadequate and already stretch council resources, the additional volume of traffic would be unacceptable. Pressures on the school population and facilities would also be stretched. Stop trying to urbanise villages.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued	Objection – nature would be disrupted on a massive scale, very old trees destroyed. There are yellow breasted warblers residing in the coppices. Noise, pollution and traffic would impact local residents. School is full and over subscribed – where will the children be schooled? There is a definite drainage problem in the village, especially North Lane and the drainage problem is already at saturation point. What would be the cost of implementing updated infrastructure? Old Station Yard appears to have many more pro’s than this site – better access in and out of the village, less upheaval for existing roads, entrance and infrastructure and easier routes to local facilities.	5723/13488	
	Objection – to removal and development of green belt around Wheldrake.	5774/13657	
	Objection – already an over stretched village in terms of the amenities. Extra cars which would cause a greater emission of pollutant gases. This would mean more cars coming and going from the village and greater queues going into York. Both Valley View and The Cranbrooks are far too narrow to be access routes and there are safety concerns as well. Concern over how the drainage system would cope. School is full and extra houses would exacerbate this problem. Problems with parking at the shop. There are few jobs locally so this would add to the number of commuters and the number of cars as the bus service is inadequate. Land is currently a wild field which goes back to medieval times. The footpath which crosses the end of Valley View and goes to North Lane is an historic lane which should be preserved. Area forms an oasis of grassland, species rich hedgerows and mature trees along with all the animals that inhabit it – including otters. This is the only remaining ‘green wedge’ in the village. The Habitats Regulation Assessment indicates that the ward has a deficit of natural and semi natural space and this would decrease it further. It would also mean the loss of a significant CO2 sink. There are small brownfield sites within the village that could be used without having such a drastic effect.	5810/13747	
	Objection – poor drainage of the site and adjacent agricultural land. No existing drainage could cope with increased rapid run off created by the development. Site is relic agricultural land that has not been subject to high levels of nutrients and pesticides and as such is a haven for wildlife, richly diverse grassland and has a number of mature trees. Access is restricted from either North Lane or via Valley View. The larger number of cars exiting the village will put further pressure on local roads. Local school is already at capacity and development is bound to put pressure	5866/15138	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on it and other community facilities.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued	<p>Objection – over capacity of village facilities, particularly the school. Extra cars would increase parking problems at the shop. Both Valley View and The Cranbrooks are far too narrow and Valley View has a tight bend and would make access difficult. Drainage problems exist in the area which would be exacerbated by more housing. Land is currently a wild field which goes back to medieval times, one of the last in the village. Footpath which crosses the end of Valley View and goes to North Lane is an historic lane which should be preserved. The area forms an oasis of grassland, species rich hedgerows and mature trees, with otters being seen recently. This is effectively the only remaining green wedge in the village. The Habitats Regulation Assessment indicates that Wheldrake is deficit in natural and semi natural areas. There are small brownfield sites within the village that could be used without having such a drastic effect on the village.</p>	5872/15152	
	<p>Objection – very large increase to an already over-stretched village in terms of the amenities. Increased number of cars which would cause a greater emission of pollutant gases, more wear and tear on the roads and greater queues going into York. The proposed access routes are far too narrow to cope with the extra traffic and there are safety concerns as well. Another problem would be how the drainage system would cope with the extra houses. The school is already full. Parking at the shop would lead to safety concerns. Increased commuting to jobs. The bus service is inadequate and would have to be improved. Land is currently a wild field which goes back to medieval times. Footpath which crosses the end of Valley View and goes to North Lane is an historic lane which should be preserved. The area forms an oasis of grassland, species rich hedgerows and mature trees. This is effectively the only remaining green wedge in the village. The Habitats Regulation Assessment indicates that Wheldrake is deficit in natural and semi natural areas. There are small brownfield sites within the village that could be used without having such a drastic effect on the village.</p>	5883/15175	
	<p>Objection – prime wildlife site with many birds. Increase in number of cars going up and down Valley View. Is there going to be a new school built to accommodate the possibility of another 90 children? Roads around the village are already very busy. Far better to build on the old railway sidings at the end of the village.</p>	6209/15742	
	<p>Objection – poor access options and land is a wonderful wildlife area. Please provide a shortlist of options for Wheldrake and explain why this is felt to be the best site – would rather an anonymous field in the green belt than fill in this wedge. Site is an</p>	6426/16147	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	important satellite area to the Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve.		
Site H28 Land To The North Of North Lane, Wheldrake Continued	Objection – do not build on greenfield sites and natural woodlands in between The Cranbrooks and Valley View as part of the Local Plan.	Petition 11	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Objection – support the views expressed by Copmanthorpe Parish Council. Together with Askham Richard, Askham Bryan is a village often visited by residents of Copmanthorpe and concerned that the numbers of vehicles will increase if the proposals to build 600 additional homes in Copmanthorpe are allowed to go ahead.	53/12605	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection – At present the population of Copmanthorpe is approximately 4500 living in some 1750 dwellings. To add a further 560 houses with an additional population of almost 1500 persons is not remotely sustainable. Services, facilities and infrastructure requiring significant improvement are as follows; The village school is already at capacity; The village drainage system is already at capacity; The village already suffers from low water pressure at peak periods; The village centre shops and car park could not cope with an additional 1500 people; and Traffic generation from additional developments would put undue pressure on existing traffic interchanges. Significant investment in services, facilities and infrastructure would be required	57/12619	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe’s identity as a village.	917/3049	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. 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.	1053/3340	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/624	
	Objection – The village would not and could not cope with the proposed number of houses for the following reasons; The road system would not be able to deal with the increased traffic flow; The sewerage system cannot cope now; The primary school would not be able to cater for more pupils. Shopping is catered for in the village currently but not if an increase in population took place. Doctors surgeries could not cope; and The ‘Village Feel’ would be eroded by the vast developments proposed.	1124/17068	
	Objection – The infrastructure in the village is completely inadequate to cope with additional development. Water supply, sewerage, road widths, capacity of the A654 junction, school provision, shopping and car parking facilities would all need improving in advance of any additional housing development.	1176/17094	
	Objection – new developments should avoid the sacrifice of good quality farmland – too many identified sites, including the proposed development to the west of Copmanthorpe, seem to be driven by opportunism by landowners rather than sound planning considerations. This land is on terminal moraine and is pretty productive land.	1207/17106	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Objection – concerned about the impact that 600 new homes will have on existing infrastructure and amenities in the village. Together with grave concerns of potentially over a thousand more cars joining the A64 from Copmanthorpe every day.	1355/17334	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.	1504/2180	
	Loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1839	NFU
	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. <u>Proposals place housing on highly productive grade 1 arable land.</u>	1884/8	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No thought has been given to infrastructure for these plans. No provision for roads. Schools already full. Doctors surgeries could not handle more patients, shops inadequate, surface water drainage and sewage at capacity, bus service would not suffice. <u>Proposals would be on prime farming land.</u>	1885/14	
	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, car parking and healthcare provision need to be improved. Copmanthorpe is full to capacity and will no longer be a village.	1886/22	
	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.	1888/34	
	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.	1892/45	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gateway junctions have problems particularly westerly gateway with traffic waiting on bend to cross oncoming traffic	1917/115	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Objection – 600 houses proposed for Copmanthorpe in Green Belt land will for ever change our 'village' into a small town.	1931/146	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe is already a large village and has a village character at its heart. Plans to double the size of the settlement will take away the character that remains. Infrastructure such as roads, drainage, schools etc will not be able to cope. Also the loss of quality farmland in the green belt will alter the semi-rural idyllic nature of outer York which is important too just as its historic centre.	1933/9918	
	Objection – objection to proposal to build 600 new houses on western edge of Copmanthorpe on prime agricultural land when brownfield and non-agricultural sites within the city should be built first. No plans to increase school size which is at capacity. No plans to increase health care provision. Manor Heath junction is already a bottleneck. Water pressure is already low and could not cope with additional demand.	1937/168	
	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.	1940/175	
	Objection – before any building work is carried out infrastructure must be reinforced. The sewerage system is at capacity, likewise the rainwater drains. Exit roads are already congested. Doctors surgeries are at full capacity. The school is at full capacity. Parking at the shops is already difficult. This is prime agricultural land – why not build on brownfield sites within the city?	1941/183	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1942/188	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not there to cope with the strain that would be put on schools, roads, water, sewerage, drainage, healthcare etc as they struggle to cope now. The use of green belt and valuable agricultural land must strongly be resisted and preserved for future generations.	1943/193	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1954/235	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/249	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/257	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/265		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/273	
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/280	
		1964/288	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/296	
	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.	1966/304	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be extremely dangerous.	1967/312	
	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.	1968/320	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/328	
	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.	1970/336	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/344	
		1972/352	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/359	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/367	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/374	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/380	
		1977/388	
		1978/396	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/403	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1980/411		
	1981/419		
	1982/426		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/434		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses.	1985/444		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Countryside should be protected.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/452	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/460	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/468	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/475	
	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.	1990/483	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character OF Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/490	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/498	
	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.	1993/506	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/520	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/527	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/535	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/543	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no Objection.	1998/551	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/557 2000/565 2001/573	
	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.	2002/581	
Support – Welcome plans to build low cost housing in the village Objection – Concerns about the number and density of homes planned and the loss of	2007/6483		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	some of the amenities and character of the village. Traffic will become intolerable unless additional shopping facilities are provided at the other end of the village. Water pressure can be an issue in the village currently – additional homes will make this situation worse. Additional dog walking space would need to be provided alongside any new development to existing recreational and dog walking areas are lost. Some of the land where homes are planned is prone to flooding. Concerned that homes will be built on this land and will subsequently be difficult to insure and maintain.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/608	
		2012/616	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/632	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/640	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/647	
		2016/655	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/663	
		2018/671	
		2019/677	
		2020/685	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/693	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/700	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/708	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/716	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/724	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/732		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/738		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/746		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/753		
	2030/760		
	2031/767		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2032/773	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/780	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/788	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/796	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/804	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/812	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/820	
		2039/828	
		2040/836	
		2041/844	
	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.	2042/852	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/860	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/868	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/876	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/883	
		2047/891	
	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.	2048/899	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/907	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/915	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/938		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/945		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.	2060/953		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited in village and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/959	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/967	
	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.	2063/973	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/981	
		2065/989	
	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.	2066/997	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1004	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1012	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1020	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2070/1027	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1034	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1042	
		2073/1050	
		2074/1058	
	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.	2075/1066	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1074	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2077/1082	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt land.	2078/1089	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1097		
	2080/1104		
	2081/1112		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2082/1120	
	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.	2083/1127	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1135	
		2085/1143	
		2086/1150	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or large enough to prevent people from travelling.	2087/1158	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1165	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1171	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1177	
		2091/1185	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1193	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1201	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1209	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new homes.	2095/1217	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1224	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1230	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1238	
		2099/1246	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Ruin York.	2100/1253		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1261		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2102/1267		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2103/1275		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village	2104/1283		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2105/1290	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with community leading to development of Local Plan.	2106/1298	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2107/1306	
	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.	2108/1314	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2109/1322	
		2110/1330	
	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.	2111/1338	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites situation.	2112/1346	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1354	
		2114/1362	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2115/1370	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2116/1378	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2117/1386	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2118/1394	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More flooding and loss of allotments.	2119/1401	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development will spoil village.	2120/1408	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2121/1416	
	2122/1424		
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.	2129/1439		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1447		
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.	2131/1455		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1463	
		2133/1471	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1479	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1487	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1494	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1502	
		2138/1510	
		2139/1518	
	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.	2140/1526	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2141/1534	
		2142/1550	
		2143/1557	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1565	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1573	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1580	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1588		
	2148/1596		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1604		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses is excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. If so many houses are needed would be better to build a small town rather than piecemeal in Copmanthorpe. 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 and already have parking problems.	2150/1612		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1618		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be protected for future generations.	2152/1626	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1633	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1641	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1648	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1656	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1664	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1672	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1679	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1687	
		2161/1695	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around York.	2162/1703	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1711	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1719	
		2165/1726	
		2166/1734	
		2167/1741	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1747	
	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.	2169/1755	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1762		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1770		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2172/1778		
	2173/1786		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2174/1794	
		2175/1801	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1807	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1815	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1822	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1830	
		2180/1846	
		2181/1854	
		2182/1860	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1868	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1876	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1884	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1892	
		2187/1908	
	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.	2188/1916	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1924	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1931	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues. 200 homes is more realistic. Increased traffic and demand on amenities is a problem.	2191/1938	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1946	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1954	
2194/1962			
2195/1970			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made?	2196/1978		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1986	
		2198/1994	
		2199/2001	
		2200/2009	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2016	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2024	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2032	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2040	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2048	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2054	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary.	2207/2062	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2070	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2077	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2085	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2093	
		2212/2101	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2109	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2117	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2132	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2140	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2148		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2156		
	2219/2164		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2172	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2188	
	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)?	2222/2196	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2204	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2210	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2218	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2226	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2234	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2241	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are 4 active badger setts on the proposed development site.	2229/2249	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath be destroyed?	2230/2257	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2265	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2273	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2281	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2289	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 - 200.	2235/2296	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street in village will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2304	
	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.	2237/2311	
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.	2238/2319		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village	2239/2327		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	could not cope with extra traffic.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2240/2334	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2342	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2350	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2358	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2365	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2373	
		2246/2381	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2389	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2396	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2404	
		2250/2412	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2420	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2428	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Large areas of land such as Monks Cross within 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.	2253/2436	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2444	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2452	
	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.	2256/2460	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2468	
2258/2475			
2259/2483			
2260/2491			
2261/2499			
2262/2507			
2263/2515			
2264/2521			
2265/2529			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2266/2537	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2267/2545	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2553	
		2269/2561	
		2270/2569	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2577	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely.	2272/2585	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2593	
	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.	2274/2601	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2607	
		2276/2614	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them.	2282/2632	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2640	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2648	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2656	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2664	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded.	2287/2672	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel of Copmanthorpe.	2288/2680	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2289/2688	
		2290/2695	
2291/2703			
2292/2711			
2293/2719			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2294/2727		
	2295/2735		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2296/2743	
		2297/2751	
		2298/2759	
		2299/2767	
		2300/2775	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2301/2783	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2791	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2799	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2807	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2815	
		2306/2823	
		2318/2831	
		2319/2839	
		2320/2847	
		2321/2854	
		2322/2862	
		2323/2870	
		2324/2878	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2886	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2894	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2902		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2908		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2916		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with YCC.	2330/2923		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2931		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2939		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2946		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3155	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3163	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2952	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2959	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2967	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2975	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2983	
		2374/2990	
		2375/2998	
		2376/3005	
		2377/3012	
		2378/3019	
	2379/3027		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3034	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3041	
	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.	2382/3057	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3064	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3072		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3080		
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.	2386/3088		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3095		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3103		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3110	
		2390/3118	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3126	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3132	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3140	
		2394/3147	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2395/3171	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3177	
	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.	2397/3185	
	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”.	2410/3193	
	Objection – The road will need to be widened to gain access to this site and pavements are not wide now. The school will need extending. The shopping centre and car park will need to be extended. Road junctions will not be able to cope with the extra cars on and off the A64.	2414/6577	
	Support – Of the rural/village sites (inclusive of H29) most seem to be of a reasonable scale.	2416/6637	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3200	
		2449/3208	
	2450/3216		
	2451/3247		
	2452/3224		
Objection – understand that the sewage of the whole village is taken along a main under Temple Lane assisted by a current over capacity pumping station. The additional homes would create a disaster waiting to happen. Development may generate low level crime. What are City of York Council plans for widening road access? Improvements to roads and drains must be put in place and working before any new housing is commenced. Where are all the new school children to be accommodated? Shops are	2469/2626		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	barely sufficient now to serve the present community – there is no space in the centre of the village to build additional shop units, nor for additional parking spaces. Will the two GP practices in the village be able to cope with the additional residents?		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2488/3231	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2489/3239	
	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.	2490/3254	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3356	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.	2494/3364	
	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.	2495/3372	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3379	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3387	
		2498/3395	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3403	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3411	
		2501/3419	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3332	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3348	
Objection – Building on prime agricultural land reduces the country’s ability to grow our own food. Cannot see how the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe could cope with such a mass build with water, drainage and sewage problems now. Serious improvements to infrastructure need to be made before any additional development could take place. There are already traffic problems at peak times additional traffic will only make	2559/6888		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	matters worse.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3309	
		2570/3317	
		2571/3324	
	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	2589/3301	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3427	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3434	
	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?	2610/3442	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3450	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3457	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3465	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3473	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3481	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3489	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3497	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.	2640/6013	
Objection – How will the vehicles from the new scheme gain access and egress from the A64? How will the village school accommodate the influx of pupils where there is no funding available or secured? Drainage improvements are noticeable by there absence.	2678/7105		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3575		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3583		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3589		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – cannot understand why anyone would want to build on open fields when there are other areas which could be renovated first. The proposal to build 600 houses on greenbelt in Copmanthorpe does not meet the requirement to protect the environment. The agricultural land is home to considerable wildlife. There will be environmental impact due to insufficient sewage and drainage and will impact the rest of the village. There will be increased congestion and increase in CO2 emissions. There is no room on the existing school site to accommodate additional pupil numbers. Due to Copmanthorpes location on the A64 the new houses will only attract workers commuting out of York.	2762/7301	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.	2932/3999	
	Objection – Should development in Copmanthorpe go ahead there will be a need to increase and improve all services as they are already at breaking point. Should houses be built part buy and with a height limit (build houses/bungalows in keeping with present houses) with enough parking spaces provided.	2988/4522	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4006	
	Objection – there is no economic justification for the number of houses proposed. No consideration of the impact on the village with extra vehicles and residents as the road struggles at the moment to cope. Moor Lane is not suitable for access to new housing as it is only single track at the end. Building close to a railway line is not a good idea especially in view of a high speed link to York proposed.	3047/7903	
	Objection –The proposal to build 600 houses on greenbelt in Copmanthorpe does not meet the requirement to protect the environment. The agricultural land is home to considerable wildlife. There will be environmental impact due to insufficient sewage and drainage and will impact the rest of the village. There will be increased congestion and increase in CO2 emissions. There is no room on the existing school site to accommodate additional pupil numbers. Due to Copmanthorpes location on the A64 the new houses will only attract workers commuting out of York.	3082/7959	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe has poor road and drainage infrastructure, hopelessly inadequate parking in the village centre, too much car traffic and a reduced bus service. To increase the population by 40% would be to destroy the nature of the community utterly.	3134/8069	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4014	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely	3283/4022	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	alter community.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4038	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4046	
	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.	3292/4030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3318/4054	
	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.	3327/4061	
	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. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.	3330/4069	
	Objection – the proposal to build more than 600 extra houses in Copmanthorpe is unacceptable and impractical. The close proximity of open country to the heart of Copmanthorpe is an essential part of the village’s character. The infrastructure of the village could not cope with the extra demands caused by more 600 extra households. Already roads are too congested and crowded, and the water supply and sewerage systems in the village are scarcely adequate for the present population. Local resources (shops, surgeries, school, library) while sufficient for Copmanthorpe residents now could not meet the needs of so many new comers.	3331/8514	
	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.	3412/4077	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4085	
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.	3414/4092		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4100	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4108	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed developments around Copmanthorpe, this area is already much developed and cannot accommodate more housing in the scale that is being suggested.	3418/8735	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8866	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8873	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8842	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8850	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8858	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6021	
	Objection – roads are already heavy with traffic with very little parking. The junction onto the A1237/A64 is extremely busy from 7am. Moor Lane is a very narrow road providing poor access. Green Belt – should be kept permanently open to prevent urban sprawl. New building should be regarded as being inappropriate when there are still brownfield sites available	3511/9435	
	Objection – this area is green belt land and should not be built on. Extra traffic would be generated with more traffic going into the city. A previous application was rejected with one of the reasons being access onto Moor Lane.	3517/9449	
	Objection – this area is green belt land and should not be built on. Extra traffic would be generated with more traffic going into the city. A previous application was rejected with one of the reasons being access onto Moor Lane.	3518/9450	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don't see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6028	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6035	
Objection – to increase the population of Copmanthorpe by the levels proposed is not feasible due to poor infrastructure (schools, sewers, water supply, road junctions). New building should be on brownfield sites – these proposals sacrifice both green field agricultural land and green belt. Access to York from the A64 to Micklegate would not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urban sprawl should be contained.	3621/9635		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe's green belt/open space will be virtually eliminated by proposed building of dwellings and wind farm. Increased traffic	3626/9314		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – particularly to the proposed development at Copmanthorpe. The village already struggles with drainage issues. The local school is already at full capacity. Roads struggle now to cope with the traffic. Building will destroy views and animal habitats (bats are meant to be protected species). This is green belt land, brownfield sites should be developed first.	3720/10013	
	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. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	3726/5998	
	Objection – an additional 600 homes in Copmanthorpe would place a strain on local amenities. The village would not cope with another 1000+ cars on already busy roads and will affect children's safety. Existing junctions are already overly busy. Parking facilities are already insufficient (road parking is commonplace and leads to traffic conjection). Current public transport links in the village are poor. The village school is already at full capacity. A strain will be placed on stretched GPs, shops electricity supply (power outages are already quite common), and drainage (current surface water drainage and sewage system problems exist together with local flooding issues).	3727/10028	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6006	
	Objection – fail to see how proposal for substantial increases to housing in Copmanthorpe can be in the interests of the residents of the village, there are other sites in and around York which would be better suited to such development. Copmanthorpe is already a large village and any major increase in housing will put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure and will irrevocably change the nature of the village. The land to the south of Copmanthorpe is prime agricultural land – brownfield sites should be used first. Open spaces and fields surrounding Copmanthorpe are used regularly by residents and others for general walking, bird watching, walking dogs etc, and by children who can roam safely all of which play an important part in the well being of the residents. Traffic congestion will substantially increase and major improvements to exit roads from the village will need to cope with the increase in traffic. Traffic congestion will increase during start and finish of school	3820/10279	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	increasing the risk of accidents. How are the Council going to improve infrastructure to cope with increased demand? Sewage and drainage capacity of the village are already prone to flooding after heavy rain. What are the plans to improve shopping, health and parking provision within the village? There will be a need to widen roads and footpaths to accommodate growth of the village.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would increase village by approximately 40%. Infrastructure and services cannot cope.	3888/4558	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3889/4566	
		3903/4585	
	Objection – there is not an adequate transport network to cope with the extra housing. If land is green belt it shouldn't be built on.	3966/10556	
	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.	4057/4688	
	Objection – although it is appreciated that York needs more housing, the scale and density of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe is inappropriate and the Plan appears to make no improvements to the infrastructure of the village. Main areas of concern relate to traffic, drainage and parking all of which cause problems now.	4099/10796	
	Objection – nearly 600 new homes to the west of Copmanthorpe and a further 55 acres taken out of the green belt and safeguarded for future development.	4128/10825	
	Objection – concerned that increasing the population size of Copmanthorpe by 40-80% will have a significant negative impact on the primary school which is already having to convert parts of the building to accommodate the existing pupils.	4168/10893	
	Objection – any further development in the Dringhouses/Woodthorpe/Copmanthorpe area will further increase pressure on Tadcaster Road route in/out of the city. At peak times the route cannot cope with the current traffic load.	4305/11172	
	Objection – 600 additional homes would be a gross over development of a small village. At least 600 additional cars would be placed on an infrastructure unsuitable to bear such an increase. Urban development of a village community is a bad idea.	4328/11234	
Objection – the Copmanthorpe development of 600 houses is much too large. If added to the potential of the 'safeguarded' land this could lead to over 1100 new houses. This is gross over development and no mention in the Plan of any infrastructure development.	4329/11240		
Objection – infrastructure cannot cope and improvements must be made before any additional development. Drainage – surface water regularly causes flooding. Sewage –	4343/11614		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pipe work already to capacity. Roads – upwards of 1000 cars will overwhelm the villages already congested roads, especially the manor Heath and A64/A1237 junction. Village school is already at capacity. Health and welfare facilities are operating at capacity already. Water pressure is not currently good. Building on prime agricultural land places pressure on abilities to grow our own food whilst brownfield sites should be built out before green field sites are developed.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – there is a disproportionate amount of development proposed for Copmanthorpe (an increase of 35%) an will affect the quality of life in the village. The fundamentally rural location will change with easy access to the fields for walking, rural views and the sense of being part of the countryside will be lost to a large extent. Drainage problems already exist. Roads are currently quiet where a large number of children can play safely. The school is currently at capacity – a substantial increase in pupils will necessitate either building a new school or building on playing fields.	4389/11373	
	Objection – an increase of 33% in housing terms is unacceptable – the village amenities such as schools, shops, doctors, dentists etc could not possibly cope with such a huge increase. I addition the majority of the village infrastructure – roads, drainage, water supply etc are already at full capacity. Proposals to build on Moor lane will lead to additional traffic onto Main Street which is already unacceptably congested. To imagine that a few hundred more cars could be attempting to use this road is unthinkable and no thought seems to have been given to this.	4405/11411	
	Objection – no regard has been made to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. The area proposed for housing is in Green Belt and prime agricultural land. Brownfield sites should be developed first. To destroy rime agricultural land considering the increasing cost of food is ridiculous. The school is already to capacity, local amenities are already at full capacity, water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and car parking for these will be unable to cope. There is a major concern to the amount of traffic that will be generated. Not only will road capacity be compromised but the environmental damage from such an increase will also be huge.	4412/11424	
	Objection – no regard has been made to the Copmanthorpe neighbourhood plan. The area proposed for housing is in Green Belt and prime agricultural land. Brownfield sites should be developed first. To destroy rime agricultural land considering the increasing cost of food is ridiculous. The school is already to capacity, local amenities are already at full capacity, water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and car parking for these will be unable to cope. There is a major concern to the amount of traffic that will be generated. Not only will road capacity be compromised but the environmental	4414/11436	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	damage from such an increase will also be huge.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	4434/5199	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can’t cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5206	
	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.	4451/5214	
	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.	4737/5279	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5329	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Out of scale with village. In green belt. Needs significant investment in infrastructure. A64 already congested. Traffic in village would increase. Shortage of parking. Issues with sewage system. Impact on wildlife and flora. Area is site of a roman settlement.	4761/5335	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5343	
		4763/5351	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. Adding 600 to 800 houses would destroy what we have. Schools cannot cope with proposed increased numbers. Youth Groups of village at capacity. Problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. Problems with car parking and road system cannot cope with extra traffic.	4764/5359	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5367	
		4766/5375	
	4770/5383		
Objection – the current village infrastructure is already having to cope at full capacity. Local parking would not be able to handle the 50% increase in the current population. Building of additional homes will have a significant impact on local drainage and	5137/12451		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sewage. Drains are unable to cope now. The local school is at full capacity. This is a green field site, brownfield sites should be targeted first. No consideration has been made for increased healthcare needs. Wildlife will be disrupted – particularly bats. This is an area of prime farm land.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – here will be an increase of more than 1/3 if 600 homes are built in Copmanthorpe. During wet weather drainage and sewage system does not cope with the current housing stock. The school, car parking are all currently operating at full capacity and could not cope with such large expansion of housing, cars and primary school children.	5166/12302	
	Objection – the proposals for Copmanthorpe are inappropriate. They will fundamentally alter the nature of the village increasing size inorganically by circa 40%. The proposed housing density is inappropriate for a village and will further negatively affect the ambience of the village. What is the justification for requiring greater housing density on Greenfield sites than on brownfield ones? There is no indication that adequate vehicle parking arrangements will be made for new residents. There is a national requirement for UK to maximise its own food production – why target prime agricultural land. No indication is provided that all infrastructure improvements will be carried out before housing development is commenced. There are already infrastructure pressures in Copmanthorpe e.g. poor rainwater drainage, low water pressure, road junctions are under intense pressure at peak times.	5186/12390	
	Objection – the numbers of proposed houses are too high for Copmanthorpe.	5202/12425	
	Objection – all land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s Green Belt.	5223/12501	
	Objection – the addition of 600 houses to the village of Copmanthorpe would increase its size by around 35% which is simply unsustainable and would overwhelm the existing infrastructure. The development of the additional ‘safeguarded’ land would turn it from a village into the size of a small town. Many of the village amenities are already overstretched: the village school is full, the centre of the village struggles to cope with car parking, drains and sewers are at capacity, water pressure is substandard, electricity supply is regularly subject to faults and access points into the village by car are already incredibly congested. There would need to be significant investment in such infrastructure to enable any large scale development to take place. To develop the western side of the village would skew its population significantly away from the current centre – the suggestion that additional retail facilities or an additional school should be built ignores the fact that having a clear centre, a single school, and	5239/12574	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	clearly defined boundaries are important elements of the village character.		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – the proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are thoroughly inappropriate given the size and atmosphere of the village, will have a catastrophic impact on life in the village and significantly impact on enjoyment and property values.	5508/14895	
	Objection – if houses are built in Copmanthorpe all it will do is create cheap housing for people that work in Leeds. Where are all the kids going to go to school in Copmanthorpe? The school is already full to the brim. Why is it ok to build on green belt land?	5511/14905	
	Objection – the proposals for so many houses would turn Copmanthorpe into a small town and erode the green belt. Why not build on brownfield sites rather than prime agricultural land. Concerned about the impact on local wildlife, in particular bats, by building on green belt land.	5514/14908	
	Objection- the village cannot cope with so many extra houses. The school is already full to capacity and additional cars would add significantly to traffic. Not convinced of the need to build so many extra houses given the state of the housing market and the numerous houses in the village that already cannot sell. Worried about building on green belt land. This will affect the identity and make a small village much more like a small town with no real infrastructure to cope with so many people.	5515/14914	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe cannot support the proposed housing.	5516/14920	
	Objection – Copmanthorpes infrastructure cannot cope as it is without an additional 600 proposed new homes. Empty homes/offices in York should be used first. The additional 600 homes are not sustainable, with 30% affordable homes/local authority homes bringing their own unique set of problems.	5518/14928	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed for the village is far too large. Do not see the evidence for why so many are needed and believe this would have a detrimental effect on the local community. The character of the houses proposed is not in keeping with the village. There is not sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with these houses. The main road through the village is heavily congested. Do not believe the local primary school has capacity to consider this plan in full. May impact on ability of children in current homes to attend Tadcaster Grammar.	5553/13015	
	Objection – too many houses to be built in Copmanthorpe. There is little or no infrastructure to support it with school places, few doctors, adequate access and egress roads and other vital facilities. Residents in the new homes will all need to get in their several cars per household to get to where the facilities are.	5556/13028	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – the scale of development proposed for Copmanthorpe is completely out of proportion to its current size. Areas of concern are: infrastructure – drains, roads, junction of Manor Heath and A64 slip road; primary school capacity and the feed to appropriate secondary schools; shopping and car parking facilities; adequate health car provision.	5747/13555	
	Objection – what about the increase in school capacity, doctors surgeries and dentists? How does Copmanthorpe school cope with the influx of families who will be occupying the hundreds of houses expected to be built there?	5750/13567	
	Comment – the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development. Key infrastructure problems are drainage and roads.	5760/13620	
	Objection – the proposed building outside of Copmanthorpe would be completely inappropriate to the village atmosphere and despoil beautiful countryside.	5764/13629	
	Objection – it is wrong to build on green belt land and there has been a serious lack of investigation into the suitability of the village to cope with additional housing. Traffic routes are already over stretched and getting in and out of the village at peak times is a struggle. The school could not cope with an influx of additional kids and parking at the shops is already difficult. It would no longer be a village but more of a dormitory town losing its character.	5765/13632	
	Objection – to add 560 to 1750 houses in Copmanthorpe is unsustainable as this would have a negative impact on all infrastructure and local services which would not be able to cope with additional houses. All services would require overhaul and significant upgrade including schools, drainage, highways, healthcare and local shops. Adding these houses would overwhelm the local highway network. Land is long established green belt land.	5766/13638	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure of the village cannot support the addition of the proposed housing. The roads are too narrow to allow vehicle flow where vehicles are parked on the road. Parking at the shop is at capacity. The drainage system seems at or beyond capacity. Water pressure is often poor, surely the addition of further households will exacerbate this? Loss of wildlife and good agricultural land.	5787/13703	
	Objection – too much housing proposed on Copmanthorpe boundary, these will bring in commuters from Leeds and not help York housing.	5799/15011	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6227 5807/6235	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – loss of wildlife. Essential that the green belt surrounding the western side of the village is left to counteract the pollution from the very busy, noisy A64. School is already overcrowded. Hundreds of new families would put a strain on what few community facilities exist in Copmanthorpe.	5844/13830	
	Comment – grave worries about the houses to be built in Copmanthorpe in particular roads and infrastructure. A present the roads are disgusting and a danger to cyclists, how will they cope with an extra minimum 500 cars. How will the cars leave the village to access the A64 it is bad enough now.	5856/15113	
	Comment – where will 600 children go to school plus 600 vehicles or more trying to get onto the A64.	5909/15232	
	Objection – would ruin one of the most beautiful aspects of the village. Colton Lane is a Roman Road, surely the villages have a right to preserve their history as well as York City Centre.	5946/15295	
	Support – more housing will help to sustain local services (shops, medical, library, post office etc.) and hopefully improve public transport. The junction onto the A64 would need improvement. The local school could do with more children from within the catchment as the school traffic associated with the relatively high numbers coming from out of the catchment is a problem.	6232/15795	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure. Long queues at Manor Heath junction with A64/A1237 and at the Tadcaster Road junction now. No proposals for new employers within Copmanthorpe. A potential 1000 additional cars is unworkable from a transport and environmental perspective and would destroy the amenity of the village. The location of Copmanthorpe makes environmentally friendly cycle use to York, employment sites or Leeds unviable for the average cyclist. Lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage. The replacement of agricultural land with houses is simply not workable. Lack of adequate facilities in the village – the primary school is full – building on Copmanthorpe school playing field is not a credible proposal – there is no proposal to build a further GP surgery – existing car parking provision is inadequate. Infrastructure improvements would need to be agreed and carried out before any additional housing can be approved. The proposals involve building on grade A food producing land – this should be safeguarded as agricultural land use only. Loss of dog waking routes. There are bats within the area proposed for development	6292/15906	
	Objection – Lack of transport infrastructure. Long queues at Manor Heath junction with A64/A1237 and at the Tadcaster Road junction now. No proposals for new employers within Copmanthorpe. A potential 1000 additional cars is unworkable from a transport	6293/15912	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and environmental perspective and would destroy the amenity of the village. The location of Copmanthorpe makes environmentally friendly cycle use to York, employment sites or Leeds unviable for the average cyclist. Lack of adequate surface and sewage drainage. The replacement of agricultural land with houses is simply not workable. Lack of adequate facilities in the village – the primary school is full – building on Copmanthorpe school playing field is not a credible proposal – there is no proposal to build a further GP surgery – existing car parking provision is inadequate. Infrastructure improvements would need to be agreed and carried out before any additional housing can be approved. The proposals involve building on grade A food producing land – this should be safeguarded as agricultural land use only. Loss of dog waking routes. There are bats within the area proposed for development		
Site H29 Land At Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15922	
	Objection – the proposals will change the whole character and village life of Copmanthorpe. It seems fitting that such a historical and widely admired city of York to be bordered by villages and for those villages to be bordered with green belt areas. House building will take place on prime agricultural land with no plans to accommodate extra traffic, people, drainage etc. Copmanthorpe village school is already full.	6320/15975	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6324	
	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.	6433/6331	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6339	
		6435/6347	
		6457/6368	
		6467/6389	
	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.	6486/6435	
Objection – considerable increase in housing proposed would be unsustainable and have a detrimental affect on the physical and emotional environment of the village. Green areas in Copmanthorpe are limited. It would be a travesty to build on green field sites.	6525/16517	Brian Bell Carpets Ltd	
Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for housing.	Petition 9		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H30 Land To The South Of Strensall Village	Objection – the site for a station is included in H30 and must be planned to include sufficient car parking space and should also include retail to remove the problems of congestion in the village centre. H30 is also in a part of Strensall where drainage runs via a combined system to Cobbs Cottage to Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works. However, Site H30 is not only on agricultural Green Belt land but is also adjacent to sites of natural Conservation as well as Strensall Railway Buildings Conservation Area and must be removed in order to meet the sustainability requirements identified in the Local Plan. There are grave doubts that Robert Wilkinson Primary School can cope with the additional children from any of the proposed developments. Site H30 (and SF1) have been excluded from the Green Belt by this draft plan in order to meet housing targets which are unacceptable.	77/12766	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Support – site H30 is supported but want reconsideration on original submission through call for sites.	144/12876	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – the site adjoins the boundary of the Strensall Conservation Area – there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the Conservation Area.	238/14080	English Heritage
	Support – support the allocation of site H30.	304/14175	Shirethorn Ltd
	Objection – Strensall does not have the infrastructure to support any further growth other than committed development already in the pipeline. Site H30 is in the Green Belt and forms part of an open wedge coming into the heart of the village and should be preserved – totally oppose the proposed removal of Green Belt status. Development is not sustainable on the Green Belt and because of the lack of jobs in the area would result in a considerable amount of extra traffic on the Strensall to York Road. It is totally unreasonable to use the proposal of a new station to justify yet again further large scale development particularly as Strensall has already contributed more than its share towards York’s housing needs.	494/16622	
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1840	NFU
	Objection – want to keep the green belt around the village, do not want Strensall to become a town, it is a village. The school is full to capacity. There are congestion and safety concerns. The local health services, the surgery, school and shopping facilities cannot possibly cope with this level of new housing, not to mention the sewage works that cannot cope with the intake as it is.	2404/6556	
	Support – of the rural/village sites (including H30) most seem of reasonable scale.	2416/6638	
	Comment – all proposed new housing in Strensall and Towthorpe must be minimised in	2846/7545	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	numbers.		
Site H30 Land To The South Of Strensall Village continued	Objection – object to proposed developments regarding H30 on following grounds; Roads in Strensall are already at full capacity. 61 houses will generate about 122 cars resulting in more pollution, traffic and congestion. Roads are narrow and Southfields Road gets busy to a dangerous level. Drainage is already a big problem in H30. Schools are already working at full capacity, as is the Surgery. There is no industry in Strensall, therefore, there are no jobs for new residents. New houses built near H30 are already higher by a third than the rest of the village which ruins the appearance of the village. The economy isn't great in the country, concerned about the type of housing that will be built – Strensall will lose its charm and people will move out to safer areas. No proposals for infrastructure upgrade in Strensall. Development will destroy wildlife. Any development in the area should take account of the presence of great crested newts and if proposed works are likely to result in any offences being committed the developer is expected to apply for a mitigation license from Natural England to allow the work to be undertaken whilst ensuring the newt population is protected	3059/7916	
	Objection – main concerns regarding development in Strensall (including H30) are traffic congestion and the loss of open space. This site forms part of an open wedge leading into the heart of the village and should be preserved as Green Belt in perpetuity.	3062/7923	
	Comment – in Strensall with a primary school that already has the highest number of pupils in the York area, there are plans for 82 new homes on nearly 10 acres of Green Belt land at the Brecks Estate with 61 new homes on over 6 acres south of the village. With agreement for 53 homes on the former Tannery site. The traffic generate by these developments will be considerable.	3295/8462	
	Objection –the adverse impact H30 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 infrastructure of the area. Strensall has already been over developed with a housing population in excess of 6000. The endangered wildlife in this area includes barn owls, badgers, bats and great crested newts.	3297/8464	
	Objection –number of proposed developments on and around the A1237 outer ring road including H30 represent 'development sprawl'. The increase in cars using the A1237 each day as a result of the proposed developments will rise drastically, perhaps by an extra 8-10,000. The area will also become a construction site until 2030 and	3428/8780	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	construction vehicles will add to the volume of traffic on the a1237 and through villages leading to it. Air pollution will result as well as massive congestion and raised health hazards.		
Site H30 Land To The South Of Strensall Village continued	Objection – Strensall is already larger than Malton and already endures stretched services.	3604/9591	
	Objection – site forms part of the open green corridor coming into the village.	4054/10733	
	Objection – removal of green belt designation on land H30 (and SF1)	4081/10764	
	Objection – believe that Strensall is already residentially overdeveloped. There is no significant infrastructure and facilities are already stretched,. Obstructive kerbside parking is a significant problem in places, no off road parking is available near the post office, Tesco, chemist, library and fish & chip shop. More houses will simply mean even more parking congestion and blockage, with nothing in the plan proposed to alleviate this. Should development be carried out it would over power the roads and limited facilities and destroy the quality of life in the village.	4139/10848	
	Objection – Strensall has already had its fair share of housing development – the infrastructure cannot support further growth. Traffic is already busy and at times unsafe and more houses would mean further strain on the infrastructure. The green belt needs preserving.	4150/10862	
	Objection –further development of Strensall will destroy the very attractiveness of the place. The ‘green wedge’ (which H30 forms apart) and is what makes Strensall attractive, has valuable green land for wildlife, and for the beauty of the countryside. It supports barn owls, bats, pheasants, and deer grazing on vegetation that represents an important habitat o the edge of Strensall Common. Strensall is a small settlement that has already grown to be so large that it affects its very attractiveness as a place to live. Urge that it be left alone as far as additional housing because any ‘benefits’ would be far outweighed by deleterious effects on the whole environment that makes Strensall the beautiful place that it is.	4242/11008	
Objection – green belt land. Strensall is a historic village and has a Conservation appraisal. This was approved as a supporting document for the Local Plan by the CYC Planning Committee on 24 th March 2011. The key characteristic of the Conservation Area is that of a linear village. The land has been left to nature for many years and is now a haven for flora and fauna that includes deer, badgers, barn owls, bats and great crested newts. There are many trees within this area and hedgerows form an important corridor and safe haven for wildlife listed and should be kept for nature conservation. There are existing problems with congestion of cars, and development	4250/11022		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will have an impact on flooding within the village with its antiquated Victorian sewage system that cannot cope now.		
Site H30 Land To The South Of Strensall Village continued	Objection –removal the green belt status of land in H30.	4318/11203	
	Objection – removal the green belt status of land in H30.	4394/11384	
	Objection –land being taken out of Green Belt for housing, particularly site H30 allocated for 61 houses	4495/11524	
	Objection – to build additional housing in Strensall to the scale envisaged would mean that current facilities particularly drainage, roads and schools already overstretched would not be able to cope. Site H30 is meadowland and home to newts and other wildlife, it floods in winter and is also in the Green Belt. Building additional homes here would aggravate the already severe traffic congestion and road safety hazards along Southfields Road.	4703/11996	
	Objection –loss of more Green Belt around Strensall should H30 (and SF1) be developed.	4769/12060	
	Comment – before any further building is allowed in Strensall, a plan should be produced for the village. In addition Strensall has a clearly defined Green Belt, local residents see no reason to change this green belt. Further, Wallbutts Sewage Treatment Centre already stinks on evenings with no breeze. There appears to be no plans to improve this facility. There are no plans to improve the infrastructure particularly traffic flow through the village to cope with the increased demand which will result from further development (including H30). Welcome the proposals for a Station in Strensall at H30, although enough land needs to be identified to provide car parking space it will require to ensure it viable. Strensall has been denied a scale of community facilities commensurate with the increase in housing and population since the '70s. Although Strensall is surrounded by green fields, open public space in the village is limited.	5189/12402	
	Objection – Strensall’s infrastructure cannot cope with this amount of development. The drains, roads, schools – unless the Council’s leaders propose to allocate more money for these. Also what about the wildlife so very close to Strensall Common?	5492/14857	
	Objection – please do not over develop Strensall. Developers have already felled healthy trees, saplings and destroyed natural habitats. How will the infrastructure cope? The local primary school is full, the doctor’s surgery is full, the roads are full, the Victorian drains are full.	5494/14863	
Objection – no more infilling in areas with poor access to main road (H30)	5674/13371		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H30 Land To The South Of Strensall Village Continued	Objection – there are no facilities in Strensall to encourage the building of new houses. Traffic on the main road through the village is already a major problem.	5961/15319	
	Objection – there is too much traffic coming through the village as it is and the school has more than enough pupils.	5962/15323	
	Objection – 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 infrastructure of the area. Strensall has already been over developed with a housing population in excess of 6000. The endangered wildlife in this area includes barn owls, badgers, bats and great crested newts. Robert Wilkinson School is already the largest Primary School in York and is at capacity. No consideration has been made in the plan for leisure facilities. The Local plan and the sub-urban sprawl it entails has potential to destroy the charm and character of Strensall. The Council should protect our local environment as it does the historical character of York.	6152/15641	
	Objection –removal of Green Belt designation on H30 (and SF1)	6312/15956	
	Objection – Strensall has 3 level crossings and has a rural feel. The green belt between Haxby and Strensall and indeed the rest of York should be maintained for posterity. More housing would create more cars and more traffic congestion. The proposed developments at (Haxby) Strensall (and Clifton Moor) are frankly ludicrous; the Council should listen to the electorate.	6456/16187	
	Objection – the main village street of Strensall becomes extremely congested as the few facilities that exist, drainage and roads all struggle to cope as it is. Indeed the Secondary School in Huntington, that serves Strensall will already be under pressure from potential housing developments in Huntington & Monks Cross. Concerned about the potential development at (H27 and) H30, not least because of potential drainage worries but also because access will be via the main village which puts greater pressure on the main village street. Comment - Work is already underway on site H32 (The Tannery Site) this is the type of brownfield site that the Council should be promoting for development ahead of any 'green' location.	6514/16305	Cllr Paul Doughty

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington	Comment – the Parish Survey revealed that of those returning the survey 13.5% were in favour, 65.2% were against and 21.3% expressed no opinion.	59/12646	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – along with other housing developments in Dunnington will increase traffic movements in the village and will further threaten the serious drainage and surface water issues. Being a green belt site it will significantly impact on the open character of the villages. Will put pressure on the already over subscribed doctors and school. The village cannot cope with further housing development.	640/11768	
	Comment – H31 (and H35 and H33) will cause serious drainage and sewage outlets also traffic problems through the village. However, the Council could think about land west and north of Dunnington towards York. This land is old green belt but it could possibly drain towards York’s system.	945/16981	
	Objection – too much additional housing does nothing for the environment or the countryside.	961/16988	
	Objection – adding further bulk to our population by way of the new housing (and traveller) sites would reduce the quality of facilities currently on offer throughout the village. This is a small village whose minimal facilities would see considerable strain should the proposal go ahead.	981/17004	
	Comment – the developer could widen the choice of housing within the village, provide additional affordable housing within the village, be required to improve the infrastructure of the village for instance improving drainage and sewage systems which would eliminate the risks of flooding and the backing up of sewage, be required to contribute to a fund to be used to enhance amenities in the village and be required to make improvements to the road infrastructure which would improve safety of vehicle users and pedestrians.	995/17023	
	Objection – Eastfield Lane is a medieval lane and a special place to be protected from further development. It is green belt land and should only be developed in very special circumstances which do not apply in Dunnington. The openness of the green belt is very precious. The village suffers from sewer water surface/drainage problems which would be made worse by this development.	1109/17194	
	Objection – H31 Eastfield lane (and H35 Intake Lane) are inappropriate developments ruining the openness of the green belt, in addition to the views of the Yorkshire Wolds.	1898/6041	
	Objections –proposals will lead to urban sprawl to the village, with the village ending up like other villages in the York area. The plan is over ambitious. Can the existing infrastructure cope? Loss of green belt.	1913/94	
	Objection – Greenfield v Brownfield sites , cannot believe there are no suitable	2316/6520	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Brownfield sites in the York area for housing development. Extensive housing development will have an adverse effect on Dunnington, there is already significant congestion on York Street and Church Street, a significant increase in cars would make travel both dangerous and intolerable. An increase in housing would cause strain on the primary school – it is already full to capacity. There would be no additional funds from central Government for this enlargement, nor for employing additional teachers to cover the increased demand.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – this land is treated as green belt, there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant a change in its status. The proposed development will have a significant and dominant impact on the open character of this area and cannot be justified. Access to the site is via a narrow country lane – alteration to this lane would have a major impact on the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. Development would increase vehicles on Eastfield Lane and increase pressure on Eastfield Lane/Church balk junction. This junction cannot be changed without impacting the character of the approach to the village within the conservation area.	2349/6535	
	Objection – deep concerns regarding the proposed planning for more houses (wind farms & travellers site) in Dunnington. The village would almost double in size. The volume of traffic and overloading at school, the doctors and dentist would have a disastrous affect.	2407/6564	
	Support – of the rural/village sites (including H31) most seem of reasonable scale.	2416/6639	
	Objection – green belt land, in open countryside and would impact greatly on this rural village which does not need to be expanded further without loss of its unique character and charm. The road junctions in the vicinity cannot support further expansion this development would bring. Local services such as water, sewage, surface drainage, schools, for example, are at a full capacity now and further expansion cannot be achieved without wholesale upgrading which will lead to a reduction in the village’s charm and attraction. This land should be retained as agricultural.	2467/6743	
	Objection – H31, H33 and H33 will seriously impact on the village especially on Eastfield Lane which links H33 with H31 and provides the only access to H35 through H31. The land is green belt and development would damage the northern setting of the village and its open rural character. Impact on Eastfield Lane would create serious traffic issues and prejudicing its historic and scenic status as the northern boundary of the village. There is no vehicular access to H35 from Intake Lane, access would be through H31. Serious traffic issues would be created on Eastfield Lane. The lane	2505/6779	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>towards Holtby is a very narrow single lane road with no recognised passing places. The lane is lined along most of its north-western side by an ancient native hedge and is often difficult to negotiate because of parked cars and heavy vehicles. The number of cars using Eastfield lane would increase by as much as 200. The lane is used currently as a rat run to avoid the already excessive congestion on Church and York Streets. The chicane- like junction of Eastfield lane and Church Street and Church Balk is a night mare, any attempt to improve the junction would damage its scenic character at the entrance to the village. Eastfield Lane boundary is of historic, scenic and structural importance to the setting of Dunnington. Mill Hill is the most prominent part of the York terminal moraine. Eastfield Lane should not be widened as widening would necessitate destruction of a long ancient native hedge a habitat for some rare species, it would also encroach on the Green Belt Such large overall development planned for Dunnington would make matters worse concerning sewerage, drainage, hard standing and surface water issues.</p>		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	<p>Comment – should development take place there should be a social mix of new housing so that all sectors of the community are served. Objection – concerned that housing development will increase the existing traffic movements and congestion in various parts of the village. The school has capacity problems which new housing is likely to exacerbate. The village has a discrete identity being compact and surrounded by countryside, any development needs to recognise, respect and complement the established village context.</p>	2511/6783	
	<p>Objection – the existing infrastructure along Eastfield Lane could not cope with extra housing on this site. Infrastructure would need upgrading without which the development is unsustainable. New development would affect access roads, traffic volume, underground drainage, surface run-off, water supply ad school provision. There is an issue concerning the status of the existing house at The Market Garden. Access to H31 is very poor. Any attempt to alter Eastfield lane would cause serious harm to the rural character of the village and the Green Belt and would result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. Eastfield Lane would effectively act as the Local Distributor Road for the housing. Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane which will exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church balk, which is a bus route. Concerned new building along Eastfield lane will exacerbate the problem of drainage of surface water from the road surface and have a wider impact on the village which has an acknowledged drainage problem. There is also very significant surface run off from fields during heavy rain, development would</p>	2517/6801	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. There are low water pressure issues to properties on Eastfield Lane, extra housing could be a problem for existing and new properties. There should be no change to the exiting boundary of the Green Belt as this should be regarded as inappropriate development. Dunnington has a problem with drainage, sewage, infrastructure, school capacity. Wildlife on this field has included barn owls, deer etc. Noise and light pollution will be an issue.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – if Dunnington is to have further housing in the village it should be made a priority that the drainage system and top water be made completely up to standard to cope with this influx. It is a health hazard.	2533/6814	
	Objection – the huge number of new homes to be built on ‘Green Belt’ land (plus three wind farms).	2552/6864	
	Objection – a reduced number of affordable housing is necessary. This is green belt and traffic pressure on Eastfield Lane and surrounding roads would be significant.	2556/6875	
	Objection – much concern about extra houses when the primary school is full and there is traffic everywhere, particularly much congestion on York Street. If houses were built on Intake Lane people would have to exit by driving through the village, whereas houses on Eastfield lane would be able to exit straight on to the Stamford Bridge Road with less impact on the village. Residents would prefer to not have any extra housing as it would spoil the village completely and the infrastructure would not be able to cope. Drainage is already a problem.	2558/6880	
	Objection – disagree with area to be allocated for housing in Dunnington. The village water drainage system is unable to cope with existing demands of the housing.	2561/6893	
	Comment – major housing development should be on the side further from York i.e. Eastfield Lane in order to retain the village feel. Development on the three main entrances to the village should be restricted i.e. York Road, Church Balk and Common Road.	2565/6898	
	Support – no objection to developing this site.	2566/6902	
	Support – no objection to developing this site.	2592/6940	
Objection – proposals appear to have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own ‘Design Statement’. Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems, additional development will make the problems worse and increase risk of flooding. Put further strain on the already problematic sewage system. Change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geological features ancient native	2594/6945		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Increase the number of road users which will add to the existing congestion and its inherited road safety risks particularly at junctions. Increase the need for parking and will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in a conservation area. Destroy the unique historic character.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – development projects in its surrounding villages could extend into one vast array of housing estates. All sense of community will be crushed and amenities will be overwhelmed by force of numbers.	2623/6964	
	Objection – this site is situated along a very narrow lane which already has traffic flow problems. New development would change the balance of the village and impair views over the Yorkshire Wolds.	2635/6988	
	Comment – H31 is OK if much smaller scale as traffic problems likely.	2642/7005	
	Objection- the village roads cannot accept any further traffic – Eastfield Lane and Church Balk crossroads being a significant problem. Drainage and parking are well known problems.	2645/7009	
	Objection – proposals for H31 (and H33, H35 and H44) objected to relating to potentially dangerous access on to the main roads the additional dangers caused by pedestrians notably schoolchildren attending the local school. The village questionnaire in 2004 there was an unanimous feeling Dunnington was already 'fully built' no further development was wanted or needed. The village school is not capable of adequately coping with any additional pupils as a result of additional planning proposals.	2646/7014	
	Objection – proposals for H31 (and H33, H35 and H44) objected to relating to potentially dangerous access on to the main roads the additional dangers caused by pedestrians notably schoolchildren attending the local school. The village questionnaire in 2004 there was an unanimous feeling Dunnington was already 'fully built' no further development was wanted or needed. The village school is not capable of adequately coping with any additional pupils as a result of additional planning proposals.	2647/7018	
	Objection – any major housing developments would cause concerns for the infrastructure of the village. The roads are already inadequate and poorly maintained, the same can be said for drainage, sewage etc. Basic facilities would be stretched and should there be a large rise in the number of children at the school, major work would have to be considered. The school is already over subscribed.	2666/7059	
	Objection – against building houses in the village – the village is big enough and don't want to become a sprawling town. If houses are needed not against building on infill sites within the village.	2677/7096	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems, a problematic sewage system, the character and aspect of the village will change and impact adversely on important geological features, ancient and native hedgerows and productive agricultural land. Road junctions are already under pressure.	2679/7110	
	Objection – proposals appear to have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own ‘Design Statement’. Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems – additional development will;Make the problems worse and increase risk of flooding. Put further strain on the already problematic sewage system. Change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geological features ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Increase the number of road users which will add to the existing congestion and its inherited road safety risks particularly at junctions. Increase the need for parking and will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in a conservation area. Destroy the unique historic character.	2682/7120	
	Objection –sites encroach on the green belt and are detrimental to the landscape and will put pressure on facilities within the village.	2697/7151	
	Objection –green belt land and should not be treated as building land. New development would significantly increase the traffic on Eastfield Lane. Also at present this land is used as a successful market garden business and the rearing of livestock which would be a loss to the economy of the city.	2706/7163	
	Objection – the roads within the village are narrow and parking is difficult, even now, to generate more cars from new housing will have a negative impact on the village – particularly at Church Balk, Petercroft and Common Lane. The loss of parking for the Church at the Eastfield lane site would put more cars onto the roads in an already congested residential area. There are ongoing problems with sewers and drainage in Dunnington, more housing and hard surfacing can only add to these problems. Further development of the village needs to be looked at from a safety angle, services and the issues around them and the loss of quality of village lifestyle	2707/7166	
	Objection –green belt land and would adversely affect the character of the village.	2708/7174	
	Objection – development will impact on the village character – more built up area and less open space, existing services will be under strain. Will the school be able to cope? There could be an increase in parking in York Street which could lead to more congestion. What weight does the ‘Green Belt’ status carry?	2709/7180	
	Objection –green belt land should not be considered for housing until ALL brown field	2711/7186	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	land has been fully utilised for housing. Dunnington would require a major upgrade of drainage and sewage disposal which at present is barely adequate. Substantial improvements to the road infrastructure which would be necessary would seriously harm the character of the village. Additional vehicles would cause serious congestion on Church Lane and York Street which are already extremely busy roads and create safety problems.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – any more housing in Dunnington in any shape or form requires additional sporting land and a lot of money spent on basic infrastructure in respect of sewerage and schooling.	2713/7196	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Objection – the proposed big developments (including H31) would be too large for the village. Have we as a city and surrounding areas run out of Brownfield sites? Perhaps we should make best use of them before encroaching on Greenbelt. Main roads around Dunnington are already congested.	2714/7203	
	Objection – would be reneging on a previous agreement not to build on green belt land. Housing would have a negative impact on the open character of a rural village. The size, scale and location of the proposed housing presents an issue of inappropriate development on green belt land which is contrary to the green belt policies in the City of York Draft Plan. Narrow roads are already working to full capacity, Dunnington wouldn't be able to sustain the increase in traffic. The congestion in and out of the village would also certainly be negatively affected. Additional vehicles would definitely have an adverse effect on the already existing parking issues. The main junctions in and out of the village will also be affected by the increase in traffic. The impact to pedestrians of the increase in traffic would also be detrimental – children and elderly residents simply won't be able to cross the village roads quick enough to avoid being hit by a speeding vehicle. CYC clearly states that brown field sites should be used for development before green belt land is considered. Sewerage systems of Dunnington are already working to maximum capacity. New housing would be too close to the existing residences. The right to privacy in your own home is a basic human right. New houses would take away the majority of natural light from existing residences. There are current serious drainage issues affecting the village An impact would be made to the visual amenity of the village and would destroy the unique character of the village. Not enough local amenities to cope with an increase in residents.	2726/7223	
Objection – opposed to the housing development proposed for Dunnington (including H31) This site is green belt and there are no special circumstances as to why this should change. The environmental impact must be considered together with the affect	2728/7229		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on the visual amenity of the surrounding areas.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the land is part of the green belt because of its open character. There are no exceptional circumstances to change its status and it should remain as open productive agricultural land. Development will seriously impact upon the open character of this rural village and severely compromise the visual amenity of properties in Holly Tree Croft and Eastfield Lane. Any new access to the site and the increase in vehicular traffic will seriously affect the character of the village and be a danger to the existing residents who regularly walk along the lane. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will exacerbate the already dangerous junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk.	2731/7237	
	Objection – the land is part of the green belt because of its open character. There are no exceptional circumstances to change its status and it should remain as open productive agricultural land. Development will seriously impact upon the open character of this rural village and severely compromise the visual amenity of properties in Holly Tree Croft and Eastfield Lane. Any new access to the site and the increase in vehicular traffic will seriously affect the character of the village and be a danger to the existing residents who regularly walk along the lane. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will exacerbate the already dangerous junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk.	2733/7241	
	Objection – this land is treated as green belt because of its open character and productive agricultural use. Development would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate surface water/drainage issues affectively in the village. Development will result in a significant increase in vehicular movements along Eastfield Lane and will exacerbate the problems at an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. This junction cannot be improved without impacting adversely on the character of the village and the setting of the conservation area.	2736/7247	
	Objection – no evidence that we need this additional amount of housing. The local health, education, transport and sanitary infrastructure will struggle to cope with such a dramatic increase. It is essential we maintain the green belt currently surrounding the village and that we keep attractive approach to the village in order to prevent urban sprawl and to provide a buffer between the village and the industrial estate.	2743/7263	
	Objection – green belt should not be included in the proposals. Development of this site will further increase the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. Concerned about the increase in the volume of traffic this will cause at the already busy junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk. Any alteration to this junction will	2750/7274	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	have a serious impact on the character of the village and on the setting of the conservation area.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – this site is on green belt land (together with H33 and H35) any development would have a detrimental impact on the visual aspect of the area. Dunnington has a lovely sense of community, worried that an increase in properties would have a negative impact on this.	2774/7340	
	Objection – any more expansion would be catastrophic. The Eastfield Lane development would exit onto a very dangerous junction. Wish to keep the village as it is.	2776/7347	
	Objection – H31 is situated on land proposed for green belt. Development of this land would also have a significantly adverse affect on the visual impact on the village, impacting the openness and character of the village as well as the surrounding area. The H31 site supports economic use for a landscape gardening business and for livestock use. The loss of this land for this purpose would impact the wider revenues for the city. A number of roads would require development destroying established hedgerows and wildlife within. There would be serious impacts on the road junctions with a significant increase in the amount of traffic within the village. The development of houses will put further strain on the village drainage and increase the risk of flooding.	2778/7349	
	Objection – H31 is green belt and provides an attractive and open character to the rural village. A large number of new properties will increase the problem with surface water drainage already experienced in the village. New development will increase the use of the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk and exacerbate the problem of this hazardous junction. The site is currently a business (landscape gardening and livestock) housing development would cause a loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. There is further concern for residents whose visual amenity will be affected and for the large increase in additional traffic into the village along narrow country lanes.	2779/7357	
	Objection – development of H31 will impact on the geographical feature of the York Moraine. The junction at Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is already a difficult one and would need widening. The drainage off Eastfield Lane is already horrendous. More housing at that end of the village will make for more traffic – the A166 is already a hazardous venture.	2780/7363	
	Objection – inappropriate given the problems with the Market Garden pig breeding venture. The access road is used by farmers and their farm machinery and is not	2781/7368	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	suitable for the additional vehicles the proposed housing will bring. The proposed field is a hunting ground for barn owls, sparrow hawks and lesser spotted woodpecker. Deer have also been sighted. There will also be drainage problems in particular flash flooding. The current infrastructure will not support the proposed number of houses across any of the proposed sites.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection –green belt land (together with H33 and H35) any development would have a detrimental impact on the visual aspect of the area. Dunnington has a lovely sense of community, worried that an increase in properties would have a negative impact on this. This is a green field site – what exceptional circumstances warrant the change of status of land to allow building development.	2786/7380	
	Objection – 60 homes here is too many for the size of the road and the open character of the site relative to the rest of the village.	2793/7407	
	Objection – the land is Green Belt. For H31 development access could only be from the narrow lane that continues from Eastfield Lane past Dunnington House – this is a single track road and its character would be changed irrevocably.	2810/7457	
	Objection – most concerned about the Eastfield Lane proposal (H31) this is green belt area with drainage issues, concerns about an increase in traffic and impact on junctions.	2811/7461	
	Objection – 60 new homes of Eastfield Lane in Dunnington is inappropriate for the following reasons; Eastfield Lane beyond the existing dwellings is a narrow country lane - it is not wide enough for two way traffic. If a new road was built it would severely alter the visual aspect of this aprt of the village. It would be dangerous to create another active junction onto the A166. It is unlikely that new house owners would be happy to be living close to livestock and their associated smells. Issues with unauthorised rearing of pigs are still believed to be unresolved by CYC.	2827/7493	
	Objection – proposals appear to have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own ‘Design Statement’. Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems – additional development will; Make the problems worse and increase risk of flooding. Put further strain on the already problematic sewage system Change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geological features ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Increase the number of road users which will add to the existing congestion and its inherited road safety risks particularly at junctions. Increase the need for parking and will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in a	2836/7507	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	conservation area. Destroy the unique historic character.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – the need for housing in the York area is well known but the enlargement of Dunnington should be restricted so as not to destroy the village life which the residents value so much.	2840/7523	
	Objection – development of H31 (and H35) will reduce green field site areas around the village. Traffic movement in and through the village will be increased and the character of the village will not be improved by any attempts to alter junctions and road widths. Significant expenditure will be required to resolve surface drainage and sewerage problems.	2842/7530	
	Comment – what safeguards will be put into place to control the extra flooding due to the new housing. Also the sewerage system is at full capacity.	2914/7628	
	Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic caused by the extra building will add to the chaos on local roads and the proposed building will cause flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields.	2915/7635	
	Objection – totally object to any development here without a full upgrade to the Eastfield Lane access to the site and a full upgrade of the drainage/sewage system.	2916/7641	
	Objection – this land is treated as green belt because of its open character and productive agricultural use. Development would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate surface water/drainage issues affectively in the village. The proposed development will have a significant and dominant impact on the open character of this area and cannot be justified. Access to the site is via a narrow country lane – alteration to this lane would have a major impact on the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. Development would increase vehicles on Eastfield Lane and increase pressure on Eastfield Lane/Church balk junction. This junction cannot be changed without impacting the character of the approach to the village within the conservation area.	2930/7663	
	Objection – this land is treated as green belt because of its open character and productive agricultural use. Development would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate surface water/drainage issues affectively in the village. The proposed development will have a significant and dominant impact on the open character of this area and cannot be justified. Access to the site is via a narrow country lane – alteration to this lane would have a major impact on the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. Development would increase vehicles on Eastfield Lane and increase pressure on Eastfield Lane/Church balk junction. This junction cannot be changed without	2931/7667	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	impacting the character of the approach to the village within the conservation area.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the proposed H31 Eastfield Lane site (and H35) is inappropriate development – will ruin the openness of the green belt and roads which are already very narrow with often overgrown hedges providing access.	2939/7681	
	Objection – any development here would have significant impact along an already narrow country lane. Widening would harm the character of the lane resulting in damage to native hedgerows and encroach into the nearby cemetery land. Increased traffic at the junction of Eastfield lane and Church balk would result and cause increased risk of surface water issues.	2941/7689	
	Objection –productive agricultural land, forming an open aspect around the village and on formally proposed Green Belt. Further development will threaten serious water draining issues in the village. Will have a greater impact on traffic and access in and around the village at some already hazardous junctions and narrow lanes. To gain access will result in removal and damage to many ancient hedgerows with the resulting loss of habitat for wildlife. Any further housing will put an even greater strain on the parking and highways issues within the village especially issues of road safety near shops and the school and access into and out of the village at the already hazardous junctions onto both the A166 and A1079. Dunnington is a village and should preserve its isolation from the conurbation of York.	2942/7695	
	Comment – understand more homes are needed and Dunnington could take some more – the main problem being the need for better sewage/flooding work to be done and roads would need to be wider.	2947/7703	
	Objection – National Planning Policy Framework states Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside form encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes.	2956/7711	
	Comment – Should more houses be built and used this road (Eastfield Lane) it would be busier, some cars now go too fast.	2957/7719	
	Objection – it is essential to protect green belt and green field sites to preserve the countryside. Over development of a village destroys its very nature. Dunnington already large enough. Productive farmland should not be removed from the supply of food. There has already been a huge loss of productive farmland around York. Why are so many houses needed?	2958/7726	
	Objection – the road is too narrow and cannot cope with more traffic. Eastfield Lane has a problem with drainage already.	2959/7731	
	Objection – this site lies within the Green Belt – the number of houses proposed would	2963/7739	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	have a significant impact on Dunnington. Increasing the risk of flooding. The access roads are not constructed to modern standards and increased traffic is likely to lead to accidents.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – concerns about the proposed plans for the increased housing in Dunnington.	2967/7742	
	Comment – concerns about the proposed plans for the increased housing in Dunnington.	2968/7746	
	Comment – there is a huge problem now with traffic flow at the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk with an accident waiting to happen.	2972/7756	
	Objection – the proposal to build new housing stock in Dunnington is really not on and would add considerable strain to an already oversized village. Nothing has been taken into account for new infrastructure, the sewage and top water drainage would need to be updated/renewed and the school would need to plan for additional students. Also leading to a loss of productive agricultural land, loss of native hedge rows and infringement on the green belt. The development would despoil the view of the village and depreciate the views/skyline of Mill Hill: a geographical feature of the York Moraine. Eastfield Lane is also prone to flooding.	2984/7765	
	Objection – the proposal to build new housing stock in Dunnington is really not on and would add considerable strain to an already oversized village. Nothing has been taken into account for new infrastructure, the sewage and top water drainage would need to be updated/renewed and the school would need to plan for additional students. Also leading to a loss of productive agricultural land, loss of native hedge rows and infringement on the green belt. The development would despoil the view of the village and depreciate the views/skyline of Mill Hill: a geographical feature of the York Moraine. Eastfield Lane is also prone to flooding.	2985/6201	
	Objection – there is already trouble with surface water. Development of the site would seriously harm the character of this part of the village. The land falls in the green belt with open views to the Wolds. The land is productive agricultural land. Development would significantly impact the open character of the village. This is confirmed green belt land. Access to the site is very poor, Eastfield Lane is a single track road with no passing places near the site. The infrastructure in both Dunnington and along Eastfield Lane would need major upgrading before any new development could take place. Development would affect access roads, traffic volume, underground drainage, surface run off, water supply and school provision. Any attempt to alter Eastfield lane would cause serious harm to the rural character of this part of the village. Eastfield Lane does	3027/7870	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	not meet the requirements of a local distributor road as defined in the council document 'Hierarchy of Roads'. Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane. Underground drainage – the main pipe along Eastfield Lane was a 6" drain and, therefore, below specification for drainage. Serious surface water drainage issues affect the village. Low water pressure affects the area.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – do not opposed development of land at H31 (together with H35 and H44), however, if to be developed will result in significant additional traffic movement on Eastfield Lane requiring highway improvement.	3056/7911	
	Objection – drainage and utilities are currently overstretched. Many of the roads and footpaths around the village are in much need of repair and even this seems too big an issue. Any building development in the village would increase the flood risk in the village.	3089/7972	
	Comment – have no objection to further housing development in Dunnington the school would not be able to take an increase of children. The volume of traffic on Eastfield Lane will have a detrimental affect on an already busy junction with Church Balk.	3122/8041	
	Objection –the village as it cannot sustain and does not have the resources for such large developments.	3123/8045	
	Objection – no objection to the principle of new housing being built but do not consider the sites put forward (including H31) are the most appropriate for a rural village as they would mean a combination of visual intrusive encroachment on important and ancient rural settings and would introduce substantial traffic into the heart of the village.	3136/8075	
	Objection – the fields running down the York Moraine to Eastfield Lane are green belt land and should not be developed. The increase in surface water run off due to development will increase the risk of flooding on Eastfield Lane. Eastfield Lane would need widening this would result in the loss of hedgerows which is objected to.	3140/8086	
	Objection – the village has already reached its maximum and the local amenities are stretched to their absolute limit.	3146/8099	
	Objection – concerned that the proposed additional housing will have a detrimental impact on the character of the village and a strain.	3165/8143	
	Objection – H31 (together with H33 and H35) are inappropriate developments as they would ruin the openness of the green belt affect the visual amenity of the village and detrimental to the overall beauty of the village.	3169/8152	
Objection – H31 is situated on land proposed for green belt. The land is in productive	3176/8168		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in status. Part of the site is already in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for rearing livestock. Development will result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the existing residents and will threaten serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. It will significantly impact on the extremely narrow country lane, alteration of which would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage of ancient native hedgerows. Significant increases in vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane will result and exacerbate an already hazardous junction which cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – development will completely change the open aspect of the village in this area. It is on land currently used for agricultural purposes and thus treated as green belt. Eastfield Lane is a very narrow and to widen it would increase traffic to the A166 and would lead to the removal of hedges and verges.</p>	3247/8337	
	<p>Objection – flooding is already a problem. Dunnington is a village with village roads not wide enough for so much extra traffic. The roads are part of the village character – wider roads are not wanted. This is green belt land, there is no justification to use the green belt.</p>	3262/8377	
	<p>Support – provided the developer improves the drainage and sewage systems to eliminate the flood risk and back up of sewage and improves the road access to the site which is currently a narrow country lane – this proposal is supported.</p>	3265/8384	
	<p>Objection – this site will be encroaching on the current green belt.</p>	3290/8435	
	<p>Objection – this site will be encroaching on the current green belt.</p>	3291/8443	
	<p>Objection – issue of visual impact on the character of the village, permanent loss of green spaces or green belt land, increased pressure on facilities in the village such as school, Dr and dentist practices, higher levels of traffic and loss of sense of community spirit if the village expands too greatly in size too quickly.</p>	3293/8452	
	<p>Objection – protest on both social and environmental grounds. There will be a considerable increase in the number of houses and together with the development at Grimston Bar will result in a real danger of being consumed in York’s urban sprawl with a resultant loss of identity and community involvement. The proposed developments are all hugely out of scale with the village – they are simply too big. School provision - extra space would be required to house the increases number of classes. The drainage in the village is chancy at best and the eastern end of the village is where all the water ends up. The environment agency flood risk map makes it obvious why houses have not already been built in this area – it floods.</p>	3310/8486	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – H31 is situated on land proposed for green belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in status. Development will result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the existing residents and will threaten serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. It will significantly impact on the extremely narrow country lane, alteration of which would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage of ancient native hedgerows. Significant increases in vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane will result and exacerbate an already hazardous junction which cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village. Increased traffic will have a knock on affect on the whole village with driving/parking along the main York Street already a major issue.	3321/8502	
	Objection – this is green belt land, development here would have a significant impact on the character of this rural village, a detrimental impact on surface water drainage issues, generate an increase in traffic along Eastfield Lane. To alter the junction would harm the character of the village and the setting of the conservation area.	3368/8643	
	Comment – although this land is currently green belt land it would be preferable to have houses on this land than the illegal pig farm. The down side is that it will further threaten serious water drainage for the people living to the south of this development. The additional traffic it will generate at the Church Balk will increase the problems that already exist at this junction.	3383/6053	
	Comment – the proposal of H31 will result in significant additional traffic movement along Eastfield Lane which will require highway improvement. Should the development go ahead it should be tied to a legal agreement that all the livestock activity should cease including adjacent land so as to remove any conflict with residential amenity.	3402/8712	
	Objection –impact of traffic in the village. Despite the volume and acknowledged speed of the traffic there are no designated crossings within the village and no plans put forward to introduce any. Not against housing development in the village in principle, however, they must be accompanied by clear proposals to address the traffic issues. In the absence of any such information it must be assumed that no proposals exist.	3408/8724	
	Objection – strongly object to proposals on the grounds that it represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and raises highway safety problems. Development would cause significant detrimental visual and environmental impact on a narrow country lane. And have a substantial adverse impact for residents in existing adjacent properties. It would damage existing ancient hedgerows that provide an important linear habitat for native species. It is inappropriate green belt development.	3431/8757	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Increased traffic would be generated by the development causing highway safety problems.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – Eastfield Lane would carry traffic to the site. There are no passing places and it already carries significant traffic as it provides a short cut from the A166 into the village and the Industrial Estate on Common Road.	3434/8764	
	Objection – concerns regarding the housing development proposed for Dunnington. Especially drainage, flooding and sewage. Further housing would only exacerbate this problem and put further stresses on an already over stretched drainage system. Also additional traffic is a concern. H31 would cause problems at the Eastfield Lane/Church balk junction as well as placing unreasonable pressure of traffic on a narrow lane.	3446/8824	
	Objection – no emphasis placed on essential infrastructure improvements needed before any work is carried out Surface water drainage must be improved as existing drainage facilities are inadequate. Sewage is another issue. Water pressure is already a problem for houses in Eastfield Lane. Existing levels of traffic are very high for the capacity of the core routes. The impact of the probable increase in the number of children on the primary school in terms of capacity and additional vehicular traffic must be taken into account. Eastfield Lane would carry traffic to site, there are no passing places and it already carries significant traffic as it provides a short cut from the A166 into the village and the industrial estate on Common Road. The number of houses would give rise to a very large number of private cars. Water pressure in Eastfield Lane can vary significantly, additional houses will require that pressure improved. Surface water drainage is a major issue, drainage pipes are of different diameters, dredging of ditches is not carried out and flash flooding occurs all too often.	3464/8893	
	Comment – no objection to the housing developments providing the correct infrastructure is put in e.g. more roads, drainage etc. What about Church parking and the new cemetery on Eastfield Lane. Over development will destroy the unique character	3471/8907	
	Objection – this is green belt land, York struggles with congestion and this plan would destroy the unique character of York.	3509/9428	
	Objection – housing proposals for Dunnington seem far too large and on green belt land. Are there no brownfield sites that could be developed. Please do not change the nature of our village.	3523/9462	
	Objection – proposition for development on green belt would be detrimental to the character of the village let alone the impact on bio-diversity.	3530/9473	
	Objection – H31 will take up a green field site. Traffic movement through the village	3537/9490	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will increase and the character of the village will be maimed by any attempts to alter junctions and road widths. Significant expenditure will be needed to resolve surface drainage and sewerage problems.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection –infrastructure on Eastfield Lane could not cope with extra housing on site and would need major upgrading. New development would affect access roads, traffic volume, underground drainage, surface run off and water supply. Access – Access to the site is very poor. Verges are very narrow and the carriageway is very narrow. There is no grass verge or room to create one on either side. Should development proceed highway construction vehicles are totally unsuited in both directions and would result in loss of amenity to residents. Mud may enter existing drains. Damage to ancient native hedgerows would result. Eastfield lane would effectively act as the Local Distributor Road for housing. Traffic – Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane and will exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk, which is a bus route. The main pipe on Eastfield lane is a 6” drain and, therefore, below specification for drainage. New building will exacerbate the problem of drainage of surface water from the road. Very significant surface run off from fields north of Eastfield Lane occur during heavy rain storms. Development will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues. Existing properties suffer from low water pressure and could be a problem for existing and new properties and would need upgrading. Green Belt and existing house at the Market Garden at Eastfield lane. Development will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in Green Belt. The house has an agricultural occupancy clause suggesting the land is agricultural land. This should be regarded as inappropriate development and there should be no change to the existing boundary of the green belt.	3582/9543	
	Objection – development of this site (and H33,35 and 44) are completely unsuitable for a village of this size. It will destroy the character and put pressure on local amenities and destroy the green belt. This land is agricultural land. Dunnington has a problem with drainage and this proposal would impact further on flooding. Increased traffic would create further hazards near the proposed sites. Junctions could not be altered without causing real harm to the conservation area. Additional houses will impact on the busy roads. The primary school is now reaching maximum capacity. Development would have a negative impact on the rural open character of the village on Green Belt land.	3589/9557	
	Comment – too many authorities are trying ways to use the ‘Green Belt’ and will have	3590/9565	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	an adverse impact on many issues over years. If too many dwellings are constructed the infrastructure of Dunnington will be unable to cope.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – all sites in Dunnington have winter floods. They will need major investment for roads, water and sewage beyond present capacity. The local school has capacity issues. There are lots of sites in York, why build on green field sites?	3610/9601	
	Objection – this land for development purposes lies on Green Belt land – are there no more appropriate brownfield sites suitable for housing development. Development on the scale suggested would greatly impact the existing infrastructure within the village. Developing H31 would have a serious impact on the narrow Eastfield Lane. Alterations of the lane would destroy some ancient and significant native hedgerow. Good hedgerow is essential for the protection of nesting birds. There would be a significant increase of traffic along Eastfield Lane towards the Church Balk junction with an increase in accident risk. Development would affect the surface water drainage of the area. The site is already in economic use as a landscape gardening business, housing development would result in a loss of economy to the village and city.	3614/9613	
	Objection – access problems and loss of good agricultural land. Overall the drainage and infrastructure in Dunnington would need substantial upgrading.	3616/9619	
	Comment – housing development for Dunnington is a little ambitious and would significantly affect the visual attractiveness and rural character of the village. Objection – No provision made regarding drainage, sewage disposal, road improvement, main services etc. Strain would be imposed on the school, health centre and shops. A substantial increase in local traffic would make convenient parking impossible. Some more houses at strategic places in Dunnington are acceptable. However, deplore the notion that the proposals represent a realistic need.	3636/9650	
	Objection – Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems which cause flooding. Additional development will make matters worse and increase flood risk together with putting strain on the already problematic sewage system. The village is surrounded by open space on all sides, development will change the character and aspect of Dunnington and impact adversely important geological features, ancient hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Roads and junctions are already under pressure. Development will increase road users adding to congestion and inherent safety risks particularly at junctions. Parking needs will be increased. Further expansion of a small village will destroy its unique historic character.	3679/9695	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the mains services are unable to cope. Flash flooding is a frequent occurrence as drains cannot cope. Power cuts were too frequent following previous building of new housing developments	3681/9704	
	Objection – this is the highest part of the parish and should be kept open. Surface water already streams down from the land and floods gardens. Drainage of the area needs to be of great priority and expense to put right. Loss of countryside feel and the lovely aspect for all. If housing is needed there are better sites.	3689/9726	
	Objection – there are serious issues of surface water drainage and sewage in the village which need to be resolved prior to any development. Developments would result in highway safety issues for road users, children, and pedestrians crossing roads by increasing the amount of traffic and parking issues along small narrow roads and hazardous junctions that currently exist. Additional traffic will cause safety issues. The proposed developments are green belt Greenfield sites in agricultural use on York Moraine with ancient hedgerows and would detract from the visual amenity and open character should they be developed. Additional housing development will have serious issues on already current and serious issues of surface water drainage, flooding, sewage, road safety, parking and infrastructure of Dunnington.	3690/9732	
	Objection – the amount of traffic in and out of the village along Church Balk has significantly increased. 30 mile limit is ignored by a large amount of traffic. It would also put extra pressure on the exit from Church Balk onto the Stamford Bridge road. This is already an accident black spot.	3695/9742	
	Comment – aware of need for additional housing but feel pressure on facilities in village by both additional cars and people needs to be considered. Getting in and out of the village at rush hour times is already difficult. The school is already bursting at the seams.	3699/9747	
	Objection – Eastfield Lane is an unspoilt area – more housing would result in more traffic. The sewage system would struggle to cope with more housing. Widening of the lane would cause difficulty in access and more accidents would result.	3712/9995	
	Objection – construction on this land would mar the agricultural aspect of the area and village. It would cause traffic problems on the Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction and be detrimental to the water drainage system.	3713/9998	
	Objection –Green Belt in open countryside . Development would impact on the charm and character of the village and setting. The roads and junctions in the vicinity cannot support further expansion. Local services such as water, sewage, surface drainage, schools are full to capacity. The land should be retained for agricultural use.	3723/10020	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – green space for agriculture, nature reserves or just to make the country a more pleasant place to live is becoming very scarce. Dunnington currently has a strong sense of community. If the population of the village increases we will lose this community feel. Increasing the size of the village so there is less space between Dunnington, York and other villages will dilute this individual character.	3748/10140	
	Comment – Dunnington will be unable to absorb any further development of any size without major alterations to infrastructure which will seriously affect the charm and character of the village. It should retain the current culture and charm of the village. Should development occur the single most important thing that must receive attention is drainage, sewerage and surplus water. There are already problems in all of these areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. The drains at this level already cannot cope. At some points in the village surface water passes through the same system as sewerage which makes the position much worse. H31 for development control purposes is treated as green belt because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Part of the site is already in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for the rearing of livestock. Housing development on this site would result in the loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. Development of the site will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the residents of the existing adjacent properties. Development will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. 60 additional dwellings will have wider highway and parking impacts on the village which would also be further exaggerated by housing developments elsewhere.	3756/10157	
	Objection – accept there is a housing need, but totally object to any development here without a full upgrade of the Eastfield Lane access to the site and a full upgrade of the drainage/sewage system.	3765/10171	
	Comment – Dunnington will be unable to absorb any further development of any size without major alterations to infrastructure which will seriously affect the charm and character of the village. It should retain the current culture and charm of the village. Should development occur the single most important thing that must receive attention is drainage, sewerage and surplus water. There are already problems in all of these	3798/10234	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. The drains at this level already cannot cope. At some points in the village surface water passes through the same system as sewerage which makes the position much worse. H31 for development control purposes is treated as green belt because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Part of the site is already in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for the rearing of livestock. Housing development on this site would result in the loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. Development of the site will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the residents of the existing adjacent properties. Development will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. 60 additional dwellings will have wider highway and parking impacts on the village which would also be further exaggerated by housing developments elsewhere.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – this is inappropriate development as it will ruin the openness of the green belt.</p>	<p>3817/10268</p>	
	<p>Objection – infrastructure on Eastfield Lane could not cope with extra housing on site and would need major upgrading. New development would affect access roads, traffic volume, underground drainage, surface run off and water supply. Access – Access to the site is very poor. Verges are very narrow and the carriageway is very narrow. There is no grass verge or room to create one on either side. Should development proceed highway construction vehicles are totally unsuited in both directions and would result in loss of amenity to residents. Mud may enter existing drains. Damage to ancient native hedgerows would result. Eastfield lane would effectively act as the Local Distributor Road for housing. Traffic – Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane and will exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk, which is a bus route. Underground Drainage - The main pipe on Eastfield lane is a 6" drain and, therefore, below specification for drainage. New building will exacerbate the problem of drainage of surface water from the road. Surface run off – Very significant surface run off from fields north of Eastfield Lane occur during heavy rain storms. Development will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues. Water Supply – Existing properties suffer from low water pressure and could be</p>	<p>3821/10283</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	a problem for existing and new properties and would need upgrading. Green Belt and existing house at the Market Garden at Eastfield lane – Development will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in Green Belt. The house has an agricultural occupancy clause suggesting the land is agricultural land. This should be regarded as inappropriate development and there should be no change to the existing boundary of the green belt.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this housing site is on designated green belt land. Large scale residential development should not, in principle, be proposed on green belt land for the very reason that it will result in development spreading beyond the built up limits of the village. There also needs to be consideration to the possibilities available for extending the school to accommodate the extra numbers of children in the village.	3822/10286	
	Comment – all housing planning requires expert reports and careful consideration of the effects on the infrastructure of the village. Including expert reports on the state of sewage system, and surface water run off in the village together with a full transport survey covering access, traffic movement and projected effects of increased traffic flow.	3823/10289	
	Objection – the amount of traffic which would be generated by such a large extension to the village would be very considerable and totally unwarranted. This is green belt and should remain as agricultural land. Drainage issues here are considerable and will impact further down the village.	3829/6470	
	Objection – development of H31 would destroy the open aspect of the green belt.	3853/10347	
	Objection – new houses are required but not the number envisaged for Dunnington.	3858/10366	
	Comment – Dunnington has poor road access especially access to Eastfield Lane from Church balk. It is particularly dangerous and if any house is to be built a solution to this area of the village must be addressed.	3866/10384	
	Comment – while not opposed to additional housing in and around Dunnington , this if it goes ahead will in itself create a greater need for additional retail, education and leisure facilities.	3870/10394	
	Comment – H31 that is currently used as a pig farm is probably more suitable (than H33) but the entrance should be on Intake Lane.	3871/10400	
	Comment – if more houses must be built, build them on Common Road on the land proposed for a traveller’s site not on our precious hill tops and slopes and not surrounding the new cemetery in Eastfield Lane.	3876/10409	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection - the proposed Traveller site and increase in dwellings would have a huge detrimental impact to the village's resources and add further traffic and pollution to the village.	3887/10430	
	Comment – happy to support a small area of housing in Dunnington to provide a share of the housing need for more housing stock. However, there are some issues which would have to be considered before planned developments are approved. Such as; Inadequacy of sewerage, surface water drainage and run off from houses; and acknowledgement that more houses would mean more cars joining the lengthy queues on the A1079 which start to build up at the Common Road junction and continue all the way via the Grimston Roundabout to the city centre.	3918/10454	
	Objection – this land is currently in use for productive agriculture. Any development will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues for the village which are already a problem. It would also impact on further problems associated with parked cars along Eastfields Lane as the road is extremely narrow with barely room to pass now. Any development of this site will significantly impact on the open character of what is a rural village and cannot be justified in Green Belt land. More traffic! More school places required? Question whether the present infrastructure could cope – power, sewerage, drains, roads.	3932/10469	
	Objection – this is inappropriate development as it will ruin the openness of the green belt.	3934/10476	
	Comment – accept that there could be some advantages gained from the proposals to build new houses in the village e.g. affordable housing, improving/maintaining utility services, amenities and bus services. The locations proposed and scale of the development is inappropriate. Objection – H31 is in agricultural and economically productive use. Development would have a negative visual impact on a beautiful and historic part of the village, destroying the openness of the aspect towards the Wolds and vestiges of its former agricultural use. The impact of increased traffic would necessitate widening this ancient country lane with the loss of its historic character and the destruction of ancient native hedgerows and trees. Development would aggravate the problem the village already has with surface water due to the nature of the terrain and the natural descent of the land from the Stamford Bridge Road into the village. Eastfield Lane has been subject to flash flooding in recent years.	3941/10487	
	Comment – any substantial housing development in Dunnington will put further strain on the village sewage and surface water drainage system. Development of H31 will	3944/10493	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	result in more traffic using the junction with Stamford Bridge B166 road which is already v dangerous.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this site is on green belt land it has an open character and used for productive agricultural use. Development will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified. Currently it is used as a landscape gardening business and rearing livestock. Development would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity on the residents in nearby houses. New houses will have a dominant visual impact. Serious surface water drainage issues affect the village now. Development would have a serious impact on a very narrow country lane from which access would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage to native hedgerows. Huge increases in traffic on Eastfield Lane would be generated and exacerbate a very hazardous junction. The infrastructure of the village cannot support this size of development.	3945/10501	
	Objection –the infrastructure to support any more housing doesn’t exist. Each time there is a cloudburst or violent storm in Dunnington localised flooding occurs because the present drainage system is unable to cope with a deluge of water. In the past 20 years or so, when a new development of housing has been constructed in Dunnington, the incidence of power failures has increased until electricity supply has been suitable upgraded. The council should insist that all utilities are upgraded by the developer before any development takes place. The road network is inadequate to cope with the extra traffic that more houses would generate. In the village itself the junction from Petercroft Lane into Common Road, Church Street and York Street is dangerous. Also the junction from Eastfield Lane into Church Street is complex and dangerous. There is already a considerable amount of ‘parking blight’ in Dunnington. There should be no further housing development in Dunnington until the road network is upgraded to cope with additional traffic. Outside Dunnington the Grimston Roundabout cannot cope with traffic at peak hours – more housing in Dunnington will only exacerbate the problem.	3952/10513	
	Objection – land formerly proposed as green belt and because of the open character is, for development purposes, treated as green belt. Used for productive agricultural use and so no special and special circumstances that justify the change in status. Defines the open character when entering the village and development would seriously affect and cause harm to this characteristic. Any new dwellings would dominate and impact on the visual amenity of residents of adjacent exiting residents. Development would threaten the native ancient hedgerows. Development will seriously affect the surface	3955/10525	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and sewerage drainage capacity throughout the village. The level of proposed additional homes will have wider highways and parking impacts on the village as a whole and cause further traffic congestion in its centre and will increase the likelihood of a serious accident to both pedestrians and drivers alike in that area. H31 is part economically used as a landscape gardening business and rearing of livestock. Development will result in loss of this contribution to the City business economy. The need for considerable infrastructure road works along the narrow lane to gain access to the site would lead to serious harm to the character of this part of the village and damage the ancient native hedgerows.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this site, in open countryside formerly proposed as green belt and which has been treated as such for development purposes, is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant changing its status. Development will have a negative impact on the visual amenity of residents of existing adjacent properties and will ruin the open rural character of this part of the village. There will be a further threat from serious surface water drainage issues. Eastfield Lane is an extremely narrow country lane which would have to be altered to accommodate the increase in traffic which in turn would cause serious harm to the character to this part of the village. Widening the lane would cause damage to the ancient hedgerows and verges together with having a negative impact on all native wildlife that presently flourishes there. There will be an increase in traffic movements along the lane and will cause further problems at the junction where the lane meets Church Balk and will have a knock on effect on the whole village with driving/parking along the main York Street already being a major issue.	3993/10602	
	Objection – development would lead to serious problems of congestion and difficult visibility issues at junctions especially at Church Balk.	3996/10604	
	Objection –village infrastructure particularly drainage and road infrastructure are plainly operating at maximum use. Often pavements are submerged in surface water due to the inability of the drainage system. Junctions in the village are extremely hazardous.	3999/10609	
	Comment – on land formerly proposed as green belt. Increasing amount of traffic using the Eastfield Lane will result from development, there aren't any footpaths on either side of the lane.	4029/10660	
	Objection – roads to and from the village are very dangerous already.	4032/10667	
	Objection – Eastfield Lane is too narrow to allow building vehicles on it. It would also result in using up more agricultural lane.	4045/10701	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – accept there is a housing need but totally oppose development here without a full upgrade to Eastfield Lane access to the site and a full upgrade of the sewage/drainage system.	4092/10777	
	Objection – this site lies on land formerly proposed as green belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant the change in status. Development of the suite will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of the village and result in the damage of ancient native hedgerows. Development of the site will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in green belt.	4108/4811	
	Objection – Eastfield Lane is a very narrow winding country lane with room for one vehicle. The character of this lane would be seriously harmed if it were widened sufficiently to allow for two way traffic as it would require removal of ancient native hedgerows. The land is currently in productive agricultural use and has formerly been proposed as green belt. No exceptional circumstances for changing this status. There are already serious surface water drainage problems in the village and building more houses on this site would exacerbate this situation.	4142/10852	
	Objection –poor impact on the visual amenity of residents in adjacent properties – any new dwellings would have a dominant visual impact. Development will have a detrimental impact and further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. There will be a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane – alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in the damage of native ancient hedgerows. Development cannot be justified as it will mean building on green belt agricultural land.	4208/10950	
	Objection – any development of this site would be detrimental to the visual amenity and have a dominant impact. Development would have a significant impact on a narrow country lane which already has a dangerous junction at Church Balk.	4234/10997	
	Objection – housing planned for this site is inappropriate as it is on green belt land and will ruin the openness that currently exists.	4252/11026	
	Objection – Dunnington should not have to take a higher proportion of housing than its proportionate share of the total housing needs minus developments on brownfield sites minus the housing within the large developments. The council should ensure that the historic villages retain their character. No development should take place before the surface water drainage and sewage problems are resolved. If there is to be	4257/11038	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>development in the village the increase in the number of vehicle movements will increase substantially and make roads more crowded and unsafe. Consideration needs to be given to improving the junction of Church Balk and Eastfield lane and there is need for traffic lights at the junction of Hull Road and Common lane. Comment – if there is to be development in Dunnington first choice would be behind the Doctors Surgery (H44) second would be H31 – although the lane at this point is very narrow and is shared by pedestrians and cars and would need to be improved.</p>		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	<p>Comment – would prefer no further development in Dunnington. However, realise that there is a housing need. This proposed development should take account of wildlife, access and drainage problems. There would need to be more spent on improving the drainage before there is more housing.</p>	4270/11082	
	<p>Objection – do not support development of this land – sight lines from Stockhill Close are poor and increased traffic from the development will make this more dangerous as will be the Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction. Development would need to include widening of Eastfield Lane and this would result in destruction of ancient native hedgerows. The site is already used as a gardening business and its loss would reduce employment.</p>	4352/11277	
	<p>Objection – do not support development of this land – sight lines from Stockhill Close are poor and increased traffic from the development will make this more dangerous as will be the Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction. Development would need to include widening of Eastfield Lane and this would result in destruction of ancient native hedgerows. The site is already used as a gardening business and its loss would reduce employment.</p>	4353/11282	
	<p>Objection – this would be a green field housing development. Recent planning requests for other developments – relating to agricultural buildings – have been refused. Housing development is wholly inappropriate for this site for the following reasons; Drainage – already surface water drains from this field into adjacent fields and floods small becks and ponds, some of the run off runs into local gardens. Access to/from site – current access is proposed along either a bridle path used as access from the kerver lane development by walkers and residents or via a single track road which borders on the land running to the ridge of the terminal moraine. Loss of visual amenity – Imposing on the landscape, visible from the A1079 and against the terminal moraine, and damage to hedgerows and impinging on the rural green belt area.</p>	4373/11328	
	<p>Objection – the proposed site should not be developed for the following reasons: The site is designated green belt land and is currently in agricultural use and there are no</p>	4383/6453	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>exceptional circumstances that should warrant its change in status. Development will increase noise, traffic congestion and pollution for existing residents in the adjoining area. The main access point is via a narrow section of Eastfield Lane and where it joins Church Balk is itself a highly hazardous one. Any alterations to existing roadways to make them safe will have a significant impact on the character of the village and will result in damage/loss of ancient native hedgerows and the associated impact on wildlife. Significant negative visual impact on the adjacent existing residents. Increased risk of flooding in a village that has an existing significant flood risk exposure especially at lower elevations due to surface water drainage issues. Additional large scale construction of further residential housing will significantly increase the flood risk. Local infrastructure and services such as health care, schools, library, public transport will not be able to cope due to the increased population demand. Over development of this relatively small village will destroy its unique character</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – refers to Appeal Decision (appeal ref: App/C2741/A/12/2187812) to the market Garden Eastfield Lane states that the construction of new buildings for agriculture is not appropriate development in the green belt. Any development would be visible from a large number of residential properties to the south and west of the land, The report concludes that the proposed development would result in loss of openness and would be harmful to the green belt. The council proposes up to 60 houses could be built on the same area. Development of this site in open countryside will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in the green belt. A new development would affect access roads traffic volume, underground drainage, surface run off, water supply and school provision. Eastfield Lane becomes a single track lane beyond existing built up area with no recognised passing places. All building materials and machinery would be delivered along a totally unsuitable road resulting in loss of amenity of residents, possible further damage to the existing road surfaces and drainage both underground and surface run off. The existing infrastructure both in Dunnington and along Eastfield Lane would require major upgrading. This should be regarded as an inappropriate development and there should be no change to the existing boundary of the green belt.</p>	<p>4384/6459</p>	
	<p>Objection – against in principle any development which impacts either significantly or adversely on the village and in particular any development along any of the three main entrances into the village. The site is in green belt – a buffer zone protecting existing properties from inappropriate development.</p>	<p>4387/11366</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the land was formerly proposed as part of land to be within the green belt and has been regarded as green belt. There are no exceptional reasons for its character to be changed. Building on the land will cause further problems with surface water, may cause damage to ancient hedgerows and further traffic along the narrow Eastfield Lane will cause problems.	4399/11398	
	Objection – this site is green belt land in productive agricultural land – there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant change of status. 60 homes will generate a significant increase in vehicular traffic movements along Eastfield Lane, these movements will exacerbate the hazardous junction with Church balk. No alterations or improvements can be carried out without impact on the character of the village and its setting within the conservation area.	4401/4903	
	Objection – disagree with any new houses built in Dunnington as the village will lose a lot of green belt, the sewerage system is overloaded and lots of the roads are very narrow lanes and just couldn't cope with extra traffic.	4503/11533	
	Objection - any new estates would spoil the village and it would become an urban town. The expense would be astronomical to provide new drainage, sewage, roads, school, surgeries and shops.	4549/11551	
	Objection – this is a Greenfield site within the green belt. There are no exceptional circumstances or evidence that existing brownfield sites have been assessed for suitability. Previous development applications were rejected by CYC as the sites were stated as being in green belt by assessment officers. It is important that consistency in policy requirements is applied. There are ancient native hedgerows that provide wildlife corridors and habitat for native species. That would be impacted by this development and the necessary widening of the country lane required for access. The land is productive and contributes to the economy of the city. Development of this site would lose this economic contribution.	4582/6462	
	Objection – fail to understand the need to develop greenfield sites within Dunnington. Preference should be given to developing brownfield sites first. Difficult to comprehend why prime agricultural land around Dunnington is even being considered for development. Site H31 is inappropriate development as it would significantly impact on the open character of the rural village and cannot be justified in green belt. It would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of residents and there is a serious problem of access in relation to any proposed development at this site. Development would seriously threaten the surface water drainage issues affecting the village. Currently the agricultural land in the site goes someway to reducing the surface run-	4588/5991	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	off caused by impermeable surfaces.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the roads are too narrow and crowded with traffic already – the school cannot take more pupils.	4591/11570	
	Objection – this site is in the Green Belt and as such should not be used to build houses. Access to the site from Eastfield Lane is inadequate for development of this type. There is poor drainage and the danger of flooding in Dunnington – this will be exacerbated if more houses are built. The road is barely adequate for current traffic levels. Development of this site will have a considerable visual impact and will alter the look and character of the village. The site is productive agricultural land – Britain cannot be self sufficient in food so every acre of agricultural land is precious for our future.	4626/11579	
	Objection – building on this site will replace existing views with those of houses and detract from the visual amenity in this part of Dunnington. Development will reduce the potential for water to soak away. This is green belt and not appropriate for development which would adversely impact the character of the village. The infrastructure will not cope with additional load. The school is full. Roads are very narrow and unsuitable for any significant amount of traffic which would lead to increased hazards at key junctions. Widening of roads would detract from the current character of the village as well as displacing ancient native hedgerows that are essential to local wildlife. The village cannot sustain further growth without losing its village character.	4643/6065	
	Objection – the open aspect and natural boundary of this area would be eroded if the proposed housing is passed. Development would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane. The character of this area will be lost and landscape changed. The visual amenity of the existing houses will be harmed. Drainage will be affected by any changes.	4747/12032	
	Objection – this is green belt – the National Planning Policy Framework states green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. Development of H31 would ruin the openness of the green belt and varied wildlife.	4782/12076	
	Objection- this is inappropriate development. It has been formerly treated as Green Belt.	4794/6069	
	Objection – development on green belt would be detrimental to the beauty to the ancient trees and hedgerows. The National Planning Policy Framework states green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and planning	4795/12090	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – York is by northern standards a City with high skills levels and low unemployment, why we need to develop the surrounding area so extensively is a puzzle. Sustainable development is fine – this does not come under that category. Development of H31, on green belt land, will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village. This land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Part of the site is already in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for rearing livestock. Development would result in the loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. Development will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of residents of existing adjacent properties and will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. There would be a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane.	4798/12098	
	Objection –lies to the eastern limit of the village on land formerly proposed as green belt. Development will increase surface water drainage issues in the village. Provision of homes will generate a significant increase in vehicles and further impact on an already hazardous junction.	4804/12104	
	Objection – the proposed development is in the green belt. Not suitable due to the lack of infrastructure. There will be a significant increase in traffic through the village as a result of this and other sites within the village.	4806/12110	
	Objection – the village is already a flood risk – worries about the drainage of surface water. How will existing road system cope with additional housing? The original development plan produced by York City Council stated that no housing development would be considered in Dunnington as the local amenities and infrastructure could not be sustainably developed.	4809/12116	
	Objection – this site lies to the eastern limit of the village on land formerly proposed as green belt. Development will increase surface water drainage issues in the village. Provision of homes will generate a significant increase in vehicles and further impact on an already hazardous junction.	4821/12136	
	Objection – object to most of the houses to be built in and around the village	5106/12206	
	Comment – what is important is the type of properties that are built. What is really required are smaller properties to suit first time buyers and older people wishing to downsize from bigger family homes. H31 extends development into the green belt but as there is already a house and a business occupying the outer field it almost becomes an 'infill' situation. For some people it might even be better for housing to come to this	5107/12210	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>site as the business which seems to have become quite a lot more than the original small market garden it started off as has in recent years caused quite a lot of concern and some aggravation for its near neighbours. Obviously the existing lane will need considerable widening and upgrading to accommodate a major development and access road to it which will cause a loss of more verge and hedging thus reducing the country lane feel of the present situation. In fact all the infrastructure requirements will need to be studied and determined with great care to ensure that the proposal is a viable development.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – drainage and traffic problems apply to H31. Not convinced that the narrow country lane linking Eastfield Lane to Stamford Bridge Road could be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic without significant damage to the ancient hedgerows and the creation of a potential accident black spot at the junction with the A166.</p>	5173/12312	
	<p>Objection – whilst accepting some development is inevitable – drainage and traffic problems apply to H31. Not convinced that the narrow country lane linking Eastfield Lane to Stamford Bridge Road could be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic without significant damage to the ancient hedgerows and the creation of a potential accident black spot at the junction with the A166.</p>	5174/12317	
	<p>Objection – do not support development of this land for the following reasons: Sight lines for existing Stockhill Close are poor and increased traffic from the development will make this more hazardous as will be the Church Balk/eastfield Lane junction. Development would have to include the widening of Eastfield lane resulting in the loss of ancient native hedgerows. This site is already in use as a gardening business and its loss would reduce employment in conflict with other parts of the Plan (Policy EMP4)</p>	5181/12381	
	<p>Objection – extremely concerned with the potential that 147 new homes would have on Dunnington Re: sites H31,H33, H35 and H44: The suggested sites are all proposed as green belt. Eastfield Lane development is open countryside and existing views. All proposed buildings would have a negative visual impact on existing homes. There are serious concerns regarding the drainage of surface water which is already an issue in the village. Introduction of more homes will mean more traffic through the village. Roadside parking is already hazardous at the amenities, public houses, the school and doctors - this would be further exacerbated. The loss of the Church car park would cause further parking dangers. There are many lanes which are too narrow to cope with any additional increase in vehicular use.</p>	5185/12384	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection – strong view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on standard of living. It would have an unacceptably adverse impact on amenities of properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by the following reasons: Visual Impact – it would represent an outward extension of built development beyond the planned limits of Dunnington into open green belt countryside resulting in a visual intrusion into the countryside and a coalescence of settlements to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area. Residential Amenity – there is a danger that the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants of the building or of adjacent residential properties particularly with regards to their right to the quiet enjoyment of garden amenities. Urge the council to consider its responsibilities under Human Rights Act especially Protocol 1 Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. Believe the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to quiet enjoyment of own property. Article 8 states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. Residential amenity has already suffered adversely from the building of the Persimmon and Hogg home sites and further building would further destroy the residential amenity currently enjoyed. Green Belt Intrusion – Already suffered from incursion into the green belt and strongly object to further development. Flooding and Drainage – whilst the area itself is not in a flood plain and has a low risk of flooding we have suffered locally from flash flooding. Concerned drainage could impact on property. In addition anecdotal evidence suggests that sewers and drains in Dunnington were functioning at maximum capacity following building of the Persimmon/Hogg estates and that the existing infrastructure would not support further development without massive expense and upgrading. Increased Traffic and Road Safety – highway improvements would be required. There is very little room for expansion in Eastfield Lane without encroaching on the upper fields. There is an increased danger of road accidents with the increase in traffic. Loss of Privacy and Overlooking. Treat to Wildlife – There is a possibility of great crested newts in the fields and field provide habitats for barn owls, sparrow hawks, deer and woodpeckers. This would be threatened by the proposed housing.</p>	5187/12398	
	<p>Objection – whilst accepting some development is inevitable – drainage and traffic problems apply to H31. Not convinced that the narrow country lane linking Eastfield Lane to Stamford Bridge Road could be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic without significant damage to the ancient hedgerows and the creation of a potential</p>	5191/12410	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accident black spot at the junction with the A166.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Comment – whilst recognising a need to provide additional homes, any development of the proposed site should be looked at with serious consideration to existing drainage problems and should not change the nature of approach roads. Whilst there is some evidence to support overall housing needs in York the number of homes required in Dunnington is questionable and would require further justification taking into account other proposals.	5208/12437	
	Objection – strongly oppose the proposed housing developments (H31, H3, H35, H33) The school is stretched to the limit with the limited hall space for PE on wet days and for school lunches and library has already been reduced in size. The traffic and parking in the village is already difficult for cars and pedestrians and is especially difficult when accompanying young children on bicycles. Parking around the school is an on going issue with parents parking on all access routes and causing a hazard to the children who walk or cycle. The increase in families can only make this worse. Church Street is also a traffic problem with poor visibility and busses and cars trying to get up and down between the parked cars. Dunnington village is only just coping with its current number of residents and any increase is going to put a lot of pressure on many areas which are already barely coping. The centre of Dunnington is a conservation area and the existing network of roads makes any increased traffic a big problem. The 3 main junctions through the village are all difficult for pedestrians especially children. Road access to both H31 and H35 is particularly tricky especially the land off Intake lane as the only access will be from Eastfield Lane which is too narrow. Eastfield Lane is suffering from increased water run off after the cemetery was put in, this would get a lot worse with new housing. This water sits on the road and freezes in winter causing a hazard for cyclists and drivers. This is an issue which needs resolving before next winter. The 3 development sites will have significant impact on 2 main junctions in the village. Where Eastfield Lane meets Church Street/Church Lane/Church Balk there are severe difficulties in crossing the junction at the moment without any further increase in traffic. Unsure why the Council feels there is a need for increased housing on this green belt land and wonder what evidence there is for the need for this development. The land is productive agricultural land and there are no exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status.	5212/12473	
	Objection – this site in terms of development control is classed as green belt. The development of this site would have a detrimental visual impact on the village. The significant increase in traffic 60 homes would generate would greatly increase traffic	5214/12480	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>flow along Eastfield Lane. This lane is very narrow and the junction at Holly Tree lane is hazardous now and that is before the extra traffic flow. The junction onto Church Balk is extremely dangerous and this is a blind corner where visibility is greatly reduced. Any attempt to widen Eastfield Lane would damage the ancient hedgerows and biodiversity it protects would be lost. The village infrastructure and amenities would be under huge strain if more homes were built.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – this is green belt land in agricultural use. Green belt is intended to prevent sprawling development – there appears to be no exceptional circumstances particularly requiring a major increase in residential accommodation in Dunnington. This site will generate a substantial increase in road traffic through the junction of Church Balk, Church Street, Church Lane and Eastfield Lane by residents driving to the centre of the village. Moreover, owing to the presence of old houses and the Church at the corners, there is no scope for road widening or modification at this point.</p>	<p>5219/12484</p>	
	<p>Objection – specifically the strategic housing sites outside the York ring road. As a minimum all land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s green belt.</p>	<p>5223/12502</p>	
	<p>Comment – any housing development should take account of both the character and setting of the village and any new development must address serious shortcomings in the current village infrastructure. The drainage system is insufficient for peak rainfall and results in surface water flooding within the village. This must be fully adequately addressed as a formal requirement of any planning approval for additional housing. The road infrastructure also requires upgrading if any additional housing is approved - junction of Hull Road and Common Road – dangerous junction, junction of Eastfield lane and Church Balk – dangerous junction, blind corner and Common Road – insufficient parking capacity for Dunnington Sports Centre. Concerned about the extent of building on land which has until now been considered green belt in terms of planning applications. Any increase in housing in the village must address infrastructure and amenity upgrade, relevant road infrastructure, sewage, surface water drainage and water supply pressure, school capacity and protection of natural habitat, character and setting of village, protection of wildlife.</p>	<p>5230/12528</p>	
	<p>Objection – commonly acknowledged that Dunnington has reached its limit. The drainage system is already at full capacity. Concerned about the effect of increased traffic, both from the point of view of vehicles accessing and leaving the village via junction with the A166 and the resultant congestion which will arise on the narrow Eastfield Lane were this development to go ahead. Proposal will have a</p>	<p>5241/14320</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	disproportionately large impact on the quality of life in the village.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – feel that the plan to build 147 houses to be inappropriate for a small village. Objections: Plans to build on green belt – there are no exceptional circumstances to alter the use of the land. Flooding issues – further development will only make matters worse. School – already over capacity – traffic issues when too many cars dropping/picking up children. Traffic – additional number of cars on unsuitable roads. Why does a small village need such a large increase in houses?	5258/14347	
	Comment – if houses are built on this plot there will need to be considerable changes to the infrastructure of the access roads. This is a single track part of road totally unsuitable for the amount of extra traffic created by 60 homes. Housing built here will also need draining/flooding issues to be resolved.	5294/14423	
	Objection – site H31 is green belt which does not warrant a change of purpose. Along with H33 and H35 would greatly increase the population of the village therefore affecting its infrastructure in a detrimental way. The local school is already at capacity, surface drainage issues exist and parking is a problem already on narrow village streets. Increased traffic will certainly be a hazard.	5300/14449	
	Objection – both sites H31 and H35 are on green belt land currently used for agriculture on the edge of the village. New development would have a visual impact on existing properties. Access to H31 would have to be gained by going along a narrow country lane which could spoil or damage hedgerows. Extra vehicle traffic on roads could lead to hazardous situations near children’s play areas and create dangers at busy junctions in the village. Parking issues will be exacerbated. There will be impact on the local school.	5303/14460	
	Objection – concerned about plans to build along the York Moraine on the north side of Dunnington from Church Balk to partway along Eastfield lane. The land there sits above the core part of the village in terms of elevation. The wet conditions experienced in 2012 caused flooding in low lying ground from Chessingham park to Hagg Wood. In all cases the water appears to rise from below ground rather than to run in from the surface. When these conditions exist percolating water becomes very noticeable at the following locations; Church lane, close to its junction with York Road, manor Drive, The junction between Eastfield lane and a farm track. Where Eastfield lane climbs up to the summit of the moraine to join the A166. Chief concern is that the ground might not be as stable as we would think it to be when the water table is high and when there has been heavy rain or snow. Trust that the Council will perform a rigorous assessment of the situation and present the results before a final decision is made.	5341/14527	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Comment - should conditions turn out to be acceptable for development then junction of Church Balk with Eastfield Lane is already a hazardous place both for road users and pedestrians alike. This junction has not seen improvement in living memory. Church Balk's other junction with the A166 has seem much improvement although it retains its reputation for serious accidents and fatalities. Surely adding more traffic to these junctions is going to make their situation worse. Eastfield lane is a single track highway and is already a popular route to the A166 at Holtby. Are thee any plans to upgrade this road to have two way traffic capability with at least one footpath along its whole length and on both sides where built up? Community utility – one feature of the corner of the Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction is a car park for community gatherings. Further along the lane is the cemetery – the building plan indicates that no expansion will be possible.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – there are no 'very special circumstances' or 'exceptional circumstances' to warrant the development of such a large site on green belt land. The land is used for agriculture and is in productive use. The National Planning Policy Framework allows limited infilling in the green belt – this development is not infilling but rather is a reduction in the area of the York green belt. The house at The market Garden, Eastfield lane as a condition of the planning consent has an agricultural occupancy condition attached to it. This was given by the Council as recently as 2004. This suggests that the plot of land was regarded as agricultural land and not part of the built up area of Dunnington. Access is very poor as Eastfield Lane is very narrow in both directions. The total width between the hedges at the proposed site is about 7 metres with a 2 to 2.5 metre carriageway. This is not wide enough for a local distributor road. Drainage is already a problem in Eastfield Lane. Extra housing will increase considerably the traffic on the narrow lane which is already busy. Water pressure is already very low. Development of this site, in open countryside, will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in the green belt.</p>	<p>5377/14593</p>	
	<p>Objection – development on this site is inappropriate and would significantly impact on the open character of the village. The land is currently productive agricultural land. Development will impact detrimentally on residents of adjacent properties. Serious surface water drainage issues affect the whole village. Te access road for this area is a narrow country lane and unsuitable for extra traffic. Widening the lane would alter the rural nature of the area and character of the village. Ancient hedgerows of significant ecological importance would be lost for ever.</p>	<p>5382/14605</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – latest proposals fly in the face of the design statement for the village and it is unclear whether there has been any consideration given to actually ascertain whether demand for the developments in Dunnington. The original development plan produced by York City Council stated that no housing development would be considered in Dunnington as the local amenities and infrastructure could not be sustainably developed. Has this changed? Sever worries about surface water drainage. How will the existing road system cope with the additional housing? Church Street is already dangerous.	5387/14619	
	Comment – understands from a local estate agent that houses in the Dunnington area are both proving to be more difficult to sell and that the average values have fallen by a considerable amount since the publication of the draft local plan. Surely this will conflict with other plans of increasing the housing in the area.	5414/14700	
	Objection – land previously accepted as green belt and is used as agricultural land. Housing development will ruin the rural character of the village and permanently destroy its open character. All the proposed sites have issues with water drainage which could impact the whole village. Already there are problems with sewerage in the village. All sites have access problems. Eastfield Lane is narrow and any widening would destroy ancient hedgerows and ruin the character of the area. The junction of Eastfield lane and Church Balk is already hazardous. The Petercroft Lane/Church Street is a busy and dangerous crossing. More traffic would have to go through the village via York Street causing more congestion. The village school is already overcrowded. There are many brownfield sites available with existing transport infrastructure.	5415/14703	
	Objection – the site lies within a green belt area. Number of houses proposed would have a significant impact on Dunnington. There would be an increased risk of flooding. The sewers were designed for a much smaller community. The access roads are not constructed to modern standards and increased traffic is likely to lead to accidents.	5467/14814	
	Objection - This land was formerly proposed as green belt land – treated by the Council as this due to its open character. This is productive agricultural land and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Currently this is the only remaining land that acts as natural drainage to the hill on the opposite side of Eastfield Lane – properties at the bottom of Holly Tree Croft encounter flooding in prolonged periods of rain, due to development of the land in the seventies. Developing H31 will further exacerbate this problem and worsen already serious surface water drainage issues currently affecting the village. Part of the land was refused consideration as a site for travellers due to the narrow nature of Eastfield lane as the	5554/13020	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>lane was deemed unsuitable for large vehicles associated with the travelling community. (see Local Plan Preferred Options Document). The narrow nature of the lane also means that the location is unsuitable for large vehicles associated with the construction industry. Alteration of the lane would cause serious harm to this part of the village and result in damage to ancient and native hedgerows. Provision of 60 new homes will generate a significant increase in traffic along part of Eastfield Lane that in reality should be considered for closing of traffic due to the health and safety implications of allowing traffic along such a narrow country lane. It will generate a significant increase in vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane and exacerbate an already hazardous junction at Church Balk. The junction cannot be changed without impacting on the character of the village and the setting of the conservation area. Accessing the A166 at peak times is an issue now and further building will only exacerbate an already large and growing issue.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – oppose sites H35, 33 and 31 on grounds that the Dunnington infrastructure can not maintain this much development and that the historic nature of the village will be badly affected by such growth. The small streets in the village can barely cope with the current level of traffic.</p>	<p>5623/13231</p>	
	<p>Objection – will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of al residents with adjacent houses. Any new houses will have a dominant visual impact and take away the open countryside identity of this part of Dunnington. Eastfield Lane is extremely narrow country lane which will have a significant increase in traffic – widening of the lane will cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and would result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. Concerns about the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk which is already a hazardous junction. The junction cannot be changed without impacting on the character of the village and setting of the conservation area. Water drainage is already an existing problem, development would further threaten the serous drainage issues. Development of this site will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village and cannot be justified in Green Belt.</p>	<p>5649/13287</p>	
	<p>Objection – do not believe there is a need for this number of additional homes within the city, there are several currently approved development sites (e.g. Germany Beck) where builders have not begun construction (despite approval being given several years ago). Why do existing villages (except for infill) need additional housing when two new settlements are proposed? Dunnington already has capacity issues with drainage, congestion problems and full school. This will put significant strain on existing resources. The site lies on land currently considered by the planning authority</p>	<p>5650/13289</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	as green belt because of open character which this development will significantly affect. Part of this site is used as a market garden business and rearing livestock this benefit to the local economy would be lost. Development will worsen existing serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village. Access to the site will be difficult and make worse existing problems. Any widening of the access road will damage ancient native hedgerows. The visual amenity would be detrimental to existing village residents especially those adjacent to the development.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection –scale of these developments seems too large in these locations. The sites are in close proximity to each other and are in open areas of land which currently mark the northern and eastern limits of the village. There would be a negative visual impact on properties on Eastfield Lane and Church Balk but their dominance of the landscape in this part of the village would also impact more generally on the open character of the village entrances in these locations in land formerly proposed as green belt. Surface water drainage has been a long standing problem. The increased traffic generated at these sites (inclusive of H35) is a serious concern. H31 and H35 will impact on the already hazardous junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane. The proximity of the developments to the village primary school makes it highly likely that children making their way to school will be at greater risk from traffic accidents. The number of homes proposed (at H31,33 and 35) would significantly increase traffic flow and parking problems throughout the village which are already a major safety concern. The existing village amenities are ill equipped to cope with such large scale developments, least of all the school which already appears close to capacity. There would be a dramatic increase in village population and put village amenities under tremendous strain. Any large increase in the school population would adversely impact on educational provision. The scale of development would lead to over-development of the village and completely destroy its character.</p>	5668/6074	
	Comment – hope that it will be possible for it to be planned as well as the past new builds which haven’t detracted from the village scene.	5687/13401	
	Objection – the volume of new housing proposed would damage the village. The village centre already has traffic difficulties due to lack of off street car parking.	5827/13791	
	Objection – these sites (H31, 33 and 35) are at the limits of the village on land which is designated as Green Belt. It may be the intention of the Council to alter the designation but at this time the land is green belt and should be respected as such and no proposals made as to their use until the green belt label is changed.	6039/5982	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Comment – the additional housing proposed (for Dunnington) presents further traffic issues. York Street is already very congested and we have to put up with workers from the industrial site chasing through the village to exit at the traffic lights onto the A1079.	6125/15549	
	Comment – would oppose vehemently any development that did not improve infrastructure for the whole of the village. Land at H31 and H33 would require improvements to the roads to allow safe access and egress and still permit pedestrians, cyclists and buggy users to use the road safely. The junction of Eastfield Lane, Church Balk, Church Lane and Church Street is hazardous enough. Any increase in the volume of the traffic is undesirable and unsafe. Additionally the hedgerow along Eastfield Lane is an ancient marker and should not be damaged and/or removed for traffic purposes. The associated land would suffer from lack of water pressure without work done to improve supply. There is a pre-existing problem with water pressure available in this area of the village. There must be a requirement of developers to improve the drainage and surface water drainage throughout the village.	6140/15603	
	Objection – scale of the proposed sites (H33 and H31) and their locations is inappropriate. These areas are part of the green belt and there are potential flooding problems. Eastfield Lane is narrow and sometimes dangerous with parked cars and people driving too fast and the junction onto Church Balk is a hazard even in the best driving conditions.	6146/15620	
	Comment – concerned about development in the village (Dunnington) that is likely to increase traffic in the centre of the village	6148/15626	
	Objection – this site is in open country side and in green belt. 60 new homes will generate a significant increase in vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane, which for its most part is a narrow single track. It will also exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. The junction cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village and setting of the conservation area. Development of the site will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village.	6151/15635	
	Support – proposed H31 and H35 building suggestions in Dunnington are supported as fully understand that growth does need to happen but in the right places and at the right speed for the village to be able to accept new people into the community, although primary school places are again a concern for a primary school that is very much over subscribed.	6157/15651	
	Comment – the proposed developments will widen the choice of housing within the	6184/15721	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village. Any development should ensure that the developer is required to improve the infrastructure of the village including improving drainage and sewerage systems.		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Comment – in favour of additional affordable housing in the village. However, the developer would have to make improvements to the road infrastructure improving safety of vehicle users and pedestrians. Concerns at levels of traffic in the village and onto the junction with the trunk Road A1079 which has already caused problems and would cause further cost to the council. The local primary school has almost reached capacity. Believe that there are sufficient brown field sites in York which could be developed where areas have been neglected and abandoned which could make suitable areas for development along with numerous retail outlets.	6187/15724	
	Objection – this site is in open country side and in green belt. 60 new homes will generate a significant increase in vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane, which for its most part is a narrow single track. It will also exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. The junction cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village and setting of the conservation area. Development of the site will further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues affecting the village.	6210/6144	
	Objection – major concern impact of housing and gypsy, traveller and show-people proposals will have a negative impact on primary education in the village school. H31 it is not only the intrusion of privacy for current residents but also the problem of access. If access is not from the same entrance to H33 it could only be from the narrow country lane past Dunnington House and up to join the A166. This single track road and its character would be changed beyond measure with a heavy commuter traffic load. Should an entrance to the development be proposed directly from the A166 this only adds to the dangers of emerging onto a main, often busy, Bridlington Road. The current agricultural use goes some way to reducing surface run-off, in recent years there have been examples of flash floods.	6212/6149	
	Objection – of course we need more housing – but not to this extent which take up green belt. There is no need for the total housing suggested (on H31,33an and H35)	6220/15760	
	Comment – no real objection to H31 – take the view that ideally there would be no development at all but have to be realistic and accept some further development in the village. Though do think there are more suitable sites in the village such as the field on the left hand side of Church Balk (Bulls Balk) which would have the advantage of being closer to the school.	6234/15801	
	Object – why spoil a lovely village and beautiful area with more housing (and wreck	6237/15807	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the area by the Sports Club with a Gypsy and Traveller site)		
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – whilst recognising need for additional housing, particularly concerned about encroachment on Green Belt land when brownfield land might be the first consideration. The NPPF encourages local authorities to positively enhance and retain landscapes, so surprised and alarmed by the identification of H33 and 31 as possible sites.	6238/15811	
	Objection – formerly proposed green belt land in agricultural use with no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in status. Significant impact on the open character of this rural village cannot be justified in the green belt. Part of site is in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for rearing livestock, development would result in a loss of this contribution to the local economy. It would be detrimental to the visual amenity of residents in adjacent houses. Serious surface water drainage issues affect the village – this would exacerbate the problem. The lane is narrow, development would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and cause damage to ancient native hedgerows. Vehicular movement on Eastfield Lane would be increased and affect an already hazardous junction at Church Balk. 60 additional dwellings will have wider, highways and parking impacts on the village which would also be further exaggerated by housing developments elsewhere.	6242/6166	
	Objection – this site is on green belt land, development will significantly impact upon the rural and open setting of the village. 60 homes will generate a large increase in the amount of traffic using Eastfield lane which is not wide enough for two cars to pass. The junction at Church balk is already hazardous.	6252/6177	
	Objection – H31, 33 and 35 all have implications for additional traffic on narrow roads – Eastfield Lane in particular is inadequate to take traffic serving 60 new houses. All three sites are most unwelcome growing the village outwards at the expense of existing green belt land.	6257/6182	
	Objection – Eastfield lane would only serve to further congest a very busy road – its junction with Church Balk is already busy and difficult to negotiate. The lane is narrow in parts and bordered by ancient hedgerows, full of bird life. The whole character and safety on the lane will be compromised.	6259/15830	
	Objection – all of the proposed land is green belt which by its name is there to protect landscapes and enhance the areas we live. By building more housing in Dunnington will increase the traffic to a seriously dangerous level. If these sites were to be passed what plans are in place for traffic control both in and out of the village? What are the plans to extend the school?	6264/15837	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the proposed Eastfield lane development of 60 houses would destroy the green belt. There are serious drainage issues and increased number of cars would have an unwelcome impact on the rural village character and setting of the conservation area.	6268/15841	
	Objection – infrastructure could not cope. There are flooding issues. The road network could not cope with the increased influx of vehicles. There would be insufficient support services, the school is at capacity already. The environmental impact would remove the rural feel of the village and have a direct impact on the community.	6270/15847	
	Objection – the village infrastructure in its current state is not contusive to support the additional flow of traffic and increase in the number of residents in the village. CYC should first consider the safety of village residents in particular access to the nursery, primary school and village amenities.	6272/15856	
	Objection – the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. Development at H31 and H35 are inappropriate and will ruin the openness of the green belt. They would cause major traffic issues with H31 single track from the existing properties and would create a serious impact on the double bend junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane. The infrastructure of the village cannot sustain major development with the village centre unable to cope with more vehicles which such developments would inevitably create. The local school s to capacity, the drainage system unable to cope with surface water drainage already an issue on Eastfield Lane which then impacts upon the centre of the village. The land is green belt in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances to change their status. Overdevelopment of this relatively small village will destroy its unique historic character and destroy ancient native hedgerows.	6328/6207	
	Objection – object to green belt housing developments. The NPPF states green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. H31 is inappropriate development spoiling the openness of the green belt.	6463/6380	
	Objection – object to green belt housing developments. The NPPF states green belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. It also states that planning permission should be refused for developments resulting in loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. Site H31 at Eastfield Lane for 60 houses is at	6473/6404	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the eastern limit of the village on land formerly proposed as green belt. The land is in productive agricultural use with no exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Development will significantly impact on the open character of this rural village. Part of this site is in economic use as a landscape gardening business and for rearing livestock – development would result in the loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. Development will further threaten the serious water drainage issues affecting the village and will significantly impact on the extremely narrow country lane. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage to ancient native hedgerows. 60 additional houses will have wider highways and parking impacts on the village which would be further exaggerated by housing developments elsewhere.</p>		
<p>Site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Comment – there needs to be an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water runoff in the village, together with a full transport survey covering access, traffic movement and projected effects of increased traffic flow.</p>	<p>Petition 20</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H32 The Tannery, Strensall	Comment – there are grave doubts that the primary school can cope with the additional children from any of the proposed developments in Strensall.	77/12771	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – the site adjoins the boundary of the Strensall Conservation Area. If allocated, development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14081	English Heritage
	Objection – Strensall is a village and want it to remain that way. Buses, lorries and farm traffic already find it difficult to negotiate around parked cars in the village and cause congestion. School full to capacity and school traffic chaotic. Crossing near primary school is a huge safety issue. Local health services, surgery, school and shopping facilities and sewerage works cannot cope with this level of new housing.	2404/6560	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6640	
	Objection – both the Strensall and A1237 road cannot cope with existing traffic, far less anymore traffic. Strensall is beautiful rural village. All proposed housing in Strensall and Towthorpe must be minimised in numbers.	2846/7546	
	Support – development of a brownfield site that is a long term eyesore and a magnet for vandalism.	3062/7924	
	Objection – the traffic generated by the developments in Strensall will be considerable. Expect there to be some increase in Strensall’s population but at present it seems gradual.	3295/8463	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot support further growth. Traffic along Southfields Road is busy and at times unsafe. Want a village not a small town.	4150/10863	
	Objection – further housing will destroy the attractiveness of Strensall. Plan refers to fact that York is a compact urban area surrounded by small settlements, as one of those small settlements Strensall has already grown so large that it affects its very attractiveness.	4242/11009	
	Objection – to build additional housing in Strensall on the scale envisaged must mean that current facilities, particularly drainage, roads and schools which are already overstretched would not be able to cope.	4703/14254	
	Comment – before any further building is allowed in Strensall, a plan should be produced for the village. The Walbutts Sewage Treatment Centre already stinks and there appear to be no plans to improve this facility. There are no plans to improve the infrastructure, particularly traffic flow through the village, to cope with the increased demand which will result from proposed housing developments. Although Strensall is surrounded by green fields, open public access space within the village is limited.	5189/12403	
Support – land owner of land to the rear of 64 to 102 The Village, Strensall, forming	5336/14511		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	part of H32. Housing linked to rail holt is one of the best ideas. Would like to assist in moving these proposals forward. Land has no restrictions and is ready to go.		
Site H32 The Tannery, Strensall continued	Objection – Strensall turning into a town. Infrastructure cannot cope with amount of development proposed – drains, road and schools.	5492/14859	
	Objection – how will the infrastructure of Strensall cope with the influx of people? Primary school is full, doctor surgery is full, roads are full and drains are full.	5494/14865	
	Objection – there are no facilities in Strensall to encourage the building of new homes. Traffic on the main road through the village is already a major problem.	5961/15317	
	Objection – there is too much traffic coming through the village as it is and the school has more than enough pupils.	5962/15321	
	Objection – plans will impact on road safety (parked vehicles), the community facilities (school at capacity – new schools and recreational facilities needed), the local wildlife and the historical character of the village. Will put an immense strain on the already struggling local infrastructure.	6152/15639	
	Objection – three level crossings mean Strensall cannot cope with more traffic. Village has a rural feel. Any more housing would create more cars and traffic congestion and worsen the air quality in the Vale of York.	6456/16188	
	Support - fully supported this development in the planning process as this site is an eyesore, an opportunity for the ward to make an appropriate sizeable contribution to the City's housing requirements. It is an example of a brownfield site, the type which the City Council should be promoting for development ahead of any 'green' location.	6514/16307	Cllr Paul Doughty

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington	Comment – parish survey revealed that of those returning the survey 11% were in favour, 68.7% were against and 20.3% expressed no opinion.	59/12647	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – will cause serious drainage and sewage outlets. Will cause traffic problems through the village centre which is badly overloaded already – parking and traffic flow problems through York Street and Church Street spoils the village ethos entirely. Suggest develop land north and west of Dunnington instead.	945/16982	
	Objection – too much additional housing does nothing for the environment or the countryside.	961/16989	
	Objection – adding further to population of Dunnington would reduce the quality of facilities currently on offer throughout the village. Minimal facilities would see considerable strain should proposals go ahead.	981/17005	
	Objection – defines the northern boundary of the village and formally proposed and treated as green belt because of its open character. Land is in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Land should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Part of the ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Impact on visual amenity. Development would harm open entrance to the village. Site has problem with surface water drainage and development would increase flood risk. Development would impact on road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner which is already hazardous – junction cannot be improved without harm to character of this part of village and setting of conservation area. Development would threaten destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Loss would have a significant impact on roadside parking as used by church as a car park.	995/17024	
	Objection – National Planning Policy Framework states that green belt is to assist in safe guarding the countryside from encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. Development would ruin the openness of the green belt. Development detrimental to the beauty of the view to Mill Hill in the York Moraine, the highest mill in York, with ancient trees and hedgerows. Field is an old established village boundary and any development would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village.	1109/17193	
	Objection – this is an area of natural beauty on the approach to the village, with many mature trees and hedges. It is among the very finest green belt land in the whole of the York area and should be preserved for future generations, not sacrificed against what appear to be incorrect housing need assessments.	1723/9805	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington continued	Comment - Loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1841	NFU
	Objection – inappropriate development, detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill and the ancient hedgerows, trees and the moraine, the highest point in Dunnington and the City of York. There would be a severe knock on effect on water drainage, there are currently problems with water drainage and further housing would increase this problem. The present traffic flow in and around Dunnington would be put under increasing strain.	1898/6042	
	Objection – proposals will lead to urban sprawl to the village. Could existing infrastructure take any further loading? Loss of green belt.	1913/95	
	Objection – it is government policy to have housing development on brownfield sites as a priority. Cannot believe there are no suitable brownfield sites in the York area for housing development. Green belt sites have been specified as such to protect land designated for agricultural use. Development will have an adverse effect on the village. There is already significant congestion on York St and Church St caused by the number of parked cars. Increase in housing would cause strain on the school which is already full to capacity.	2316/6521	
	Objection – opposed to development on the green belt.	2349/6536	
	Objection – if developments proposed for Dunnington go ahead then village would double in size. The volume of traffic and overloading at school, doctors and dentist would have a disastrous effect.	2407/6565	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6641	
	Objection – keep the village as a village, the school and sewerage system could not cope with large influx of people.	2467/6744	
	Objection – land is green belt. Development would damage the northern setting of the village and its open and rural character, particularly the York terminal moraine. Would create serious traffic issues on Eastfield Lane and prejudice its historic and scenic status as the northern boundary of the village. Any attempt to improve the junction of Eastfield Lane at Church Street and Church Balk would damage its scenic character at the entrance to the village. Impact on Mill Hill. Existing problems with inadequacy of drains and sewers.	2505/6780	
	Objection – any development in the village would create further problems for the inadequate foul and surface water infrastructure. Need for a social mix of new housing. Development will increase the existing traffic movements and congestion in various parts of the village. School has capacity problems which new housing will	2511/6784	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	exacerbate. Key feature of village is discrete identify being compact and surrounded by countryside, any development needs to recognise this feature and respect and complement the established village context.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington continued	Objection – area is subject to flooding and any interference with this problem would increase the dangers to the rest of the village. Building would affect the rural aspect of the village; this area plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village.	2532/6811	
	Comment – if we do have further housing it should be made a priority that the drainage system and tap water be made completely up to standard to cope with this influx.	2533/6815	
	Objection – green belt land.	2552/6865	
	Comment – a reduced number (15) of affordable houses would be more appropriate for the village and size of Eastfield Land and surrounding roads.	2556/6874	
	Objection – primary school is full and there is traffic everywhere, particularly much congestion on York Street. Infrastructure could not cope. Drainage is already a problem.	2558/6881	
	Objection – water drainage system is unable to cope with the existing demands.	2561/6894	
	Objection – development should be on the side furthest from York in order to retain the village ‘feel’. Development on the main entrances to the village should be restricted (York Road, Church Balk and Common Road). Drainage is a problem in the village.	2565/6900	
	Objection – in the vicinity to the north entrance to the village and extra traffic entering the village would present a great problem from the Stamford Bridge main road and Church Balk areas. Need to respect visitors to the graveyard at the bottom of the site.	2566/6901	
	Objection – further housing would put extra pressure on local services such as schools and healthcare.	2583/6924	
	Objection – land is adjacent to the north gateway to the village and traffic congestion would be a problem. Need to consider impact on graveyard.	2592/6942	
	Objection – village already experiences serious surface water drainage problems which causes flooding, any additional development will increase risk of flooding and put further strain on already problematic sewage system. Development will change the open character and aspect of the village and impact adversely on important geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Roads and junction are already under pressure – increased road users will add to existing congestion and its inherent road safety risks particularly at junctions. Development	2594/6946	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will increase demand for parking and have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in the conservation area. Further expansion of this essentially small village will destroy its unique historic character.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – expansion of village will mean all community will be crushed and amenities will be overwhelmed by force of numbers.	2623/6965	
	Objection – junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is already extremely dangerous and more traffic cannot be allowed from new development in that area. There is also a problem with flooding drainage in this area. Land is also very close to historical site of the York Moraine which was created in the ice age and is used by local people to view York, North Yorkshire and the Wolds. Housing would distract from the beauty of this and surrounding countryside. Area is used for farming and is in the green belt. Access through the village is hazardous. Housing on the scale proposed would change the character of the village and surrounding countryside. What are the plans for new schools, shops and medical facilities to cope with the increase in population?	2635/6987	
	Objection – village roads cannot accept any further traffic, with Eastfield Lane and Church Balk crossroads being a significant problem. Traffic along York Street is at bursting point already. What provision would be made for parking when access is required to the church? There is a drainage problem in this area.	2645/7010	
	Objection – site is green belt and should be preserved as such. It is in agricultural use and should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Land forms the edge of the York Moraine, the highest land in the York area and should remain as part of the historical contribution of the village and as a visual amenity. Serious problems with water drainage from this field causing flooding problems in Eastfield Lane and lower parts of the village. Site forms part of Church Balk/Church Lane/Eastfield Lane junction which is already hazardous. Any development would exacerbate the problems. School is not capable of adequately coping with any additional pupils. Village cannot cope with more traffic.	2646/7012	
	Objection – land treated as Green Belt. It is agricultural land and defines the outer limit of the village. As part of the York Moraine, should remain part of the historical contribution of the village and as a visual amenity. Serious flooding problems. The junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane junction is already a hazard for traffic and pedestrians. No improvement can be made here without harming the character of this part of the village and the adjoining conservation area. Any development along Church Balk would destroy ancient native hedgerows. Potentially dangerous access on to main roads, and the additional dangers caused to pedestrians, notably school children	2647/7017	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	attending the local school. In a village questionnaire, there was unanimous feeling that the village was already 'fully built', and that no further development was either wanted or needed. The feelings of the residents must surely not be ignored? Dunnington Primary School – do not believe that the school is capable of adequately coping with any additional pupils as a result of the above proposals.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Comment – important to retain the Church parking.	2661/7045	
	Objection – concerns for the infrastructure of the village. The roads are already inadequate and poorly maintained. Same can be said for drainage, sewerage, etc. Basic facilities in the village would be stretched. If there was a large rise in the number of children at the school, major work would have to be considered. The school is already over subscribed.	2666/7060	
	Objection – regarding building houses in the village, totally against. Village is big enough. Don't want to become a sprawling town like Haxby. Want to keep Dunnington as a village. If houses are needed, not against infill lands in the village.	2677/7097	
	Objection – opposed to the site.	2679/7111	
	Objection – to all proposed developments in Dunnington. Proposals appear to have been formulated without reference to the impact on existing village, characterised in Dunnington's own 'Design Statement'. Dunnington already experiences surface water drainage problems. Any additional development will make the problems worse, increase the risk of flooding. Will put further strain on the already problematic sewage system. Will change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geographical features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. The roads and junctions are already under pressure. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to the existing congestion and its inherent road safety risks particularly at junctions. Increase the demand for parking and will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in the conservation area. Will destroy its unique historic character.	2682/7121	
	Objection – all encroach on the greenbelt and are detrimental to the landscape. Several extend the boundary of the village and all will put pressure on facilities in the village.	2697/7152	
	Objection – Green Belt land, also features a rare piece of history. Increased traffic would affect this part of the village also. The junctions and lanes are far too narrow to accommodate the increase in traffic, and to widen these lanes would involve removing historic sites, such as the York Moraine.	2706/7164	
	Objection – the roads within the village are narrow and parking difficult, even now, to	2707/7167	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	generate more cars from new housing will have a negative impact on the village, particularly at Church Balk, Petercroft and Four lane ends Common Lane.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – housing on the Green Belt H33, H31, H35 and H44. Adversely affect the character of the village.	2708/7175	
	Objection – impact on its character – more built up area and less open space, existing services will be under strain. Will the school be able to cope? There could be an increase in parking in York Street, which could lead to more congestion. What weight does the “Green Belt” status carry?	2709/7181	
	Objection – proposed housing development in Dunnington to using Green Belt land. Would require a major upgrade of drainage and sewerage disposal which at present is barely adequate. Substantial improvements to the road infrastructure which would be necessary would seriously harm the character of the village. Severe congestion on Church Lane and York Street, which are already extremely busy roads, safety problems.	2711/7187	
	Objection – any more housing in Dunnington in any shape or form requires additional sporting land and a lot of money spent on basic infrastructure in respect of sewerage and schooling.	2713/7197	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Objection – main roads around Dunnington are already congested.	2714/7204	
	Objection – reneging on a previous agreement not to build on green belt land. Would have a negative impact on the open character of a rural village. The size, scale and location of the proposed housing developments presents an issue of inappropriate development on green belt land which is contrary to the green belt policies in the City of York Draft Plan. Narrow roads are already working to full capacity. Wouldn't be able to sustain the increase in traffic. The congestion in and out of the village would also certainly be negatively affected. Adverse affect on the already existing parking issues. The main junctions in and out of the village will also be affected by the increase in traffic. The impact to pedestrians of the increase in traffic would also be detrimental, won't be able to cross the village roads quick enough to avoid being hit by a speeding vehicle. The City of York Planning Authority policy clearly states that brown field sites should be used for development before Green Belt land is considered. Would go against their own policy. The sewerage system of Dunnington is already working to maximum capacity. New housing would be too close to the existing residences. The right to privacy in your own home is a basic human right. Take away the majority of natural light from existing residences. Would further threaten the serious and existing drainage issues affecting the village. Would impact on an existing geographical feature	2726/7224	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	known as the York Moraine. This must be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Impact on the visual amenity of the village. Would destroy the unique character of the village. Not enough local amenities to cope with the increase in residents to the village.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – believe all sites are classed as green belt, there are no special circumstances as to why this should change. This environmental impact must be considered together with the affect on the visual amenity of the surrounding areas. The site at Water Tower is the one most concerns about. This land forms part of the geographical feature known as York Moraine which should be protected. Furthermore on this site there are ancient native hedgerows that should also be protected. Impact it will have on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane which is already very hazardous. Part of site is also used by the Church as a car park. Again further hazards will be created if people park on the roadside instead.	2728/7230	
	Objection – land is part of the Green Belt because of its open character. There are no exceptional circumstances to change its status and should remain as open productive agricultural land use. Site is part of the York Moraine Ridge, an important geological feature. Should be preserved as an important part of the village’s heritage and historic character. Part of an open agricultural landscape which defines the edge of the village and from a visual impact perspective, creates an important gateway to the village. Would greatly increase traffic volumes in the village and seriously impact upon the already very hazardous junction. Totally inappropriate proposed development, harmful to the character and appearance of the local area.	2731/7238	
	Objection – land is part of the Green Belt because of its open character. There are no exceptional circumstances to change its status and should remain as open productive agricultural land use. Site is part of the York Moraine Ridge, an important geological feature. All of which should be preserved as an important part of the village’s heritage and historic character. Part of an open agricultural landscape which defines the edge of the village and from a visual impact perspective, creates an important gateway to the village. Would greatly increase traffic volumes in the village and seriously impact upon the already very hazardous junction. Visual amenity would be compromised for the properties along Eastfield Lane.	2733/7242	
	Objection – land proposed as Green Belt, because of its open character. Productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its Green Belt status. Forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of	2736/7248	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the village. Surface water drainage on this site poses a long-standing serious problem. Any development would increase flood risk. The development will seriously impact the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane which is already hazardous. The wider highway and parking impact of this development for the village also applies. Ecological and environmental threat with the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Part of the proposed development site has for a number of years been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Its loss would have a significant impact on roadside parking.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – seen no evidence for the need of this amount of housing. The local health, education, transport and sanitary infrastructure will struggle to cope with such a dramatic increase; essential to retain the green belt which currently surrounds the village, and keep the attractive approach to the village, in order to prevent urban sprawl and to provide a buffer between the village and the industrial estate.	2743/7264	
	Objection – forms part of the York Moraine and as such should be left undeveloped as it is an important part of the village. Defined as greenbelt, why has this been included in your proposals, has your greenbelt policy changed?	2750/7275	
	Objection – firstly H33 as you need an open view on your entrance/exit to and from the village. The junction of Church Lane/Church Street/Church Balk/Eastfield Lane is already a dangerous junction to come out of without another 43 dwellings there.	2761/7297	
	Objection – proposal is inappropriate. Site is historically important due to the geographic Moraine which is a feature. The ancient hedgerows present sets a unique feature to the area as a whole but, more significantly, to the entrance to this beautiful village. Development would be detriment to the area.	2768/7314	
	Objection – Green belt land. Any development on the land would have a detrimental impact on the visual aspect of the area. Lovely sense of community, worry that an increase in properties would have a negative impact on this.	2774/7341	
	Objection – a number of roads would require development, destroying established hedgerows and the wildlife within. There would be serious impacts to the road junctions. All four sites, including H44 Rear Of Surgery and 2a/2b Petercroft Lane would lead to a significant increase in the amount of traffic within the village. The development of houses in each of these sites will put further strain on the village drainage and increase the risk of flooding.	2778/7350	
	Objection – the Eastfield Lane site and Water Tower Land for the housing development is Green Belt and provides an attractive and open character to the rural village. H44 Petercroft is in a Conservation Area and is an important part of the village’s agricultural past. Will increase the problem with surface water drainage already experienced by the	2779/7358	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village. The new development will increase the use of the junction and exacerbate the problem. The housing development would cause a loss of this contribution to the economy of the city. There is further concern for the residents whose visual amenity will be affected and for the large increase in traffic into the village along narrow country lanes.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – impact on the geographical feature of the York Moraine. The junction at Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is already a difficult one. Drainage off Eastfield Lane is already horrendous. Will make for more traffic exiting on the A166.	2780/7364	
	Objection – drainage problem in particular flash flooding. The current infrastructure will not support the proposed number of houses across any of the proposed sites.	2781/7369	
	Objection – increase in population would affect not only the visual aspect of the village but also the character of the village and the supportive community spirit that we have. Proposed buildings being developed on green field sites. What exceptional circumstances warrant the change of status of the land to allow building development?	2786/7381	
	Objection – highest point of the village area, significant impact on the approach to the village. Would increase the flood risk. The road junction at Church Baulk/Eastfield Lane would become more hazardous because of increased traffic.	2793/7406	
	Objection – to this proposed development for the following reasons: Located on gateway to the village. High point of the village and on the ancient York Moraine. This is a special place and as such must be protected. Will change the character of the northern village gateway. There are no other houses built on the north side of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk. These roads mark settlement boundary. Flooding is a major problem. Hedgerows home to Birds and hedgehogs would be damaged, a loss of other wildlife such as Barn owls and Birds of prey hunting. Dear grazing. This field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. 70% of villages were against development on the Water Tower field. To alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village approach. Massive visual impact on Dunnington’s green belt and approach into the village. New site suggestions: The garage at the junction of Church Balk and Stamford Bridge Road would be the perfect brown field site for development. Stock Hill would be the preferred option for development.	2794/6049	
	Objection – the land is treated as Green Belt. The land, particularly for H33, is high in elevation and the visual intrusion would be immense. The H33 development proposal is particular ill-judged. The land taken would require the grubbing out of hedgerows, overlook the recently established cemetery and likely require the removal of the car	2810/7458	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	park used for church services and events such as weddings.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – H33 Proposal is again greenbelt and is productive agricultural land and therefore should remain as such.	2811/7462	
	Objection – formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own ‘Design Statement’. Serious surface water drainage problems which causes flooding. Will put further strain on the already problematic sewage system already highlighted by Yorkshire Water. Development in the proposed areas will change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. The roads and junctions are already under pressure. Demand for parking and will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly in the conservation area. Destroy its unique historic character.	2836/7508	
	Comment – the need for housing in York area is well known but the enlargement of Dunnington should be restricted so as not to destroy the village life which the residents value so much.	2840/7524	
	Objection – it would alter the whole balance of the Village. The views and wildlife you can see at the moment would be gone and gone and gone for good. This field should be saved for the future expansion of the Village Cemetery.	2903/7617	
	Comment – what safeguards will be put in place to control extra flooding due to new housing. The sewerage system is at full capacity.	2914/7629	
	Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic, caused by the extra building, will add to the chaos on local roads. Including the gypsy encampment, will cause more flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields. Opposition to the proposed developments.	2915/7636	
	Objection – any development would therefore overpower the existing properties, and have a serious impact on the already hazardous Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction. Therefore object to any development of this land.	2916/7642	
	Objection – proposed as Green Belt, because of its open character and productive agricultural use. The proposed development, if confirmed, would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate surface water/drainage issues affecting the village. Development of site H31 would have a significant/detrimental impact in terms of increased traffic and highway safety and this together with development at site H33 would lead to particular safety issues at the Eastfield Lane/Church Lane and Church Balk junction. The site at H35 would require further land acquisition to provide access to Intake Lane and, along with H31, may,	2930/7664	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	additionally, lead to narrow country lane disruption to hedgerows and the wildlife that frequents them. Overall, development of the three sites (H31, H33, H35) would have an adverse effect on traffic movement/parking/safety in the central area of the village.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – proposed as Green Belt, because of its open character and productive agricultural use. The proposed development, if confirmed, would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate surface water/drainage issues affecting the village. Development of site H31 would have a significant/detrimental impact in terms of increased traffic and highway safety and this together with development at site H33 would lead to particular safety issues at the Eastfield Lane/Church Lane and Church Balk junction. The site at H35 would require further land acquisition to provide access to Intake Lane and, along with H31, may, additionally, lead to narrow country lane disruption to hedgerows and the wildlife that frequents them. Overall, development of the three sites (H31, H33, H35) would have an adverse effect on traffic movement/parking/safety in the central area of the village.	2931/7668	
	Objection – the development of H33 Water Tower is inappropriate as it is detrimental to the beauty of the area and is an ancient glacial moraine with ancient trees and hedgerows.	2939/7680	
	Objection – its open countryside aspect containing native hedgerows. Green Belt land because of its open character and also forms part of the York Moraine which is an important historical setting to the village approach. Impact on an already hazardous road junction. Could increase a flood risk further within the village.	2941/7688	
	Objection – productive agricultural land, forming an open aspect around the village and on formally proposed green belt. Will threaten serious water drainage issues in the village. Will have a greater impact on traffic and access in and around the village at some already hazardous and narrow lanes. To gain access will result in removal and damage to many ancient hedgerows with the resulting loss of habitat for wildlife. Lies on the ancient geological York Moraine this must be maintained as a historical contribution to the village setting. Would put even greater strain on the parking and highways issues in the village, especially issues of road safety near shops and the school and access into and out of the village and the already hazardous junction onto both the A166 and A1079. Dunnington is a village and should remain so. Should be preserved in isolation from the conurbation of York.	2942/7696	
	Comment – understand more homes are needed & village could take some more, the main problem would be better sewage/flooding work done? Also roads need to be wider.	2947/7704	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and that planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. The proposed development at H33 Water Tower is a particularly inappropriate development detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine and the ancient trees and hedgerows. The proposed development at H31 Eastfield Lane is quite inappropriate involving the loss of the only facility for car parking for the local church with no alternative facility available and it would intrude on the peace and sanctity of the new burial ground that has been provided there. The nature of the roads at the junction already constitute a traffic hazard.	2956/7712	
	Comment – as part of this area is used for car parking for the Church – Weddings, Funerals, Services, etc. where would they park? Roads would need to be wider and sewage/flooding updating.	2957/7720	
	Objection – essential to protect green belt & green field sites to preserve the countryside. Over development of a village destroys its very nature. Dunnington is already large enough. Productive farmland should not be removed from the supply of food. There has already been a huge loss of productive farmland from around York. Urban sprawl.	2958/7727	
	Objection – it is Ancient Geographical land known as the York Moraine, also at the junction of Church Balk/Eastfield Lane it is already hazardous corner.	2959/7732	
	Objection – lies within a green belt area. The number of houses proposed would have a significant impact on Dunnington. Increased risk of flooding. The access roads are not constructed to modern standards and increased traffic is likely to lead to accidents.	2963/7740	
	Objection – concerns for the increased housing in Dunnington but also the travellers’ site on Common Road.	2967/7743	
	Objection – concerns for the increased housing in Dunnington but also the travellers’ site on Common Road.	2968/7747	
	Objection – concerned that any future housing development in this area would create huge problems with water drainage and access. Do experience greatly increased water running down Holly Tree Lane now when there’s heavy rain.	2972/7755	
	Objection – the proposal to build new housing stock in Dunnington is really not on; would add considerable strain to an already oversized village. Feel nothing has been taken into account of the new infrastructure needed to accommodate. The sewage and top water drainage would need to be updated/renewed. Loss of productive agricultural land, loss of native hedgerows and an infringement on what is perceived as Green Belt land. Despoil the view of the village; especially of the Water Tower and Eastfield Lane	2984/7766	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proposals. This would depreciate the view/skyline of Mill Hill; a geographical feature called the York Moraine.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection –the proposal to build new housing stock in Dunnington is really not on; would add considerable strain to an already oversized village. Feel nothing has been taken into account of the new infrastructure needed to accommodate. The sewage and top water drainage would need to be updated/renewed. Loss of productive agricultural land, loss of native hedgerows and an infringement on what is perceived as Green Belt land. Despoil the view of the village; especially of the Water Tower and Eastfield Lane proposals. This would depreciate the view/skyline of Mill Hill; a geographical feature called the York Moraine.	2985/6202	
	Objection – inappropriate site for development. It is a natural green boundary to the village, giving space between the village and the busy A166 Bridlington road. A development at the water tower fields would detract significantly from the village character of Dunnington.	2987/7769	
	Objection – no to any housing development. Dunnington is a lovely village that will be spoiled with any housing.	3027/7874	
	Objection – this land plays an important role in defining the open character of this Northern boundary to the village. Defines the Northern residential boundary of the village. Treated as Green Belt, because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use, no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its' Green Belt status. Ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Very significant impact on visual amenity. Open character at the entrance to the village. Serious problem with surface water drainage. Will seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner. Would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Wider highways and parking impact on the village. Over development in this relatively small village will destroy its' unique historic character. Significant impact on roadside parking.	3056/7914	
	Objection – located on gateway to the village with open views. High point of the village and on the ancient York moraine. Will change the character of the northern village gateway. Views out into open country. Stand alone development and a blot on the landscape. Flooding is a major problem. Loss of other wild life. This field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. 70% were against development. To alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village approach. Massive visual impact on Dunnington's green belt and approach into the village. The City of York and surrounding area has many	3070/7944	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	brown field sites that may not be as attractive to developers as green field sites, but surely these brown fields must be considered as the preferred option.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the current drainage and utilities are already over stretched. Many of the footpaths and roads around the village are in much need of repair and even this seems a too bigger issue. Any building development in the village would increase the flood risk to the village. Travellers’ horses and livestock to graze in the field will damage the wildlife and eco systems. Would be better used as a car park for Dunnington Sports club.	3089/7973	
	Objection – land formerly proposed as Green Belt, because of its open character. Is in productive agricultural use, no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its’ Green Belt status. Forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Threatens the future of the whole Moraine but will also have a very significant impact on visual amenity. Plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village. Serious problem with surface water drainage. Development would increase flood risk. Will seriously impact on the road junction. Threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Wider highways and parking impact on the village. Will destroy its’ unique historic character. Church as a car park. What is the plan to correct the extensive drainage issues required to support this development?	3098/7985	
	Comment – school would not be able to take an increase of children. Where will cars park when using the doctors surgery or is that also being turned into housing? Traffic on Eastfield Lane/Church Balk. Objection – Against building in Petercroft.	3122/8042	
	Objection – to any further building developments within the village. Does not have the resources for such large developments.	3123/8046	
	Objection – open views. High point of village. Change the character of the north approach. Views out into open country side from the top of Church Street and along Eastfield Lane and Church Balk will be lost forever. These roads mark the settlement boundary. Would be a standalone development and a blot on the landscape. Die to two large ponds having being filled in by the land owner, flooding is a major problem. Hedgerows home to birds and hedgehogs. This field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. 70% were against development. Traffic is already a problem. Alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village. Visual impact in the green belt. Approach to the village and maintains an open visual amenity for all to enjoy. Should be protected for long term expansion of Dunnington cemetery. Eastfield Lane forms the ancient settlement	3131/8059	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	boundary of Dunnington to build here would ruin the open views across to Mill Hill and beyond.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection – open views. High point of village. Change the character of the north approach. Views out into open country side from the top of Church Street and along Eastfield Lane and Church Balk will be lost forever. These roads mark the settlement boundary. Would be a standalone development and a blot on the landscape. Die to two large ponds having being filled in by the land owner, flooding is a major problem. Hedgerows home to birds and hedgehogs.. This field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. 70% were against development. Traffic is already a problem. Alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village. Visual impact in the green belt.</p> <p>Comment – The garage at the junction of Church Balk and Stamford Bridge Road would be the perfect brown field site for development. The field opposite The Water Tower was earmarked for development as long ago as the 1970s. Stock Hill would be the preferred option for development. It would have less of a visual impact.</p>	3132/8062	
	<p>Objection – open views. High point of village. Change the character of the north approach. Views out into open country side from the top of Church Street and along Eastfield Lane and Church Balk will be lost forever. These roads mark the settlement boundary. Would be a standalone development and a blot on the landscape. Die to two large ponds having being filled in by the land owner, flooding is a major problem. Hedgerows home to birds and hedgehogs. This field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. 70% were against development. Traffic is already a problem. Alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village. Visual impact in the green belt.</p>	3133/8064	
	Objection – the sites being put forward are the most appropriate for a rural village as they would mean a combination of visual intrusive encroachment on important and ancient rural settings.	3136/8076	
	Objection – Green Belt land. Surface water run. Eastfield Lane the road is narrow and would require widening, would require the removal of existing hedgerows, object to.	3140/8087	
	Objection – already reached its maximum and the local amenities are stretched to their absolute limit. The amenity and infrastructure in the village are already stretched. Problems with water drainage in the village. Impact on the narrow country lanes, destroying ancient and native hedgerows. Part of the Terminal Moraine will be destroyed having a significant impact on the open visual aspect approaching the village. Land is on Green Belt. Will also generate extra traffic throughout the village.	3146/8100	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Different junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane and also along Petercroft Lane and Garden Flatts Lane.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – defines the Northern residential boundary. The land is in productive agricultural use, no special or exceptional circumstances. Ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Significant impact on visual amenity. Site sits in open agricultural countryside. Serious problem with surface water drainage. Road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner. Threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Wider highways and parking impact on the village. Over development in this relatively small village will destroy its' unique historic character. Church as a car park. Its loss would have a significant impact on roadside parking.	3152/8124	
	Objection - the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the character of the village. The centre of the village and site 33 is at risk of flash flooding, there is also a risk that the existing built drainage system cannot cope with the additional guttering water from proposed new properties.	3165/8144	
	Objection – inappropriate developments as they ruin the openness of the Green belt, affect the visual amenity, overall beauty of the village.	3169/8153	
	Objection – defines the Northern residential boundary of the village. Formerly Green Belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its' Green Belt status. Ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Should be preserved as an important historical contribution. Significant impact on visual amenity. Site sits in open agricultural countryside. Serious problem with surface water drainage. Impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner which is already hazardous. Would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Will destroy its' unique historic character.	3176/8169	
	Objection – this proposed development will take away the open aspect of entry into the Village. Green Belt and is currently used for agricultural use. Hedges will need to be removed to develop the site, and this in itself will remove the 'country' look to this part of the Village. For a number of years, part of this site has been used, with the owner's permission, as a Church Car park, thus stopping the need to park on the street, which the residents appreciate. The new Cemetery is also on part of this site, providing just a few car parking spaces, so the 'Church Car Park' is needed as an over spill car park. Housing developments in both these areas will lead to an increase in traffic on Eastfield Lane leading into Church Balk, already a dangerous junction.	3247/8338	
	Objection – too many new homes. Flooding is already a problem. It is a village with village roads, not wide enough for so much extra traffic. Our roads are part of the	3262/8378	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	'Village Character' we do not want wider roads. No justification to use Green Belt.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – Green Belt, because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its' Green Belt status. The land should be allowed to continue to define the outer limit of the village. This land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Very significant impact on visual amenity. The site has a longstanding serious problem with surface water drainage. The development of this site will seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner which is already hazardous. Development of this site would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Over development in this relatively small village will destroy its' unique historic character. Part of this site has, for a number of years, been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Its loss would have a significant impact on roadside parking.	3265/8382	
	Objection – this land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, which should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Will also have a very significant impact on visual amenity. Long standing serious problem with surface water drainage. Further development would increase flood risk in many areas. For many used been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Think of the impact its loss would have on roadside parking and access to the church for weddings and funerals. Over development in this small village will destroy its unique historic character.	3276/6450	
	Objection – will not protect the existing trees hedgerows and the natural beauty of the location. Also it will be detrimental to the character and presentation of the village access.	3290/8436	
	Objection – will not protect the existing trees hedgerows and the natural beauty of the location. Also it will be detrimental to the character and presentation of the village access.	3291/8444	
	Objection – especially have concern over the proposal of 5,580 homes as 'Whinthorpe', combined with the development of 'Derwenthorpe', 1569 homes at Monks Cross and up to possibly 60 new homes in Dunnington. Issue of visual impact on the character of the village of Dunnington, permanent loss of green spaces or Greenbelt land, increased pressure on facilities in the village such as the school, Dr and dentist practices, higher levels of traffic and loss of sense of community spirit if the village expands too greatly in size, too quickly. Particularly against the proposed development at H33 Water Tower, because of the detrimental effect on the character and visual entrance into the village.	3293/8453	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection – protest at the current development plans for Dunnington, on both social and environmental grounds. Considerable increase in the number of houses, and together with the development at Grimston Bar will result in a real danger of our being subsumed in York’s urban sprawl with a resultant loss of identity and community involvement. Have managed to retain a ‘village’ feel despite the closeness to York. Feel this is largely due to the fact that there are clear edges and open green fields between us and the city. The proposed development are all hugely out of scale with the village – they are simply too big. If all of the proposals were allowed we would have 141 new homes, and 15 pitch travellers’ site, and 2 new light industrial units. In a village of this size that is absurd. As a teacher and a parent one of my main areas of concern is the impact of the extra housing on the school provision. Extra space would be required to house the increased number of classes. Dunnington students mainly go to Fulford School for their secondary education. This school is already large, and would struggle to maintain its high standards if the number of students were to significantly increase. There has been no commitment to increasing school provision either at primary or secondary level. Another area of concern is the increase in traffic that the proposed developments would bring. The drainage in the village is chancy at best, and the eastern end of the village is where all of the water ends up. The environment agency flood risk map makes it obvious why houses have not already been built in this area – it floods.</p>	3310/8487	
	<p>Objection – inappropriate as it is a threat to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine, together with the beautiful old hedgerows and trees in the area. Ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, this land should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Surface water drainage has been a problem for many years in this area. Heavier traffic in the village. The Church has used some of this land as a car park for a good many years. A new cemetery has recently been created within this portion of land.</p>	3321/8503	
	<p>Objection – defines the northern residential boundary of the village and is regarded as Green Belt for development. Surface water drainage problem which causes flooding in Eastfield Lane. Development would increase traffic at the Eastfield Lane/Church Balk junction. Part of this site has been used as church car parking for several years. Ancient native hedgerows would be threatened by development on this site.</p>	3368/8644	
	<p>Comment – in addition this is the cemetery extension field which will be require for further burials in the long term. As an alternative to the council proposals there is potential to develop land in the field opposite H33 and possible extension in to the</p>	3383/6054	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	adjacent land towards Pear Tree School.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this land plays an important role in defining the open character of this Northern boundary to the village and at the gateway to the conversation area. The land is at its highest point in the village and links into Mill Hill, part of the geographical feature of the York Moraine.	3402/8713	
	Objection – to the proposed development due to the impact they will have on traffic in the village. Despite the volume and acknowledged speed of the traffic there are no designated crossings within the village, and no plans put forward to introduce any. In the absence of any such information however, must assume that no proposals exist, no choice but to strongly object to the housing developments. Comment – Not against future housing development in the village in principle, however they must be accompanied by clear proposals to address the traffic issue.	3408/8725	
	Objection – to the above proposal on the grounds that they represent inappropriate developments in the Green Belt and raise highway safety problems. Arup Report. The land is part of the ancient geographical feature of the York Moraine, which forms a key historical part of the village setting and its beautiful open natural environment. Threatens the destruction of existing ancient native hedgerows that provide important linear habitats for many native species. Inappropriate development within the Green Belt that will have an adverse impact upon visual amenity, upon the local natural environment and upon existing productive agricultural land. Persistent problem with surface water drainage. Increase the risk of flash flooding. Will significantly increase road traffic along Church Balk and Eastfield Lane. The proposed development will also remove an area of land which has for many years been used for car parking for those attending events at Dunnington Parish Church.	3431/8758	
	Objection – this site defines the open character of the entrance to the village, and has important geological and historical aspects. It is also on the edge of the Village Conservation Area. There are long standing surface water drainage problems which effect Eastfield Lane and the lower areas of the village. Part of the site is made available, to the Parish Church as a car park. That facility is of particular value when there is a funeral as the Parish Cemetery is in the adjacent field.	3434/8765	
	Objection – drainage, flooding and sewage. Further housing would only exacerbate this problem and put further stresses on an already over-stretched drainage system. The proposed development on land near the water tower (H33) would be of particular issue here as surface drainage problems will cause flooding further down the hill into the village. Impact that additional traffic will have on the village. Therefore oppose	3446/8825	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proposed development H33 as this would be directly on a very dangerous junction where Eastfield Lane joins Church Balk.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Comment – Draft Local Plan lays no emphasis on the essential infrastructure improvements that are needed before any developments could be started. Surface water drainage must be improved because the existing drainage facilities are inadequate. Sewage is another issue. Water pressure is already a problem for houses in Eastfield Lane. Existing levels of traffic are very high for the capacity of the core routes. The impact of the probable increase in the number of children on the Primary School both in terms of capacity and of additional vehicle access traffic must be taken into account.</p> <p>Objection – this site defines the open character of the entrance to the village, and has important geological and historical aspects. It is also on the edge of the Village Conservation Area. There are long standing surface water drainage problems which effect Eastfield Lane and the lower areas of the village. Access to the Water Tower site would have to be either from Church Balk, or from Eastfield Lane. Significant improvement is needed now. Part of the site is made available, to the Parish Church as a car park. That facility is of particular value when there is a funeral as the Parish Cemetery is in the adjacent field. Surface Water Drainage is a major issue. The drainage pipes are of different diameters. Ditches have not been dredged regularly, flash flooding has occurred all too often. Should demand justify the approval of additional housing in Dunnington the size of the primary school will need to be increased. There is land behind the school that might be used for that increase if the owners were prepared to sell. That land could also be the site for additional housing as access would be possible.</p>	3464/8894	
	Comment – housing developments proposed for Dunnington. No objection to them providing the correct infrastructure is put in e.g. more roads, drainage, etc. What about Church parking and the new cemetery on Eastfield Lane? Over development will destroy its unique character.	3471/8908	
	Objection – to our allocation in Dunnington for one hundred and forty houses.	3509/9429	
	Objection – the proposals seem to be far too large. Nearly all the sites seem to be on Green belt land. Are there no “Brown field” sites in or around York that could be developed, if housing needs really are so great – near the railway station perhaps?	3523/9463	
	Objection – feel the proposition for development on the green belt would be detrimental to the character of the village apart from the impact on the biodiversity.	3530/9474	
	Objection – unsuitable for a village of this size. It will destroy the character and put	3589/9558	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pressure on local. Harm to this conservation area. Additional housing will impact on these busy roads. The Dunnington Primary School now reaching maximum capacity. Negative impact on the rural open character of the village – on Green Belt lands.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Comment – if too many dwellings are constructed the infrastructure of Dunnington Village will be unable to cope.	3590/9566	
	Objection – all sites have winter floods. All sites require major investment for roads, water and sewage. Water Tower site overlooks cemetery expansion. School – new houses, more children?	3610/9602	
	Objection – Green Belt. Would greatly impact the existing infrastructure within the village. It should be retained as agricultural land and thereby maintain its historical significance. During heavy rainfall there is a significant run off of surface water which floods Eastfield Lane. Would increase the amount of traffic; therefore increase the risk of serious accident.	3614/9614	
	Objection – a dangerous corner already. Access problems. Loss of agricultural land. Ill conceived scheme with loss of agricultural land. Fraught with dangers.	3616/9620	
	Comment – housing development for Dunnington is a little ambitious. Would significantly affect the visual attractiveness. No provision expressed regarding drainage, sewage disposal, road improvement, main services, etc. The strain development would impose on the village school, heath centre & the only comprehensive food shop. The absence of garages. Car owners to park on the kerbside. A substantial increase in local traffic would soon make convenient parking impossible. Accept a reasonable need for “some” more houses at strategic places in Dunnington. Dispose the notion that the proposed plans represent a realistic “need”.	3636/9651	
	Objection – detrimental visual impact on one of the main routes into the village. Loss of the Church car park. Too close to new cemetery. Water run off will impact on properties. Water pressure and sewage concerns. Traffic problems.	3664/9679	
	Objection – Dunnington already experiences serious surface water drainage problems which causes flooding. Additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Will put further strain on the already problematic sewage system. Surrounded by open space on all sides. Development will change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely important geological features, hedgerows and productive agricultural activity. Roads and junctions are already under pressure. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to the existing congestion. Safety risks particularly at junctions. Development will inevitably increase the demand for parking, detrimental effect on an already congested village. 6.	3679/9696	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Further expansion will destroy its unique historic character.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – to any further building in Dunnington. Flash flooding is a frequent occurrence as the drains cannot cope. Power cuts were all too frequent following previous building of new housing developments.	3681/9705	
	Objection – would be unsuitable for housing as it is a clear margin. Proposed as green belt in the past and should be defined as such without delay. Access roads would be hazardous; traffic from the main village roads would be further obstructed, and even with upgraded drains as outlined above, which has caused drainage problems.	3686/9717	
	Objection – must endeavour to preserve the open aspect to the village, always had a green belt.	3689/9727	
	Objection – issues of surface water drainage and sewage. Would result in highway safety issues for road users, children and pedestrians crossing roads by increasing the amount of traffic and parking issues along small, narrow roads and hazardous junctions that currently exist in the village. Additional traffic, causing traffic and safety issues. Proposed sites are on proposed Green Belt sites that are in agricultural use, including one site having the York Moraine & ancient native hedgerows. Would detract from visual amenity and open character within the village.	3690/9733	
	Comment – extra cars and extra people needs to be considered. Going in and out of the village at rush hour times is already difficult. The school is already busting at the seams.	3699/9748	
	Objection – this is an unspoilt area. More housing would mean more traffic. The sewerage system would struggle to come with more housing. Widening Eastfield Lane would cause difficulty in access, more accidents!	3712/9996	
	Objection – cause more traffic problems. Detrimental to the water drainage system.	3713/9999	
	Objection – Build on the Green Belt land. The roads and junctions in the vicinity cannot support further expansion. Local services such as water, sewage, surface drainage, schools, are at a full capacity. This proposal threatens the future of the York Moraine. Should be withdrawn and the land retained as agricultural.	3723/10021	
	Objection – Green space, for agriculture, as nature reserves, or just to make the country a pleasanter place to live in, is becoming very scarce. Dunnington currently has a strong sense of community. If the population of the village increases we will lose this sense of community. Increasing the size of this village so that there is less space between Dunnington, York and other villages will dilute this individual character.	3748/10141	
	Comment – believe it will be unable to absorb any further development of any size without major alterations to the infrastructure which will seriously affect the charm	3756/10158	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and character of the village. Wish, as far as possible, to retain the current culture and charm of our village. If development of any nature is to take place the single most important thing that must receive attention is the drainage, sewerage and surplus water. There are already problems in all of these areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. The drains at this level already cannot cope. Understand that at some points in the village surface water passes through the same system as sewerage which makes the position much worse.</p> <p>Objection – land formerly proposed as greenbelt and which for development control purposes is treated as greenbelt because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its greenbelt status. The land should be allowed to continue to define the outer limit of the village. This land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, along the north of Eastfield Lane which should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Development at this site would cause serious harm to this characteristic. The site has a longstanding serious problem with surface water. Development would increase flood risk. Will seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner which is already hazardous and also on Church Balk itself. This junction cannot be improved without causing harm to the character of this part of the village and the setting of the conservation area. Development of this site would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Part of this site has for a number of years been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Its loss would have a significant impact on roadside parking.</p>		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection – this land defines the northern residential boundary of the village, and rises upwards to the North. Any development would therefore overpower the existing properties, and have a serious impact on this already hazardous Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction. Therefore object to any development of this land.</p>	3765/10172	
	<p>Objection – accept the need for additional housing, do not think that building houses on land adjacent to the old water tower on Church Balk is acceptable due to the visual impact it would have on the village approach. No housing should be permitted on Eastfield Lane, as the hill on which it is proposed, is a major geological feature, being a terminal moraine. It would be irreparably damaged. Also opposed to any development along Eastfield Lane as this is one of the ancient boundaries of the village and any development in and around this area including the so called market garden, would</p>	3768/10179	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	necessitate the widening of this road. This would destroy ancient hedgerows. Before any additional housing in the village can be considered the question of the inadequate drainage and sewerage that currently exists must be addressed.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Comment – will be unable to absorb any further development of any size without major alterations to the infrastructure which will seriously affect the charm and character of the village. If development of any nature is to take place the single most important thing that must receive attention is the drainage, sewerage and surplus water. There are already problems in all of these areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. The drains at this level already cannot cope. The drainage problems must be dealt with if any development at all is to take place.</p> <p>Objection – The Water Tower land defines the northern residential boundary of the village and is land formerly proposed as greenbelt and which for development control purposes is treated as greenbelt because of its open character. The land is in productive agricultural use. The land should be allowed to continue to define the outer limit of the village. This land forms part of an ancient feature known as the York Moraine. The site sites in agricultural countryside and plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance of the village in the same way all the entrances to the village have open aspects. The site has a longstanding serious problem with surface water drainage which not only causes flooding of Eastfield Lane but also impacts lower in the village. Development would increase flood risk. The development of the site will seriously impact on the road junction. This junction cannot be improved without causing harm to the character of this part of the village and the setting of the conservation area. Development of this site would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Over development in this relatively small village will destroy its unique historic character. Part of this site has for a number of years been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking.</p>	3798/10235	
	Objection – the development of H33 Water Tower is inappropriate as it is detrimental to the beauty of the area and is an ancient glacial moraine with ancient trees and hedgerows.	3817/10269	
	Objection – the first general concern is that these housing sites are all on what are currently designated as Green Belt land. Large scale residential development should not, in principle be proposed on Green Belt Land for the very reason that it will result in development spreading beyond the built up limits of the village. There also needs to	3822/10287	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>be consideration to the possibilities available for extending the school to accommodate the extra numbers of children in the village. However, main objection is to site H33, the water tower. This site is extremely open and prominent as you enter the village from the A166. Will significantly alter the build up nature of the locality. Eastfield Lane currently provides a very definite break between what forms the built up part of the village and what is open countryside. The other side of Church Balk would seem more appropriate where there is a large gap between the development on the corner of the A166 and the residential development on the western side of Church Balk as you approach the Church.</p>		
<p>Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Comment – all other housing planning requires expert reports and careful consideration of the effects on the infrastructure of the village. For other developments for Dunnington H31 H33 H35 there needs to be an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water run off in the village together with a full transport survey covering access, traffic movement and projected effects of increased traffic flow.</p>	<p>3823/10290</p>	
	<p>Objection – land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. Should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Will have a significant impact of the visual amenity, and the character of this entrance to the village. Would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows and mature trees. This corner is already hazardous and any additional traffic would only add to this. The lower part of the site is used for church car parking – which would then be lost. Formerly proposed as green bet and for development purposes should be treated as such.</p>	<p>3829/6469</p>	
	<p>Comment – H33 is a village boundary.</p>	<p>3853/10348</p>	
	<p>Objection – new houses are required but not the number envisaged for Dunnington.</p>	<p>3858/10367</p>	
	<p>Comment – Dunnington has poor road access, especially access to Eastfield Lane from Church Balk. It is particularly dangerous and if any houses are to be built a solution to this area of the village must be addressed. Objection – The fields around the water tower are an important visual feature of the village, completely against housing here.</p>	<p>3866/10385</p>	
	<p>Comment – no opposition to additional housing in and around Dunnington, this if it goes ahead, will in itself create a greater need for additional retail, education and leisure facilities.</p>	<p>3870/10395</p>	
	<p>Objection – accept that some new houses will have to be built. The land south of the water tower is on an already dangerous corner and the additional traffic that new</p>	<p>3871/10401</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	houses will generate will only make it more so. This is also the area where the new cemetery is located. A new development will destroy the tranquillity that is found here.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Comment – if more houses must be built then build them on Common Road on the land proposed for a Travellers Site, not on our precious hilltops and slopes. And not surrounding the new cemetery in Eastfield Lane.	3876/10410	
	Objection – find the new proposals for the increase in dwellings and the traveller’s site preposterous and entirely unsuitable. Not only had Dunnington been voted as one of the best villages to raise young children, it is also a beautiful village, with a thriving community that should be preserved and not changed. This is reflected in the sheer pride that the villagers hold as seen in the results of Britain in Bloom. These prospects are unrewarding and undermining of the villagers hard work and commitment, something that should be encouraged across the country. Extra strain to the local primary school. Increase in dwellings would have a huge detrimental impact to the village’s resources and add further traffic and pollution to the village.	3887/10431	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Comment – happy to support a small area of house building in Dunnington village to provide a share of the need for housing stock. However there are some issues which would have to be considered before any planned developments are approved. Deal with the inadequacy of sewerage, surface water drainage and the run off from houses. Acknowledge that more houses would mean more cars joining the lengthy queues on the A1079 which start to build up at the Common Road junction and continue all the way via the Grimston roundabout to the city centre.</p>	3918/10455	
	<p>Objection – forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine and should be preserved as an important contribution to the setting of the village. Have a very significant impact on visual amenity. Development of this site would threaten the destruction of ancient hedgerows. It has a longstanding serious problem with surface water drainage, causing flooding of Eastfield Lane. Will result in further parking and road problems, particularly at the nonsense road junction at Church Balk – Eastfield Lane corner, this will result in Mayhem! Part of this site has for a number of years been used as a car park for the church, weddings, funerals, church services. Its loss would have a catastrophic effect on people attending the church, particularly the elderly and infants.</p>	3932/10470	
	<p>Objection –detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine and the ancient trees and hedgerows. Established village boundary and any development would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village.</p>	3934/10477	
	<p>Comment – accept that there could be some advantages gained from the proposals to build some new houses in the village, such as possibly providing some affordable housing within the village and improving/maintaining utility services, amenities and bus services, think that the locations proposed, and the scale of development involved, are inappropriate for the following reasons. Objection – this is the historic northern approach to the village with ancient hedgerows and open aspect, leading down to the church. The land is currently in productive agricultural use and has serious drainage problems. A further 43 houses with extended widened roads and concrete drives etc would add to the problem at a time when the vagaries of the weather are already proving</p>	3941/10488	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>problematic re flash flooding and sustained heavy rainfall. Water Tower Land is also of special importance in that it forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, which runs along north of Eastfield Lane. The existence of this Moraine was important in the historical setting and development of the village and should not be destroyed in part or whole, especially in a Conservation area. On the traffic front the development would lead to increased vehicles entering and leaving the village at the Stamford Bridge Road junction. The junction would need upgrading if the development went ahead. Upgrading would be difficult to achieve without altering the whole aspect of the village at that point.</p>		
<p>Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Comment – any substantial housing development in Dunnington will put further strain on the village sewage and surface water drainage system. Housing along Eastfield Lane (H31) and by the Water Tower (H33), will result in more traffic using the junction with the Stamford Bridge B166 road, which is already a very dangerous junction.</p>	3944/10494	
	<p>Objection – the water tower defines the northern village boundary and is Green Belt, for agricultural use and should not be changed and should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Land forms part of an ancient geographical feature as the York Moraine and should be preserved. This development threatens the whole moraine and would have a significant visual impact on the village. Cause serious harm to the open character of the entrance to the village. Serious problems with water drainage causing flooding on Eastfield Lane – development would increase flood risk. The junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane would be seriously affected by this development & is already hazardous. Would cause harm to the character of this part of the village and the juxtaposition of the conservation area. Highways and parking impact on the village. Part of this site has been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park. Loss of this site would have a huge impact on roadside parking. The infrastructure of the village cannot take this development.</p>	3945/10500	
	<p>Objection – the infrastructure to support any more houses does not exist. Each time there is a cloudburst or violent storm in Dunnington, localised flooding occurs because the present drainage system is unable to cope with a</p>	3952/10514	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>deluge of water. In the past 20 years or so, when a new development of houses has been constructed in Dunnington, the incidence of power failures has increased until the electricity supply has been suitable upgraded. The Council should insist that all utility supplies are upgraded by the developer before any development takes place. The road network is inadequate to cope with the extra traffic that mire houses would generate. In Dunnington itself, the junction from Petercroft Lane into Common Road, Church Street and York Street is dangerous. The junction from Eastfield Lane into Church Street is complex and dangerous. There is already a considerable amount of 'parking blight' in Dunnington. There should be no further housing development in Dunnington until the road network is upgraded to cope with additional traffic. Outside Dunnington, the Grimston roundabout cannot cope with traffic at peak times. More housing in Dunnington will only exacerbate this problem.</p>		
<p>Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – formerly proposed as Green Belt and because of their open character are, for development purposes, treated as Green Belt. They are used for productive agricultural use and so no special and exceptional circumstances that will justify their change in status. They define the open character when entering the village and such developments would seriously affect and cause harm to this characteristic. In addition any new dwellings would dominate and seriously impact on the visual amenity of residents of adjacent existing properties. Developments on all these sites would threaten destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Developments on all these sites would seriously affect surface and sewerage drainage capacity throughout the village. Surface water is channelled via streams. A total of 141 proposed dwellings on these three developments will have a wider highways and parking impacts on the village as a whole. Further traffic congestion in its centre and will increase the likelihood of serious accident to both pedestrians and drivers alike in that area. The provision of new homes on the H31 Eastfield Lane and H33 Water Tower land sites will particularly impact on the Eastfield Lane/Church Balk junction (already a hazardous junction) and cannot be improved without causing harm to this part of the village and the setting of the conservation area. Along the north of Eastfield Lane the land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. This is an</p>	<p>3955/10526</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	important historical contribution to the village setting and character, and the proposed development would not only threaten the future of the moraine, but also make a very significant impact on the visual amenity. There are already serious problems of surface water drainage, which causes flooding to Eastfield Lane. Presumably the rear of the proposed housing will overlook the established new cemetery on the north side of Eastfield Lane. This will seriously intrude on the tranquillity of this area when people wish to visit and tend the graves of their loved ones. For a number of years part of this site has been used in conjunction with the neighbouring Church as a car park. Its loss would have a significant effect on roadside parking.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – inappropriate as it is a threat to the beauty of Mill Hill on the Moraine, together with the beautiful old hedgerows and trees in the area. Forming part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, this land should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Indeed development there could be a threat to the future of the whole Moraine and would certainly have a significant detrimental effect on the views both from within and without the village boundaries. Service water drainage has been a problem for many years in this area and causes flooding not only in Eastfield Lane but also effects lower parts of the village. Development here would result in heavier traffic in the village. The Church has used some of this land as a car park for a good many years and naturally its loss would result in an increase in roadside parking, leading to difficulties and safety issues for the present residents of the surrounding streets. A new cemetery has recently been created within this portion of land.	3993/10603	
	Comment – would lead to serious problems of congestion.	3996/10605	
	Objection – village infrastructure, drainage and the road infrastructure are plainly operating at maximum usage. Large areas of road and pavement submerged in surface water due to the inability of the drainage system. Number of junctions in the village which are extremely hazardous.	3999/10610	
	Comment – the junction would need to be altered due to the increased amount of traffic using it. Stamford Bridge Road – aren't any footpaths on either side of this road.	4029/10661	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – roads to and from the village are very dangerous.	4032/10668	
	Objection – agricultural Land. Close (almost on top of) the cemetery. Houses built on this land would mean more traffic at this very junction and it would be dangerous. Dunnington has a serious problem with excess water and sewerage problems.	4045/10702	
	Objection – proposed as green belt. This land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, will also have a very significant impact on the visual amenity. Plays an important part in defining the open character. Long standing serious problem with surface water drainage. Would seriously impact on the road junction. Destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Over development will destroy its unique historic character. Significant impact on roadside parking.	4069/10754	
	Objection – will overpower the existing properties. Have a serious impact on the already hazardous Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction.	4092/10778	
	Objection – defines the northern residential boundary of the village. Formally proposed as Green Belt. Land is still in productive agricultural use, no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. The land should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine, which should be preserved as an important and irreplaceable historical contribution to the village. Will also have a very significant impact on visual amenity for the people of York and its visitors.	4108/4810	
	Comment – if access to this potential site is to be from Eastfield Lane, this would create extra hazards at the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk as outlined. Currently in productive agricultural use and has formerly been proposed as Green Belt. There are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing this status. There are currently serious problems with surface water drainage, both for Eastfield Lane and for the houses to the south of it. These problems would be greatly increased by the addition of 40+ houses. However, would consider H33 as a suitable site only if proper safeguards were put in place, namely: Access via Church Balk, halfway between the Water Tower and Eastfield Lane. Retention of the older trees in Church Balk. Reduction in size to a maximum of 20 houses, not to extend beyond the Water Tower. Retention	4142/10853	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of the church car park and the land set aside for the cemetery. The developer would be required to improve the drainage and sewage systems to eliminate the risks of flooding and back-up of sewage.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – opposed to any building on the water tower site (H33). This site should remain as open site on the approach to the village; believe that such open spaces are vital to the general appearance of any village.	4180/10911	
	Objection – this land defines the northern residential boundary of the village and should remain as it is and be allowed to continue to define the outer limit of the village. Land is green belt and in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changes its green belt status. Forms part of the York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Development would have a significant impact on visual amenity of Moraine. Site plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village in the same way that all entrances to the village have open aspects – development of this site would cause serious harm to this characteristic. Site has long standing problem with surface water drainage, any development would increase the flood risk in the village. Impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner. This junction cannot be improved without causing harm to the character of the village conservation area. Destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Overdevelopment in small village will destroy its unique historic character. Site used as church car park, its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking.	4187/4884	
	Objection – land forms part of York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Development would have a significant impact on visual amenity of Moraine. Site has long standing problem with surface water drainage, any development would increase the flood risk in the village. Site used as church car park, its loss would have impact on roadside parking. Overdevelopment in small village will destroy its unique historic character. What are the proposals to take account of increased traffic?	4208/10951	
	Objection – land forms part of the natural boundary of a self contained village. It forms part of an ancient glacial terminal moraine and plays an important	4234/10998	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	part in defining the open character of the only major entrance from the Bridlington Road. Any development would have a very significant impact on visual amenity and its green belt status should be retained.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – field is an established village boundary and any development would be detrimental to the village.	4252/11027	
	Objection – development will adversely affect the green corridor at the entrance to the village from A166. Dunnington should not have to take a higher proportion of housing than its proportionate share of the total housing needs, minus developments on brownfield sites minus the housing within the large developments. Historic villages must retain their character. No development should take place before the surface water drainage and sewage problems are resolved. The substantial increase in vehicle movements will make the roads more crowded and unsafe. Consider improving the junction of Church Balk and Eastfield Lane. There is a need for traffic lights at the junction of Hull Road and Common Road.	4257/11039	
	Objection – proposal would spoil the open entrance to the village. There would need to be investment in the infrastructure, especially schools, drainage, roads and facilities.	4263/11055	
	Objection – proposal will affect the open aspect on the approach to the village. Drainage would need to be improved before there is any more housing in the village.	4270/11081	
	Objection – part of site currently used as car park for the church, taking this away will increase the amount of on street parking. The narrowness of Eastfield Lane already makes it a difficult manoeuvre to exit Stockhill Close and more on street parking will make this more hazardous. Development will push the village boundary northward such that it will be visible from the A166 and taking away an open rural entranceway to the village. Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction is already hazardous. Surface water drainage of the site causes flooding on Eastfield Lane and Stockhill Close. Development will increase the flood risk. Development would threaten the hedgerows.	4352/11276	
Objection – part of site currently used as car park for the church, taking this away will increase the amount of on street parking. The narrowness of Eastfield Lane already makes it a difficult manoeuvre to exit Stockhill Close	4353/11281		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and more on street parking will make this more hazardous. Development will push the village boundary northward such that it will be visible from the A166 and taking away an open rural entranceway to the village. Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction is already hazardous. Surface water drainage of the site causes flooding on Eastfield Lane and Stockhill Close. Development will increase the flood risk. Development would threaten the hedgerows.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – access would either be onto Church Balk or Eastfield Lane just East of the cross road junction with Church Street, Church Balk and Church Lane. The junction is already busy with significantly impaired visibility. To increase traffic from the east would significantly increase the likelihood of a serious accident. Surface water already drains from this file onto Eastfield Lane and Garden Flats Lane. This causes significant issues in icy weather.	4373/11329	
	Objection – site is designated green belt and currently in agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that should warrant its change in status. Development would have significant impact on the adjacent roadways in particular the hazardous junction of Church Balk with Eastfield Lane. Site is prone to flooding/surface water drainage and further construction will result in an increased risk of flooding in the village. Site sits on York Moraine which should be preserved as an historical feature for the village setting. Local infrastructure and services such as health care, schools, library and public transport will not be able to cope with the increased population demand. Over development of this relatively small village will destroy its unique character.	4383/6454	
	Objection - site forms part of York Moraine which should be preserved as an historical contribution to the setting of the village. Land in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Land should be allowed to continue to define the outer limit of the village. Site has long standing problem with surface water drainage, any development would exacerbate the flood risk in the village. Development would seriously impact the junction of Church Balk with Eastfield Lane which is already hazardous. Site sits in open agricultural countryside and plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village in the same way all the entrances to the village have open aspects. Development would threaten the destruction of ancient native	4384/6460	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	hedgerows. Site used as church car park, its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – in principle against any development which impacts either significantly or adversely on the village and in particular any development along any of the three main entrances into the village. Any development along these routes is bound to detract from the appearance and feeling of entering a village. Land is green belt	4387/11367	
	Objection – land is green belt and there are no exceptional reasons for its character to be changed. Land provides a buffer between the village and the A166 and helps to define the village. Site plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance of the village. There is already flooding on Eastfield Lane and development would increase the risk of flooding. Development would lead to an increase in traffic at the Church Balk, Eastfield Lane junction and the junction cannot be improved without causing harm to the character of this part of the village. Development may lead to the destruction of ancient hedgerows. Part of site use as church car park and its loss would lead to increased congestion on narrow and residential roads near the church.	4399/11399	
	Objection – land clearly defines the northern boundary of the village, is green belt land, has an open character and is in productive agricultural use. There are no exceptional or special circumstances for change of green belt status and it should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Part of site used as church car park. Development would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Land is part of ancient York Moraine and should be preserved as an important and historical contribution to the setting of the village. Surface water drainage and foul sewer systems must be addressed before any development takes place.	4401/4904	
	Objection – much of the character of the village would be lost if this were built up. It would increase traffic at the junctions of Balk Lane/Eastfield Lane and at Balk Lane/A166. The proposals appear to be for over development which is a concern as the village already has problems with flooding, sewage and drainage. Village centre is often dangerously packed with parked cars.	4474/11489	
	Comment – of the four proposed sites in Dunnington, would be prepared to	4502/11530	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	consider this one for development given that it would have the least impact on village traffic. Entrance should be onto Church Balk and thus the A166, and developers required to upgrade Church Balk road and the drainage of the area to ensure that problems were not exacerbated.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – loss of green belt land. Sewerage is already overloaded. Lots of village roads are very narrow lanes and just could not cope with the extra traffic.	4503/11534	
	Objection - any new estates would spoil the village and it would become an urban town. The expense would be astronomical to provide new drainage, sewage, roads, school, surgeries and shops.	4549/11552	
	Objection – land forms part of York Moraine which should be marked as a site of historical and geological interest, promoting tourism and increasing educational value for the area. The ancient native hedgerows around the site need to be preserved and protected. Their loss would be a significant loss to wildlife. Land is green belt and no evidence of exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in status. There is no evidence that existing brownfield sites have been assessed for suitability. Development would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the village. Maintaining the open aspect to the countryside on the main access from the A166 is an important characteristic for the village.	4582/6461	
	Objection – fail to understand the need to develop the Greenfield sites within Dunnington. Preference should be given to developing brownfield sites. Loss of prime agricultural land. Land is green belt and there do not appear to be any very special or exceptional circumstances which would warrant a change in status. Development would be detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine and the ancient trees and hedgerows. Field is an established village boundary and development would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village. Open agricultural countryside plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village in the same way all the entrances to the village have open aspects. Overlooking of recently established cemetery. Site used as church car park, its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking. Increase in traffic would increase risk of accident at the already dangerous Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction.	4588/5992	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – the roads are too narrow and crowded with traffic already. The school cannot take more pupils.	4591/11571	
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – site is in the green belt. Infrastructure in the village will not support the development of this number of houses. Inadequate drainage and danger of flooding from surface water runoff which will be increased by further development. Hill is an established village boundary and any development will be detrimental to the character, openness and visual amenity of the village. Hill is on York Moraine and development will be detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill and endanger ancient trees and hedgerows which are part of the original Enclosure Act landscape and part of the heritage of Dunnington. Lanes are inadequate for the current traffic and the junction on Church Balk is dangerous. Site is productive agricultural land and should be retained for the future.	4626/11580	
	Objection – development will increase traffic movements in the village and further threaten the serious drainage and surface water issues. Site is on green belt and will significantly impact on the open character of the village. Proposals will put pressure on the already oversubscribed doctors and school.	4640/11769	
	Objection – land is ancient moraine and the highest point in York. The destruction of this ancient feature and the high aspect of the land will severely affect the visual amenity and character of the village and completely change the existing open aspect of this side of the village. Land is green belt and open countryside. Ongoing issues with surface water drainage, this development will further add to this by removing potential soak away land and will channel surface water towards existing developed parts of the village. School is full to capacity. Roads leading to the proposed site are very narrow and unsuitable for any significant amount of traffic; this will potentially lead to increased hazards at key junctions. The widening of the roads would further detract from the current character of the village as well as displacing ancient native hedgerows.	4643/6066	
	Objection – the open aspect would be lost and the York Moraine would be damaged by development. This is the highest contour in the village environs. Development will affect the highways and parking in this area.	4747/12033	
	Objection – land is green belt. Development will be detrimental to the beauty	4782/12077	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of Mill Hill on the moraine and the ancient trees and hedgerows. The field is an established village boundary and any development would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – land is green belt, open and rural in character and in productive agricultural use. There seems to be no special or exceptional reason to change the green belt status and as such this should remain as the northern boundary of the village. Development would be detrimental to the visual amenity at the entrance to the village and would have a destructive impact on ancient native hedgerows. Land is part of York Moraine and therefore a significant part of the historical setting of the village. Land has existing issues with the drainage of surface water which causes flooding in the village; any development would further increase the flood risks. Development will adversely affect the already dangerous junction between Church Balk and Eastfield Lane and any remedial steps to alter the junction would harm the character of this part of the village. Site used as church car park helping to alleviate the problem of dangerous roadside parking. Further pressure on car parking in the village. Development of this size is out of proportion to the scale and character of the village.	4794/6070	
	Objection – opposed to development on green belt. Development would be detrimental to the beauty of the ancient trees and hedgerows.	4795/12091	
	Objection – land defines the northern residential boundary of the village and proposed as green belt. Land is open in character and in productive agricultural use and there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Land should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Land forms part of York Moraine and should be preserved as an important historical contribution to the setting of the village. Development would have a very significant impact on visual amenity. Land plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village in the same way all the entrances to the village have open aspects. Site has long standing problem with surface water drainage and development would increase flood risk in the village. Development will impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane and junction cannot be improved without causing harm to the character of the village conservation area.	4798/12099	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Development would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Wider impact on highways and parking in the village. Over development in relatively small village will destroy its unique historic character. Site used as church car park, its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – land forms part of York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical feature of the village. Development would threaten destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Development will seriously harm the character of the village and impact on existing problems with surface water and sewage.	4804/12105	
	Objection – unsuitable for development due to lack of infrastructure, in particular the lack of suitable roads to the site. The location will result in a significant increase in traffic through the village. Land is green belt.	4806/12111	
	Objection – original development plan stated that no housing development would be considered in Dunnington as the local amenities and infrastructure could not be substantially developed – has this changed? Village is already a flood risk and this development will only increase the risk. Severe worries about the drainage of surface water. Church Street is already a very dangerous road, how will the existing road system cope with additional housing?	4809/12117	
	Objection – site is open green belt land on the approach to the village and development would cause a negative visual impact on green belt. Development would ruin the open aspect of Church Balk. Field should be protected for long term expansion of cemetery.	4814/12130	
	Objection – land forms part of York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical feature of the village. Development would threaten destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Development will seriously harm the character of the village and impact on existing problems with surface water and sewage.	4821/12137	
	Objection – land defines the northern boundary of the village and is green belt, open in character and in productive agricultural use. There are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Land should continue to define the outer limit of the village. Land forms part of York Moraine which should be preserved as an important historical	4931/12177	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	contribution to the setting of the village. Development will have significant affect on visual amenity. Site has a long standing serious problem with water surface drainage and development would increase flood risk in the village. Development would have a serious impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane which is already hazardous. Houses will have wider highways and parking impact on the village. Site used as church car park, its loss would have significant impact on roadside parking.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – opposed to houses being built in and around the village.	5106/12207	
	Objection – require smaller properties to suit first time buyers and older people wishing to downsize. Development will have visible effect as site forms the established village boundary and would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village. Will form an overbearing presence at the top of the village. No access should be considered from Eastfield Lane as road is narrow and fully used already by existing traffic. New cemetery will be very compromised by having housing eventually surround it.	5107/12211	
	Objection – concerns around the visual impact on the entrance to the village as well as environmental damage to wildlife in the surrounding hedgerows and the preservation of the York Moraine. Land was formally proposed as green belt and is in productive agricultural use. Development would result in increased traffic around the already dangerous crossroads at Church Balk and Eastfield Lane and would further exacerbate the surface water and drainage problems in the village. Not entirely appropriate in light of the impact on the cemetery.	5173/12313	
	Objection – concerns around the visual impact on the entrance to the village as well as environmental damage to wildlife in the surrounding hedgerows and the preservation of the York Moraine. Land was formally proposed as green belt and is in productive agricultural use. Development would result in increased traffic around the already dangerous crossroads at Church Balk and Eastfield Lane and would further exacerbate the surface water and drainage problems in the village. Not entirely appropriate in light of the impact on the cemetery.	5174/12318	
	Objection – part of site currently used as car park for the church, taking this away will increase the amount of on street parking. The narrowness of	5181/12382	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Eastfield Lane already makes it a difficult manoeuvre to exit Stockhill Close and more on street parking will make this more hazardous. Development will push the village boundary northward such that it will be visible from the A166 and taking away an open rural entranceway to the village. Church Balk/Eastfield Lane junction is already hazardous. Surface water drainage of the site causes flooding on Eastfield Lane and Stockhill Close. Development will increase the flood risk. Development would threaten the hedgerows. Land is green belt and as it is productive use there are no special or exceptional circumstances for changing that status.</p>		
<p>Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – land is green belt and open countryside. Building so would have a negative visual impact. Serious concerns regarding the drainage of sewage water which is already an issue in the village. More homes will mean more traffic through the village. Roadside parking is already hazardous, at the amenities, the public houses, the school and the doctors and this would be further exacerbated. Loss of are currently used as church car park would cause further parking dangers. Many lanes are too narrow to cope with any increase in vehicular use and any development of these lanes or junctions would damage ancient hedgerows and cause harm to the exceptional historic character of the village.</p>	5185/12385	
	<p>Objection – concerns around the visual impact on the entrance to the village as well as environmental damage to wildlife in the surrounding hedgerows and the preservation of the York Moraine. Land was formally proposed as green belt and is in productive agricultural use. Development would result in increased traffic around the already dangerous crossroads at Church Balk and Eastfield Lane and can it be assured that the proposals would not further exacerbate the surface water and drainage problems in the village. Not entirely appropriate in light of the impact on the cemetery.</p>	5191/12411	
	<p>Comment – serious consideration should be given to exiting drainage problems. No change should be made to the nature of approach roads, Eastfield Lane with ancient hedge boundary and Moraine is unsuitable for widening into a major thoroughfare.</p>	5208/12438	
	<p>Objection – school is stretched to the limit and already beyond acceptable capacity. Traffic and parking already difficult for cars and pedestrians.</p>	5212/12474	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Massive increase in traffic through the village will exacerbate this. Poor visibility on Church Street. Impact of traffic on the conservation area and on Church Street/Church Lane/Church Balk junction and resultant safety concerns. Problems with water run off from cemetery onto Eastfield Lane. Impact on 'countryside' feel of the lanes round the village will have an impact on atmosphere and environmental appeal of village. No social exceptional circumstances for changing green belt status and loss of productive agricultural use.</p>		
<p>Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued</p>	<p>Objection – development would damage the ancient Moraine which should be preserved. The visual amenity of the entrance to the village would be destroyed. Development would further exacerbate traffic problems at the junction of Church Balk/Eastfield Lane. Ancient native hedgerows would be destroyed or damaged.</p>	5214/12481	
	<p>Objection – green belt land in agricultural use and there appear to be no exceptional circumstances requiring a major increase in residential accommodation in Dunnington. Northern entrance to the village which is prominent because it lies on the terminal Moraine forming the northern boundary to village and presents a pleasant rural aspect – development would adversely affect the scenic beauty of the notable part of the village. Development will generate substantial increase in road traffic through Church Balk, Church Street, Church Lane and Eastfield Lane junction which is already difficult. The presence of old houses and the church at the corners leaves no scope for road widening or modification.</p>	5219/12485	
	<p>Objection – all land outside of the ring road should been considered as York's green belt.</p>	5223/12503	
	<p>Comment – any development should taken account of both the character and setting of the village and must address serious shortcomings in the current village infrastructure. Drainage system is insufficient for peak rainfall and results in surface water flooding. Junction of Hull Road and Common Road is dangerous as is junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk. Parking on Common Lane is insufficient. Brownfield land should be prioritised for development. School capacity must be addressed. Natural habitats and wildlife must be protected.</p>	5230/12529	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – Mill Hill is of enormous significance to the whole feel and nature of the village and is the highest land in the vale of York. Flooding problems already exist, and development may intensify the impact of flash floods. Eastfield Lane is not designed to carry a heavy flow of traffic, single track eastwards out of village and popular lane to enjoy tranquillity of open countryside. Development will result in congestion and potential for accidents at Church Balk/Church Lane and Eastfield Lane crossroad.	5241/14321	
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – there are no exceptional circumstance to alter the use of green belt land. Already flooding issues and further development will only make matters worse. The school is over capacity. Additional cars on unsuitable roads, the corner of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is dangerous and Eastfield Lane is too narrow to take any additional volumes of transport. The Moraine should be preserved as an important historical contribution. Any changes to the roads would affect the character of the village. Why does a small village need such a large increase in houses?	5258/14348	
	Objection – houses would cause major problems with additional traffic as the junctions in this area are already dangerous at times. Flooding from surface water is already an issue in this area. Would lose car park for the church, cars would then be parked randomly around the area causing more traffic problems and accidents.	5294/14424	
	Objection – development would increase the population of the village affecting its infrastructure in a detrimental way. School is already at capacity and there are surface drainage issues and parking problems in the narrow streets. Part of ancient Moraine. Contribute to hazardous junction at Church Balk.	5300/14450	
	Objection – concerns about plans to develop along the Moraine. Concerns about impact on groundwater and resultant flooding. Rigorous assessment of soil and groundwater issues is needed before further housing is considered on the higher ground above the village. Hazardous junction of Church Balk, Eastfield Lane and Church Lane – more traffic would make this junction and the one with the A166 worse. Eastfield Lane needs upgrading to two way traffic and a footpath out in. Loss of church car park. Loss of potential to increase size of cemetery.	5341/14528	
	Objection – there are no very special or exceptional circumstances to warrant	5377/14595	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the development of such a large site on green belt land. Land is in productive agricultural use and important for food production. Ongoing problems with drainage in the village, drains in Eastfield Lane are inadequate to carry away surface water running off the hill. Hill acts as a sponge to hold some of the water and allow it to drain more slowly. Infrastructure needs improving without the burden of further building. Church Balk is very busy road, with footpaths only on one side and junction with Eastfield Lane is hazardous. Development would have big impact on traffic flow on A166. Moraine should be preserved as an important historical setting for the village. Development would have huge visual impact and alter the character and open nature of the village. So many brownfield sites that should be used.</p>		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	<p>Objection – understood that this area was to be used as part of extended cemetery. Development will change the quiet tranquillity of the current cemetery. Potentially an important archaeological site, with the possibility that a Roman road ran along the top of the Moraine. Development will add to the current serious surface water drainage issues affecting the whole village. The access road is a narrow country lane unsuitable for the extra traffic and widening the lane would alter the rural nature of the area and the character of the village.</p>	5382/14606	
	<p>Objection – original plans stated that no housing development would be considered as the local amenities and infrastructure could not be substantially developed – has this changed? Village is already a flood risk and adding housing to this site will only increase the risk. Severe worries about the drainage of surface water. Church Street is already a very dangerous road.</p>	5387/14620	
	<p>Objection – school has overcrowding problems which will be made worse with proposed developments.</p>	5414/14701	
	<p>Objection – land previously accepted as green belt and used as agricultural land. Housing development will ruin the rural character of the village and permanently destroy its open character. Issues with water drainage which could impact the whole village. Eastfield Lane is narrow and any widening would destroy ancient hedgerows and ruin the character of the area. The junction of Eastfield Lane with Church Balk is already a hazard. More traffic through village. School already overcrowded. Many brownfield sites with</p>	5415/14704	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	existing transport infrastructure.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – the site lies within green belt. There would be an increased risk of flooding. The sewers were designed for a much smaller community and are already blocking and backing up. The access roads are not constructed to modern standards and increased traffic is likely to lead to accidents.	5467/14815	
	Objection – development will further exacerbate the increasing difficulty that residents have accessing the A1079 and Stamford Bridge Road at peak times. It will significantly increase the hazard associated with peak time traffic in locality already struggling to cope with volume of traffic and associated congestion.	5554/13021	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot maintain this much development and the historic nature of the village will be badly affected with such growth. Small streets can barely cope with current level of traffic. Not sure what sort of improvements could be made to ensure future safety and free flow of traffic.	5623/13232	
	Objection – scale of development too large for the location, especially due to close proximity to H31. Open area of land which marks the northern limit of the village. Visual impact on properties on Church Balk and Eastfield Lane. Dominance in the landscape in this part of the village would impact on open character of the village entrances in land formerly proposed as green belt. Surface water drainage is long standing problem in this part of village and number of houses is likely to exacerbate existing drainage and flooding problems. Development will have direct impact on already hazardous junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane/Church Lane. Houses would significantly increase traffic flow and parking problems throughout the village. Amenities are ill equipped to cope with such large scale developments, not least the school which already close to capacity. Over development would destroy village character.	5668/6075	
	Comment – hope it is possible for housing to be planned as well as the past new builds which haven't detracted from the village scene.	5687/13402	
	Objection – amount of housing being proposed for the village is totally inappropriate and not compatible with village life. Centre already has traffic difficulties due to a lack of off street parking; this would be exacerbated by increasing the population.	5827/13792	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – site is at the limits of the village on land designated as green belt. No proposals should be made as to its future use until the green belt label is changed.	6039/5983	
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – site is located on gateway to village with open views across to Mill Hill and the Wolds beyond. High point and on the Moraine; a special place and must be protected. Development will change the character of the northern village gateway. Views into open countryside will be lost. Church Balk and Eastfield Lane mark the settlement boundary; this would be stand alone development on the other side of these roads. Flooding is a major problem due to filling in of two historic ponds. Hedgerows would be damaged, important habitats and wildlife. Field should be protected for the future expansion of the cemetery. To alter the highways to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village approach. Massive visual impact on green belt. Brownfield sites must be considered as the preferred option.	6098/6078	
	Objection – development within the present green belt against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Detrimental impact on the landscape and setting of Dunnington. Development would have an immediate detrimental effect when approaching Dunnington.	6109/15538	
	Objection – additional housing presents further traffic issues. York Street is already very congested. There is an existing drainage problem in the village.	6125/15550	
	Comment – would require improvements to the roads to allow safe access and egress. Junction of Eastfield Lane, Church Balk, Church Lane and Church Street is hazardous enough. The hedgerow along Eastfield Lane is an ancient marker and should not be damaged or removed for traffic purposes. Land would suffer from lack of water pressure. Would be a requirement to improve the drainage and surface water drainage throughout the village. Land currently used as church car park, there is no other suitable space nearby for parking.	6140/15604	
	Objection - a housing development in the Water Tower field could damage many of the remaining ancient trees and hedgerows that give the village its character at this location.	6146/15621	
	Objection – concerned about any development in the village that is likely to	6148/15627	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	increase traffic in the centre of the village.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this site is in open agricultural countryside and plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village. Development at this site would cause serious harm to this characteristic. Development of the site will further exacerbate the long standing flooding problem on Eastfield Lane and will cause further serious surface water drainage issues for the village. This land forms part of an ancient geographical feature known as the York Moraine. This will generate a significant increase in vehicular movement along Eastfield lane.	6151/15636	
	Objection – formally proposed as greenbelt, it is in productive agricultural use, there are no special or exceptional circumstance for changing the status, it forms park of an ancient geographical feature known as York Moraine. It would have a significant impact on visual amenity, plays an important part in defining the open character at the entrance to the village, development would harm the characteristic, Longstanding serious problem with surface water drainage, seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane, threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows, need wider highways ad parking impact on the village, destroy the village’s unique historic character, part of the site has been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park, its loss would have significant impact on road side parking.	6164/15677	
	Objection – the land is the most attractive landscape – the moraine is a relic of the ice age leading to Mill Hill. The highest point in York covered by ancient hedgerows and trees, this must be preserved.	6184/6090	
	Comment – in favour with the provision of additional affordable housing within the village, however the developer would have to make improvements to the road infrastructure improving safety of vehicle users and pedestrians. Concerned with the increased levels of traffic in the village and onto the junction with the A1079 which has already caused problems and cost to CYC. There are sufficient brownfield sites in York which could be developed, such as Piccadilly where area have been neglected and abandoned which would make suitable areas for development along with numerous retail outlets with vacant premises above them.	6187/15725	
	Objection – this is open agricultural countryside, development at this site	6210/6145	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would cause serious harm to this characteristic, there is a long standing flooding problem in the area. This site forms the York Moraine, and will impact on visual amenity, there will be significant increase in vehicular movement along Eastfield Lane and impact on an already hazardous junction.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – negative impact on the primary education provision, prime agricultural land, visual intrusion will be considerable on this high land and impact on the visual amenity of these on Church Balk, it would be disrespectful to these recently interned within the cemetery. The junction with church plan is already a dangerous junction.	6212/6150	
	Objection – too many houses are planned and would take up too much greenbelt.	6220/15761	
	Objection – the site should remain as an open approach to the village, it is productive arable land and is a buffer between the industrial site and village housing.	6234/15800	
	Objection – more housing would spoil this area.	6237/15808	
	Objection – the need for additional housing is recognised but there is concern for the encroachment onto the greenbelt and brownfield land should be the first consideration. The NPPF encourages LPA to positively enhance and retain landscapes so H33 is alarming.	6238/15812	
	Objection – this site defines the northern residential boundary of the village, there is no special or exceptional circumstances to alter the greenbelt. This land forms part of the York Moraine. There is a long standing problem with surface water drainage; the development will seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane which is already hazardous. It would threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows. There would be a need for wider highways and increased parking, destroy the village's unique historic character, part of the site has been used in conjunction with the Church as a car park, its loss would have significant impact on road side parking.	6242/6167	
	Objection – the site is currently in agricultural use, and defines the open and rural open setting of the village, this will generate a large increase in the amount of traffic using Eastfield Lane. There are issues of flooding and surface water runoff which needs to be addressed.	6252/6178	
	Objection – additional traffic on narrow roads – Eastfield Lane in particular is	6257/6183	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	inadequate, this is most unwelcome at the expense of the greenbelt.		
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this is an ancient terminal moraine, this site will totally alter the lovely entrance to the village, there are long standing flooding problem, the surface water drainage needs to be addressed and affects roads and properties, the ancient hedgerows along Eastfield Lane would be threatened, the much needed overflow car park for the church would be lost.	6259/15831	
	Objection – there will be a need to travel out of the village to visit real rural areas of countryside is these sites are developed, this is greenbelt land, what plans are there for traffic control both in and out of the village, the grass verges are already overflowing on a nightly basis. What plans are there to expand the primary school?	6264/15838	
	Objection – this site defines the northern residential boundary and is recognised as greenbelt. It is part of the ancient geographical York Moraine, it would have huge impact on an already hazardous and difficult junction.	6268/15840	
	Objection – the infrastructure could not cope, flooding issues, the road network could not cope with the increased influx of vehicles, there would insufficient support services, the environmental impact.	6270/15848	
	Objection – access and amount of local infrastructure and services, increase traffic, especially near the children’s play park, Dunnington primary school is often over-subscribed.	6272/15857	
	Objection – it would be detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine and the ancient trees and hedgerows.	6328/6208	
	Objection – this site is the high point of the village and on the approach to Dunnington village, the views out into open countryside from the top of Church street and along Eastfield land and Church Balk would be lost forever there are no other houses built on the north side of Eastfield lane and Church Balk, these roads mark the settlement boundary, two large ponds have been filled in and causing flooding, the hedgerows are home to birds and hedgehogs, field should be protected for expansion of the cemetery, 70% of villages in a survey were against this development, traffic is already a problem along Church Balk, Eastfield Lane, Church Street and Church Lane, to alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village approach, visual impact on the green belt.	6361/16076	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H33 Water Tower Land, Dunnington Continued	Objection – Greenbelt site, the village infrastructure in terms of schooling, medical practice and road network will not cope with extra housing, this would impose a disproportionate burden on Dunnington and the infrastructure.	6366/16082	
	Objection – this site is the high point of the village and on the approach to Dunnington village, the views out into open countryside from the top of Church street and along Eastfield land and Church Balk would be lost forever there are no other houses built on the north side of Eastfield lane and Church Balk, these roads mark the settlement boundary, two large ponds have been filled in and causing flooding, the hedgerows are home to birds and hedgehogs, field should be protected for expansion of the cemetery, 70% of villages in a survey were against this development, traffic is already a problem along Church Balk, Eastfield Lane, Church Street and Church Lane, to alter the highway to accommodate this proposal would change the character and visual impact of the village approach, visual impact on the green belt.	6381/6252	
	Objection – this is an established village boundary, it would be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the village, detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill on the moraine, the ancient trees and hedgerows.	6463/6379	
	Objection – this site defines the northern residential boundary, greenbelt location, it is in productive agricultural use, it forms part of an ancient geographical feature, York Moraine, it would have significant visual impact on the village, and helps define the open character at the entrance of the village, seriously impact on the road junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane corner, threaten the destruction of ancient hedgerows, need for wider highways and parking, loss as parking for the church.	6473/6403	
	Objection – this site is an important part of the open approach to the village and church	6519/16470	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	Comment – there needs to be an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water runoff in the village, together with a full transport survey covering access, traffic movement and projected effects of increased traffic flow.	Petition 20	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton	Objection – this development has previously been proposed and was rejected on planning grounds. It is not understood how it can now be considered acceptable. Too large a development for the village. Any more large development would destroy the character of the village and strain the local infrastructure, in particular increasing local road congestion through the conservation area.	75/12759	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – the site was declared unsuitable for housing in 2011 and therefore presumably still is. Permission was granted a few years ago for 3 houses in Church Lane with the proviso that no further houses would be allowed. There is no viable road access to the site, any traffic would have to use the narrow lanes of the adjacent conservation area impacting on characteristics afforded protection by conservation area status and village design statement.	136/12874	Skelton Village Trust
	Comment – in view of the duty on the council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas including their setting, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is considered appropriate to allocate this area, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14082	English Heritage
	Support –the site is well contained and any development would not encroach on the countryside. It is not considered that the site performs an material Green Belt purpose. H34 is well located to the existing settlement and associated services and facilities. However the designation to the land to the North and North East of Skelton as “village Setting” is not justified or necessary as much of Skelton is modern development and does not have the small scale characteristic or form of an agricultural village.	534/16723	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Study rejected the land as being unsuitable for housing. 2013 Technical response (Annex 18) does not appear to support approval of H34 – no access to A19, inadequate vehicular and cycle access; site lies in conservation area; area previously flagged as having ecological interest. In terms of suitability of the site, if	1009/17037	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	distances to services are measured by road (rather than straight line) then many fall outside the viability criteria. Church Lane cannot accommodate an extra 42 houses and doubt entrance from A19 would be a safe option. The size has already been reduced due to the Biodiversity Action Plan and a site of Semi-improved Neutral Grassland – is this because there are Great Crested Newts?		
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1842	NFU
	Objection – difficult to understand how the Council can propose to develop 42 houses and approve the installation of an over-sized wind generator between Church Lane and the city boundary. There is very little distance between the two.	1899/105	
	Objection –this 4 acre piece of land was deemed unsuitable for building in 2011. There is no appropriate access to the site for the amount of construction traffic. The site is right next to Skelton’s Conservation area. A 42 house development is also out of proportion in comparison to the overall size of the village and could have a detrimental impact on the local facilities, including the primary school.	1901/72	
	Comment - is access going to be from Church Lane?	1920/125	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6642	
	Comment – this development does seem not so unreasonable, but access to the village would be very difficult without completely changing the ancient historic centre. Suggest old Del Monte site as an alternative, as not green belt and is close to A19.	2466/2622	
	Objection – proposals will undoubtedly destroy the character of Skelton forever.	2696/7147	
	Objection – strongly object to the plans for Skelton.	2782/7372	
	Objection – loss of green belt, York has many brownfield sites on which it could build housing.	2788/7387	
	Objection – this development has previously been proposed and was rejected on planning grounds. It is not understood how it can now be considered acceptable. Too large a development for the village. Any more large development would destroy the character of the village and strain the local	2789/7399	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure, in particular increasing local road congestion through the conservation area.		
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – to build 42 new houses just north of Skelton village, the wind turbines and the 4020 new homes at Clifton Gate. The current road infrastructure is inadequate and will make the surrounding countryside will be an eyesore.	2790/7400	
	Support – in favour of development in the Skelton area.	2795/7413	
	Objection – land north of Church Lane was deemed unsuitable for building.	2796/7420	
	Objection – infrastructure problems and poor access.	3034/7885	
	Objection – Skelton is an expanded ancient settlement with a longstanding road system and village green unable to take modern traffic requirements. There is no adequate access to and from the village to sustain the inevitable increased vehicular activity this proposed development would generate.	3071/9754	
	Objection – will cause disruption to that area and far too much extra traffic. A1237 is already highly congested around the Tesco roundabout. A1237 cannot cope with the increase in traffic which this will bring. 42 houses also proposed in Skelton is also going to cause considerably more traffic to Skelton.	3107/8009	
	Objection – plans for a new access road access through Skelton into Clifton Gate from Moorlands Road will create a huge increase of traffic through our village, visual and noise impact. The land the 42 houses are planned for was deemed unsuitable for building in 2011, how come this has suddenly changed? Loss of 500 acres of Skelton’s surrounding farmland, woodland and Greenbelt. York is a beautiful, unique and historic city. Resident of this peaceful and beautiful village.	3112/8017	
	Objection – opposed to any further building developments within the village, does not have the resources for such large developments.	3123/8048	
	Objection – 42 houses in Church Lane are proposed for land deemed unsuitable in 2011. If unsuitable then, it is still unsuitable now. Area is next to the village conservation area, no viable access. Decimation of the greenbelt. The proposed loss of hundreds of acres of farmland.	3139/8083	
Objection – inappropriate (as had been decided in 2011). No viable access, unless the lay-by just north of the village is converted into an access road.	3157/8129		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The existing Spring Lane was inadequate even for the traffic involved in building a single house in 2013. The existing roads nearby are all narrow (single carriageway), with grass verges, no footpaths, and minimal street lighting.		
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – there is insufficient access on a very narrow road with no room for a pedestrian walkway and no street lighting.	3162/8137	
	Objection – Church Lane deemed unsuitable in 2011. Village conservation area, no viable access. Undoubtedly spoil the character of the village. Loss of hundreds of acres of farmland shows complete disregard for the countryside.	3168/8149	
	Objection – wonderful arrangement of outlying villages, complete in themselves but looking to York as they have done for centuries. Go to Chester. It'll make you weep. Will ruin something really special and it'll be gone forever.	3170/8157	
	Objection – Church Lane is highly questionable; this site was deemed to be unsuitable for housing in 2011, because of inadequate access, what has changed?	3173/8164	
	Objection – this land was deemed unsuitable for building in 2011 and has no viable access onto the village's narrow roads which have minimal street lighting.	3302/8471	
	Comment – as a resident of Skelton, directly affected by the proposals to build 42 houses on land North of Church Lane, Skelton, and to erect wind turbines near the village. The land North of Church Lane has very poor access, and that the land was deemed unsuitable for building only two years ago.	3428/8771	
	Comment - Land North of Church Lane, Skelton. Site size 1.74 hectares, Village/rural, 42 dwellings to be developed during years 1-10. Total number of dwellings to be built by 2030 = 6,439. Total number of hectares to be used for house building = 215.5.	3428/8781	
	Support – have no real issue with the 42 houses proposed at Skelton.	3476/8912	
	Objection – concerned about the proposals affecting the Skelton area and the effect this will cause. It is already very congested. The roads in this area are not suitable to accommodate the extra traffic which would be involved if the number of new homes proposed were to be built. Moorlands Road is too narrow to take the additional traffic.	3818/10273	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – lack of appropriate access to the 42 home site behind Church Lane.	3969/10561	
	Support – village is in need of more housing and this is big enough to give the village a boost without being so big as to spoil the feel of the village or put too much strain on the local amenities.	4065/10745	
	Objection – congestion problems with cars, in the area, and outer Ring Road.	4074/10759	
	Objection – proposals are completely unsustainable with York’s existing roads, schools and hospitals, the impact and devastation of the greenbelt. How many trees and habitats will be lost? Not to mention the hundreds of acres of productive farmland.	4204/7800	
	Objection – this land was deemed unsuitable for building in 2011 and has no viable access onto the village’s narrow roads which have minimal lighting.	4225/10981	
	Objection – there are no guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded makes it totally unsustainable. There are many types of accommodation in York what are empty, and it would be disastrous for the city to increase its size much more as it is at saturation point already.	4231/10994	
	Comment – how will this site be accessed? This site has been declared unsuitable several times, the latest in 2011. The whole development goes against the Skelton Village Design statement.	4302/11161	
	Objection – this proposal would dwarf Skelton and ruin what is a very attractive village. A19 cannot cope with traffic as it is. This would increase Skelton on 5% and is too much. This would encroach on Skelton’s cemetery. The cemetery should be protected at all cost for perpetuity.	4345/11263	
	Objection – impact of traffic on heavily congested ring road, difficult to access the proposed sites using narrow lanes around the village, local infrastructure cannot cope, the local plan did not give details of who will fund the necessary infrastructure upgrades, loss of farmland/woodland/greenbelt land, village will become of a rat run, turn the village in to urban sprawl, no social or economic reasons for increase in housing in the village, impact on the way of life in the village.	4351/11272	
	Objection – this site was deemed unsuitable for development in 2011, there is no change in the site’s lack of suitability. There is no access for vehicles to the site from the village, there are no footpaths for pedestrians, only minimal	4366/11313	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	street lighting. Exit onto the A19 from Church Lane is already problematic, and any additional traffic would make this junction dangerous, the loss of good farmland.		
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – the local roads will be unable to cope with extra traffic and will result in urban sprawl.	4381/11344	
	Objection – the council imposes strict controls in building within Skelton’s conservation area. How can plans to decant cars from another 40 houses on to one of its narrow, single-track lanes be sustainable today?	4466/11472	
	Objection – this site was recently rejected as inaccessible and unsuitable for very solid reasons. What has changed?	4691/14246	
	Objection – irreplaceable loss of greenbelt countryside and wildlife habitats, lack of appropriate access, close proximity to A19, increase in traffic, noise and pollution.	4695/11988	
	Objection – greenbelt location, no social or economic justification.	4719/12011	
	Objection – greenbelt location, no social or economic justification.	4720/12014	
	Objection – road infrastructure can barely cope, private land wanting to make a quick profit through the Local Plan, previous applications have been refused, greenbelt area, increase in traffic which would be dangerous to children and elderly.	4793/12088	
	Objection – lack of appropriate access, site was declared unsuitable for housing 2011.	4816/12132	
	Objection – concerned about the lack of viable access, narrow roads with no footpaths and minimal street lighting.	5111/12220	
	Objection – no aware of an expected influx of businesses whether industry, commerce or whatever to encourage people to come to this area. A vast increase in the amount of traffic in the area. There is no mention of other requirements such as schools, doctors.	5135/12251	
	Objection – danger to life from increased traffic usage along Church lane and St. Giles road, both of which have no footpaths, loss of greenbelt land, adjacent to an established conservation area with great crested newts, destroy an area of ride and furrow land, it is also a potential site of encampment of the royalist troops prior to their major battle during the English Civil War.	5143/12261	
	Comment – this site has been considered before and site was declared	5213/12478	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unsuitable two years ago, there is no viable access to it.		
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – this should be considered greenbelt land, the city is already struggling with congestion.	5223/12504	
	Objection – this site was declared unsuitable in 2011, what has changed?	5226/12520	
	Objection – this is far too large and would bring chaos to the area, the roads can hardly cope. Development should be smaller scale.	5242/14323	
	Objection – lack of appropriate access, increase in traffic affecting the church.	5351/14538	
	Objection – the roads in this part of the village cannot cope with the development and the land was deemed unsuitable for development for building in 2011.	5359/14559	
	Objection – there is no detailed assessment as to why this scale of development is acceptable for York. What is the transport/roads plan? CYC has badly managed the ring road.	5367/14574	
	Objection – this will destroy the character of the conservation area, there is a perfectly good brownfield site which has not been identified (former del monte factory), it is very close to ponds and wetlands north of the village which has abundant wildlife including great crested newts.	5480/14833	
	Objection – with the development of additional houses in Skelton will the council guarantee the utility services will be upgraded to suit the development, not just attenuation on the existing services?	5584/13085	
	Objection – the technical response to H34 does not seem to support approval as a housing site – No access to A19, lies within Skelton Village Conservation area, area was removed through ecological concerns, access to services was measured as the crow flies, when measured by road many of these fail the criteria, Church Lane cannot accommodate more traffic, why are great crested newts not mention in the technical report?	5589/13104	
	Objection – no road access and present sewerage problems, severe traffic congestion, Skelton primary school has spoken of using portacabins as classrooms.	5797/13726	
	Objection – very concerned at the proposed estate north of Church Lane, in particular the access routes	5927/15262	
	Comment – how will these houses be accessed, Church Lane is too narrow.	5939/15279	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H34 Land North Of Church Lane, Skelton continued	Objection – this development would have a negative impact on the whole village, if an access road were to go via the church then the character and tranquil beauty of the heart of the village would be gone forever. If an access route were to go via the A19 then you create further problems to an already congested and struggling road and risk creating a dangerous junction. This site is not suitable for development.	6043/15469	
	Objection – this land was declared unsuitable for housing, there is no suitable access, it would completely surround the burial site, and Skelton would lose farmland, woodland and greenbelt and the habitats they support.	6145/15617	
	Objection – this site was judged unsuitable for development only 2 years ago. Access for vehicles and pedestrians would be via the narrow lanes and sharp corners of the conservation area, presenting high risk to all users.	6310/15953	
	Objection – no social or economic reason for these houses, local roads cannot cope and there would be a loss of farmland, this will lead to urban sprawl.	6420/16140	
	Objection – there is not real consideration of the environmental or infrastructure implications of these extensions.	6443/16163	
	Objection – there have been previous proposals on this site that have been rejected, how is it now acceptable? It would represent an increase in Skelton housing – too large.	6510/16289	Cllr Joseph D Watt

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington	Comment – the parish survey revealed that of those returning the survey 18.1% were in favour, 51.6% were against and 30.4% expressed no opinion.	59/12648	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support – the allocation of this site for housing.	144/12877	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Support – fully support this allocation however there are some concerns that the housing requirement does not fully meet the full housing needs of the district and the reasons for this have not been adequately explained.	534/16713	DPP One Ltd
	Objection – along with H31 and H33, will cause serious drainage and sewage issues and traffic problems through the village centre which is badly overloaded already. Parking and traffic flow through York and Church Streets already spoils the village ethos.	945/16983	
	Objection – Dunnington is inappropriate for additional housing and too much housing does nothing for the environment or the countryside.	961/16990	
	Objection – adding further bulk to the population would reduce the quality of facilities currently on offer throughout the village and place considerable strain on minimal facilities.	981/17006	
	Objection – overdevelopment in relatively small village will destroy its unique historic character. There are already significant drainage and surface water issues in the village. Land is green belt and in productive agricultural use and there are no special exceptional circumstances for changing its green belt status. Development would have significant impact on a narrow country lane, any alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village. Site cannot be developed without further land acquisition to provide access to Intake Lane. Development would result in highway safety issues through additional traffic along existing housing estate, and past children’s play area on Intake Lane as well as increased traffic at its junction with Common Road which is already busy. Junction with A1079 is hazardous and therefore traffic likely to exit via York Street or Church Street causing further congestion on extremely busy roads.	995/17025	
	Objection – land is green belt and should only be developed in very special circumstances which do not apply in Dunnington. The openness of the green belt is very precious. Dunnington is a village and not a small town. Village suffers from severe water surface/drainage problems which will be made worse by development. Access to Intake Lane is a problem. Traffic congestion through the village along medieval lanes.	1109/17195	
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1843	NFU

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – inappropriate development which would ruin the openness of the green belt and views of the Wolds. Development would have a severe effect on water drainage which is already a problem in many areas of the village. The traffic flow in and around Dunnington would be put under increasing strain and much would be required to alleviate the problems. Proposals would completely alter the nature and character of lovely village.	1898/6043	
	Objection – proposals would lead to urban sprawl in the village. Could existing infrastructure take any further loading? Loss of green belt.	1913/96	
	Objection – cannot believe there are no suitable brownfield sites in the York area for housing development. Green belt sites have been specified as such to protect land designated for agricultural use. Already significant congestion on York Street and Church Street caused by the number of parked cars, a significant increase in cars would make travel both dangerous and intolerable. Strain on the school which is already full to capacity.	2316/6522	
	Objection – greenbelt land for development purposed, open in character and in productive agricultural use. Development will have a detrimental impact on the visual aspects of the locations, served by narrow country lanes and alterations to this would involve further land access and damage to hedgerows. Extra traffic and increased hazards.	2349/6537	
	Objection – if proposals for Dunnington were to go ahead, the volume of traffic and overloading at the school, doctors and dentist would have a disastrous effect.	2407/6566	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6643	
	Objection – village is already very congested at peak times. School won't be big enough and village's whole structure will change. Why need more housing when there are so many places that could be adapted that have been empty and unused for years? Inappropriate development in the draft green belt and inappropriate in size, scale and location due to the field being land locked. Opening up the field to road access would have a huge impact on the existing footpath and potential safety implications for users of the path. Impact on views of fields and Wolds. Increase in traffic on the narrowest part of Intake Lane. Fields provide natural habitat for endangered and protected species (listed in response) and a natural gateway to Hagg Wood, the local stream and small pond. Public authorities have a duty to conserve biodiversity. Field provides arable crops and a buffer between residential properties. There are no very special or exceptional circumstances that would warrant the change in green belt status.	2427/6712	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – proposal is on green belt land and open countryside and would greatly impact on this rural village which does not need to be expanded further with out loss of its unique character and charm. The roads and junction in the vicinity cannot support further expansion. Local services such as water, sewage, surface drainage and schools are at full capacity now and further expansion cannot be achieved without wholesale upgrading which will lead to a reduction in the village’s charm and destroy its unique historic character. Land should be retained as agricultural.	2467/6745	
	Objection – housing developments proposed for Dunnington will seriously impact on the village. Land is green belt and development would damage the northern setting of the village and its open, rural character. Would severely impact on Eastfield Lane by creating serious traffic issues and prejudicing its historic and scenic status as northern boundary of village and impacting on protection of Mill Hill. The name of this site is misleading as there is no vehicular access to Intake Lane and access would be through H31 to Eastfield Lane. Eastfield Lane is narrow and lined by an ancient native hedge – but it should not be widened as this would necessitate the destruction of this hedge. Inevitable effects on York and Church Streets. Chicane like junction of Eastfield Lane, Church Street and Church Balk is the worst in the village, however, any attempt to improve the junction would damage its scenic character at the entrance to the village. No development is sustainable until the village drains and sewers are fixed given the inadequacy of drains and sewers and the need to control surface water drainage.	2505/6781	
	Objection – any development in the village would create further problems for the inadequate foul and surface water infrastructure. Should development take place there should be a social mix of new housing that serves all sectors of the community. Development will increase traffic movements and congestion in various parts of the village. The school has capacity problems which new housing will exacerbate. Key feature of the village is its discrete identity being compact and surrounded by countryside and any development needs to recognise, respect and complement the established village context.	2511/6785	
	Comment – if there is further housing, it should be made a priority that the drainage system and tap water be made completely up to standard to cope with this influx. It is a health hazard.	2533/6816	
	Objection – land formerly proposed as green belt and treated as such because of its open character. Development would have detrimental impact on visual amenity. Already a serious surface water drainage problem in the vicinity and problems with	2543/6829	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	drains and sewers. Additional traffic would have to travel along existing housing estate and the very busy Intake Lane past the play area. Village will lose its unique character and village 'feel'.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – development would have detrimental impact on very narrow country lane. Additional land would be needed to accommodate any additional houses in this area. Concerns with regard to the danger of flooding on Intake Lane. Houses to be built on green belt land.	2552/6866	
	Objection – a reduced number of affordable homes (8 homes) on this site if absolutely necessary. Land is green belt and traffic pressures on Eastfield Lane and surrounding roads would be significant.	2556/6876	
	Objection – school is full and there is traffic everywhere, particularly much congestion on York Street. People would have to exit development by driving through the village. Infrastructure would not cope; drainage is already a problem down Intake Lane and Common Road.	2558/6882	
	Objection – water drainage system is unable to cope with existing demands.	2561/6895	
	Comment – any major development should be on the side of the village furthest from York in order to retain the village 'feel'. Development on the three main entrances to the village should be restricted. Drainage, flooding and run off already cause problems.	2565/6899	
	Comment – no objection to developing this site.	2566/6903	
	Objection – further housing development would put extra pressure on local services such as schools and health care.	2583/6925	
	Support – in favour of developing this site.	2592/6941	
	Objection – proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in the village design statement. Already serious surface water drainage problems which causes flooding, and problematic sewage system; any development will make problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Any development will change the open character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features, ancient native hedgerow and productive agricultural activity. Roads and junctions already under pressure, increased road users will add to existing congestion and inherent road safety risks particularly at junctions. Increased demand for parking which will have a detrimental effect on an already congested village particularly the conservation area. Further expansion of essentially small village will destroy its unique historic character.	2594/6947	
	Objection – all sense of community will be crushed and amenities will be	2623/6966	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overwhelmed by force of members. Local pride will be swamped by indifference and lack of involvement in the small town ethos.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection - inappropriate development in the draft green belt and inappropriate in size, scale and location due to the field being land locked. Opening up the field to road access would have a huge impact on the existing footpath and potential safety implications for users of the path. Impact on views of fields and Wolds. Increase in traffic on the narrowest part of Intake Lane. Fields provide natural habitat for endangered and protected species (listed in response) and a natural gateway to Hagg Wood, the local stream and small pond. Public authorities have a duty to conserve biodiversity. Field provides arable crops and a buffer between residential properties. There are no very special or exceptional circumstances that would warrant the change in green belt status.	2628/6972	
	Objection - inappropriate development in the draft green belt and inappropriate in size, scale and location due to the field being land locked. Opening up the field to road access would have a huge impact on the existing footpath and potential safety implications for users of the path. Impact on views of fields and Wolds. Increase in traffic on the narrowest part of Intake Lane. Fields provide natural habitat for endangered and protected species (listed in response) and a natural gateway to Hagg Wood, the local stream and small pond. Public authorities have a duty to conserve biodiversity. Field provides arable crops and a buffer between residential properties. There are no very special or exceptional circumstances that would warrant the change in green belt status.	2629/6973	
	Objection – this will cause huge traffic problems and create very big dangers to play park. Area is prone to flooding and drainage problems. Forms a boundary to the village and must be looked at as green belt as it leads into Hagg Wood. Access through the village is hazardous to say the least at certain times of day. Housing on the scale proposed would change the whole character of the village and surrounding countryside.	2635/6989	
	Objection – this site would be ok for around 15 houses in the northern end as access to Intake Lane is not possible.	2642/7006	
	Objection – the village roads cannot accept any further traffic; Eastfield Lane and Church Balk crossroads being a significant problem. Traffic along York Street is at bursting point. Known problem in the area regarding drainage.	2645/7011	
	Objection – potentially dangerous access on to main roads, additional dangers caused to pedestrians notably school children attending the local school. In village	2646/7015	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	questionnaire in 2004 there was a unanimous feeling that the village was already 'fully built' and that no further development was either wanted or needed. Are the feelings of the residents to be ignored? Dunnington Primary School is not capable of adequately coping with nay additional pupils.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – potentially dangerous access on to main roads, additional dangers caused to pedestrians notably school children attending the local school. In village questionnaire in 2004 there was a unanimous feeling that the village was already 'fully built' and that no further development was either wanted or needed. Are the feelings of the residents to be ignored? Dunnington Primary School is not capable of adequately coping with nay additional pupils.	2647/7019	
	Objection – concerns for the infrastructure of the village. The roads are inadequate and poorly maintained. The same can be said for drainage, sewerage etc. Basic facilities in the village would be stretched. If there was a large rise in the number of children at the school major work would have to be considered. The school is already oversubscribed.	2666/7061	
	Objection – totally against building houses in the village. The village is big enough; don't want to become a sprawling town like Haxby. Want to keep Dunnington a village. If houses are needed not against in fill development.	2677/7098	
	Objection – against this development. Dunnington already suffers from serious surface water drainage problems and additional development will put further strain on already problematic sewage system. Will change the character and aspect of the village. Roads and junctions are already under pressure. Development will inevitably increase the demand for parking.	2679/7112	
	Objection – against this development. Dunnington already suffers from serious surface water drainage problems and additional development will put further strain on already problematic sewage system. Will change the character and aspect of the village. Roads and junctions are already under pressure. Development will inevitably increase the demand for parking.	2682/7122	
	Objection – encroachment on the greenbelt and detrimental to the landscape. Will put pressure on facilities in the village.	2697/7153	
	Objection – would threaten water drainage issues. The traffic here would be considerably increased.	2706/7165	
	Objection – the roads within the village are narrow and parking difficult, to generate more cars from new housing will have a negative impact on the village. Ongoing problems with sewers and drainage, more housing and more hard surfacing can only	2707/7168	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	add to these problems.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – object to housing on the green belt. This will adversely affect the character of the village.	2708/7176	
	Objection – will have an impact on the village’s character – more built up area and less open space. Existing services will be under strain. Will the school be able to cope? Increase in parking on York Street which could lead to more congestion. What weight does the green belt status carry?	2709/7182	
	Objection – object to using green belt. Would require a major upgrade of drainage and sewerage disposal which a present is barely adequate. Substantial improvements to road infrastructure would be necessary and would seriously harm the character of the village. 147 new houses in Dunnington would bring severe congestion on Church Lane and York Street which are already extremely busy roads and create safety problems. A Comment – a smaller development might be sustainable, subject to the provisions above.	2711/7188	
	Objection – any more housing gin Dunnington in any shape or form requires additional sporting land and a lot of money spent on basic infrastructure in respect of sewerage and schooling.	2713/7198	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Objection – along with other proposed development would be too large for the village. Main roads around Dunnington are already congested. The local amenities are not adequate to sustain a bit influx of new residents. Open farmland would be lost.	2714/7205	
	Objection – would be renegeing on a previous agreement not to build on green belt land. Would have a negative impact on the open character of a rural village. The size scale and location of the proposed developments in Dunnington presents an issues of inappropriate development on green belt land which is contrary to green belt policies in the draft plan. The narrow roads are already working to full capacity and wouldn’t be able to sustain the increase in traffic. The increase in congestion in and out of the village certainly be negatively affected. Adverse affect on the already existing parking issues. Impact to pedestrians of the increase in traffic would be detrimental. Many children and elderly residents won’t be able to cross the village roads quick enough to avoid being hit by a speeding vehicle. Sewerage system is already working to maximum capacity. New housing would be too close to the existing residents. The right to privacy in your own home is basic human right. New houses would take away he majority of natural light from existing residences. Increase in housing will impact on the visual amenity of the village and would destroy the unique character. There are not enough local amenities to cope with the increase in residents.	2726/7225	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – opposed to use of green belt, there are no special circumstances as to why this should be used. The environmental impact must be considered together with the affect on the visual amenity of the surrounding areas.	2728/7231	
	Objection – opposed to use of green belt land, land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant its change in status. Will have a significant detrimental visual impact and will further threaten surface water drainage issues affecting the village. Will generate a significant increase in vehicular movements and increase in parking requirements. Would result in highways safety issues.	2736/7249	
	Objection – no evidence that the proposed amount of housing in Dunnington is needed. The local health, education, transport and sanitary infrastructure will struggle to cope with such a dramatic increase. Essential that the green belt is retained and that the attractive approach to the village is retained to prevent urban sprawl.	2743/7265	
	Objection – important that the site’s green belt status is maintained. It is a habitat for owls, foxes, pheasants, many British wild birds etc. The hedgerows alongside both sides of the site contain many native species including healthy Ash trees. Would have a severe detrimental effect on visual amenity. Would possibly exacerbate drainage problems for the whole village. Impact on Intake Lane could create significant dangers to local residents particularly children and to the many cyclists local and visitors from all over the country who use the hugely popular Route 66 which runs along Intake Lane. Would cause serious harm to the character of the area.	2771/7333	
	Objection – treated as green belt land for development control purposes and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in status. Would have a detrimental impact on the visual aspect of the area. Dunnington has a lovely sense of community and an increase in properties would have a negative impact on this.	2774/7342	
	Objection – opposed to use of green belt land. Will have a significantly adverse affect on the visual impact of the village, impacting on the openness and character of the village as well as he surrounding area. A number of roads would require development which would destroy established hedgerows and wildlife therein. There would be serious impacts on the road junctions. Would lead to a significant increase in the amount of traffic within the village. Will put further strain on the village drainage and increase the risk of flooding.	2778/7351	
	Objection – narrowness of the approach lane is the main concern. Considerable expense has been spent on updating the excellent children’s playground; further development would increase traffic and therefore make the approach to the	2780/7365	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	playground less safe for children.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the current infrastructure will not support the proposed number of houses across any of the proposed sites. Following the building of the Persimmon/Hogg estate the sewers and drains would not support further development in the village. This would mean that tax payers money would have to be spent on upgrading the current infrastructure.	2781/7370	
	Objection – an increase in population would affect the visual aspect of the village and its character and the supportive community spirit that exists. Opposed to building on green field sites. What exceptional circumstances warrant the change of status of the land to allow development?	2786/7382	
	Comment – do not strongly object as there is a need to grow.	2793/7408	
	Objection – the land is treated as green belt. The natural traffic route is either through the village (York Street) or to the dangerous 'four lane ends' with the A1079 via Common Road.	2810/7459	
	Objection – green belt	2811/7463	
	Objection – Serious surface water drainage problems which causes problems. Additional housing will add to this strain. Development will change the character and aspect of the village and impact adversely on important geological features, ancient native hedgerow and productive agricultural activity. Roads and junctions are already under pressure, development will increase congestion and safety risk, add to the demand for parking.	2836/7509	
	Objection – there is nothing in the Local Plan for expansion of the village school, there is little or no space available on the present site, the local plan is far too big and will destroy the nature of the village, proposed housing numbers should be reduced.	2840/7525	
	Objection – this will reduce the Greenfield area around the village, traffic movement in and through the village will be increased and the character of the village will not be improved by any attempts to alter junctions and road widths, significant expenditure will be needed to resolve surface drainage and sewerage problems.	2842/7531	
	Objection – What safeguards will be put in place to control extra flooding due to the new housing? The sewerage system is at full capacity. York street is used by commuters as a car park who then catch the bus into York. This causes traffic problems for everyone.	2914/7630	
	Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic caused by the extra building will add to the chaos on local roads and the proposed building will cause flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields.	2915/7637	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – this site could not be accessed with the purchase of additional land to link it to Intake lane. Intake land is already a busy access road, and has the entrance of the sport clubs on it. Increase in traffic will lead to increased safety problems.	2916/7643	
	Objection – greenbelt location, threaten the character and the land is productive agricultural land, the development would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate the surface water/drainage issues affecting the village. The proposal would require further land acquisition to provide access, lead to disruption of the hedgerows and wildlife. Adverse effect on traffic movement/parking and safety in the village.	2930/7665	
	Objection – greenbelt location, threaten the character and the land is productive agricultural land, the development would have a dominant and detrimental impact on the visual amenity and exacerbate the surface water/drainage issues affecting the village. The proposal would require further land acquisition to provide access, lead to disruption of the hedgerows and wildlife. Adverse effect on traffic movement/parking and safety in the village.	2931/7669	
	Objection – this site would ruin the openness of the greenbelt. Access would need to run along roads which are already narrow with overgrown hedges on one side and parked cars the other. Increase traffic would make it difficult for existing residents to go about their daily business.	2939/7682	
	Objection – any increase would destroy its village feel, increase flood risk in the village, greenbelt land, detrimental effect on visual amenity, impact on the lane for access.	2941/7690	
	Objection – this is productive agricultural land which forms an open aspect and is formally proposed greenbelt, impact on drainage issues, great impact on traffic and access in and out of the village, to gain access there will need to be the removal of hedges and loss of wildlife habitats, strain on parking, shops, schools and access.	2942/7697	
	Comment – understand more homes are needed but sewerage and drainage needs improving and the roads need widening, also a speed limit of 20MPH in the village would be a help.	2947/7705	
	Objection – greenbelt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and LPA should enhance and retain landscapes. How do the proposals satisfy this?	2956/7713	
	Comment – if more homes were built this road would be busier and cars now go too fast.	2957/7718	
	Objection – essentially to protect greenbelt and green field sires to preserve the countryside. Over development in the village destroys its very nature. Productive	2958/7728	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	farmland should not be removed. Question need for houses. This will industrialise York and surround it with urban sprawl.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the road is small and narrow for the proposed number of houses. There would be greater congestion at the children’s play area as people park there.	2959/7733	
	Objection – this site lies with a greenbelt area. The number of houses would have a significant impact on the risk of flooding and backing up of the sewers. The roads need modernising.	2963/7741	
	Objection – risk of flooding, greenbelt land.	2967/7744	
	Objection – Floods on a regular basis, greenbelt land which must be retained for the openness of the whole village, has the council considered the safety of children with speeding motorists?	2968/7748	
	Objection – proposals will put considerable strain on an already oversized village. No account has been taken of the new infrastructure need to accommodate all this new building stock, including roads, sewerage, top water drainage, school provision. There would be a loss of agricultural land, native hedgerows and greenbelt land. The views of the village would be lost.	2984/7767	
	Objection – proposals will put considerable strain on an already oversized village. No account has been taken of the new infrastructure need to accommodate all this new building stock, including roads, sewerage, top water drainage, school provision. There would be a loss of agricultural land, native hedgerows and greenbelt land. The views of the village would be lost.	2985/6203	
	Objection – any further housing will spoil the village and impact on the drainage issues.	3027/7875	
	Comment – this proposal would only be acceptable if access if derived from Intake Lane. It is were accessed from Eastfield Land it would cause serious harm from additional traffic movement.	3056/7912	
	Objection – concerns over the safety of existing residents, particularly children as there would be an increase in traffic making the area unsafe for children to explore. Extra traffic coming past the park would also increase the risk of serious accident. The access to Hagg wood is hampered through flooding, this would be made worse if the fields near by are built on and are unable to absorb water and runoff. Where will parking provision be in the village centre for extra residents.	3083/7964	
	Objection – any building development in the village would increase the flood risk to the village.	3089/7974	
Objection – this inappropriate development in the draft green belt, there is no open	3090/7976		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	access to the north or south of the site. To gain access would have a huge impact on the nature of the existing footpath and incur potential safety implications. Potential increase in residential and service traffic on the narrowest park would dramatically and visually alter the open vistas and approach to Hagg wood. The field provides natural habitat for endangered and protected species.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – need for more school places and doctors should development go ahead.	3122/8043	
	Object – to any further building development within the village as the village cannot sustain and does not have the resources.	3123/8047	
	Comment – this is not the most appropriate site for housing as it would mean a combination of visual intrusive encroachment on important and ancient rural settings and would introduce sustainable traffic into the heart of the village. More appropriate would be the large area to the west of Church Balk.	3136/8077	
	Objection – already problems with the water drainage in the village. Impact on the narrow country lanes, destroying ancient and native hedgerows which are full of wildlife, generate extra traffic through the village and cause dangerous situations. Proposals will destroy the historic character of the village.	3146/8101	
	Objection – additional housing risks having a detrimental impact on the character of the village, it would remove soft ground that currently functions as a soak away and increase the surface run off. There is a risk that the existing built drainage system for the village would not cope with the additional guttering water from the proposed new properties.	3165/8145	
	Objection – this will ruin the openness of the greenbelt, affect the visual amenity of the village and be detrimental to the overall beauty of the village boundary.	3169/8154	
	Objection – this land is in agricultural use in the greenbelt, development would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of existing residents, areas has existing serious surface water drainage issues, significant impact on a narrow country lane down which access would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of the village. The site cannot be developed without further acquisition to provide access from Intake Lane. There would be highway safety issues through additional traffic. The Four Lanes End junction is already hazardous.	3176/8170	
	Comment – the preferable site but still not totally suitable. This land is used for agricultural purposes and there would be a need to widen narrow country lane, destroying hedges and verges. To gain access would be past the Children’s Play area. Extra traffic on the four lanes ends junction, which is already hazardous.	3247/8339	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – greenbelt location which is a haven for wildlife, including the barn owl.	3259/8373	
	Objection – this is too many homes and the village is becoming a small town, losing its identity and charm. Issue with flooding, drainage and sewerage, the roads are not wide enough, with a lot of no-street parking, greenbelt location.	3262/8379	
	Support – providing that the developer improves the drainage and sewerage systems to eliminate risks of flooding and the back up of sewerage.	3265/8385	
	Objection – detrimental impact and threaten serious surface water drainage issues, there would need to be further land acquisition to provide access, highway safety issues through additional traffic, four land ends junction is already dangerous and congested.	3276/8415	
	Objection – encroaching on the greenbelt.	3290/8437	
	Objection –encroaching on the greenbelt.	3291/8445	
	Objection – visual impact on the character of the village, permanent loss of green spaces, increased pressure on facilities in the village such as school, doctors, dentist, higher levels of traffic and a loss of sense of community spirit if the village expands too quickly.	3293/8454	
	Objection – real danger of the village bring subsumed into York’s urban sprawl with resultant loss of identity and community involvement. Impact of increase demand on school places, not clear where extra funding will come from, need to expand the primary school, as well as Fulford Secondary School. Increase of traffic in all areas of the village. Question where the jobs will come from for the new residents. Environmental concerns of building on greenbelt land.	3310/8488	
	Objection – this site is classed as greenbelt, development is likely to increase the surface water drainage issues, further land acquisition would be required to provide access into Intake Lane, a narrow country lane, alteration of the lane would damage the very rural nature of the village, increased traffic would probably choose to exit the village via York Street to the traffic lights at the junction with the A1079 or via Church Street, already a busy and narrow route.	3368/8641	
	Objection – the proposed area has drainage problems. Any development at this point will create more traffic in sensitive areas such as the children’s play area and common road junction. This will create a higher accidental potential for adults and especially children.	3383/6055	
	Comment – this site would only be acceptable id access is derived from Intake Lane.	3402/8714	
Objection – impact on traffic in the village, despite the volume and sped of traffic in the village there are no designated crossed and no plans to introduce any. Any future	3408/8726		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing developments must be accompanied by clear proposals to address the traffic issue.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – this is inappropriate development in the greenbelt and raise highway safety issues.	3431/8759	
	Objection – Traffic issues, there are no passing places and already carries significant traffic.	3434/8766	
	Objection – ongoing issues in the village regarding drainage, flooding and sewerage, further development would exacerbate this. Intake lane is too narrow to accommodate a large amount of extra housing and traffic from this development would also add to the dangerous junction from Common Lane onto the A1079 at Four Ends.	3446/8826	
	Objection – there is no emphasis on the essential infrastructure improvements that are needed before any development could be started. Surface water drainage must be improved as well as sewerage. Existing levels of traffic are very high for the capacity of the core routes. The impact of the increase in the number of children on the Primary School both in terms of capacity and of additional vehicle traffic must be taken into account. It is not clear now this site would be accessed.	3464/8895	
	Comment – the correct infrastructure must be provided for more development, including more roads, drainage and parking for the church. Over development will destroy the unique character of Dunnington.	3471/8909	
	Objection – inappropriate use of the greenbelt and increase in congestion.	3509/9430	
	Objection – Dunnington could take one small development of 30 – 40 houses but these proposals seem too large and sites are on greenbelt land.	3523/9464	
	Objection – development would be detrimental to the character of the village and impact on biodiversity.	3530/9475	
	Objection – Greenfield sites, increase in traffic movement, impact on character of the village, need to resolve the surface drainage and sewerage problems.	3537/9491	
	Objection – unsuitable for the size of village, destroy the character and put pressure on local amenities, destroy the greenbelt, the land is agricultural land, issues with drainage, impact of flooding, increased traffic and safety hazards.	3589/9559	
	Objection – greenbelt area, adverse effect on many issues, the infrastructure will be unable to cope.	3590/9567	
Objection – all sites in Dunnington have winter floods, all sites have requirement for roads, water and sewerage upgrades,	3610/9603		
Objection – greenbelt location, greatly impact on the existing infrastructure, increase	3614/9615		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in traffic, limited parking, increase in danger of accidents near children’s play area.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection –intake lane is already a busy road, further homes will mean more traffic.	3616/9621	
	Comment – this is a little ambitious, it would significantly effect the visual attractiveness and character of the village, there would be a need for improvement of the village infrastructure. Increase of traffic and kerbside parking.	3636/9652	
	Objection – serious surface water drainage problems, flooding problematic sewerage system, impact on native hedgerows and productive agricultural land, roads and junctions are already under pressure, add to the congestion and safety risks particularly at junctions.	3679/9697	
	Objection – flash flooding frequently occurs, drains cannot cope, power cuts were frequent following the building of new housing.	3681/9706	
	Objection – should be designate as greenbelt, productive agricultural land, access along the narrow road would damage verges and disrupt traffic. Safety at junctions would be severely compromised, traffic would need to pass the pay area and cause congestion.	3686/9718	
	Comment – this site is awkward to get access to at present, this is narrow lane with access. Brownfield sites should be used as a priority.	3689/9728	
	Objection – issues of surface water drainage, and sewerage. Highway safety issues for road users, children and pedestrians, parking issues along small, narrow roads and hazardous junctions. Additional traffic causing safety issues. Land is in agricultural use, detract from visual amenity and open character and ancient native hedgerows.	3690/9734	
	Comment – the extra cars and extra people need to be considered. Getting in and out of the village is already difficult ad the school is already full.	3699/9749	
	Objection – greenbelt location, the roads and junctions in the vicinity cannot support further expansion, local services such as water, sewerage, surface water and schools are at full capacity, the land should be retained as agricultural.	3723/10022	
	Objection – green space, for agriculture, as nature reserves or just to makes the country a pleasanter place to live in is becoming very scare, if the population of the village increases the sense of community will be lost and individual character will be lost.	3748/10142	
Objection – this should be treated as greenbelt due to its open character, the land is productive agricultural, any new development will have a dominate effect, further threaten surface water drainage, significant impact on narrow country lanes, alternation will cause serious harm to the village, result in additional traffic and safety	3756/10159		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	issues.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – this site cannot be accessed with out the purchase of additional land to link it to Intake lane, this lane is already busy, any further traffic will cause major safety issues.	3765/10173	
	Objection - this should be treated as greenbelt due to its open character, the land is productive agricultural, any new development will have a dominate effect, further threaten surface water drainage, significant impact on narrow country lanes, alternation will cause serious harm to the village, result in additional traffic and safety issues.	3798/10236	
	Objection – inappropriate development as it is detrimental to the openness of the greenbelt.	3817/10270	
	Objection – greenbelt location, development will go beyond the limits of the villages, consideration of extending the primary school, need for an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water run off, full transport survey and affects on the infrastructure of the village.	3822/10288	
	Objection – greenbelt location, development will go beyond the limits of the villages, consideration of extending the primary school, need for an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water run off, full transport survey and affects on the infrastructure of the village.	3823/10291	
	Objection – formally proposed greenbelt and productive agricultural land, seriously impact on the visual amenity, ass considerably to the serious surface water drainage issues, site appears to have no access, serious traffic issues on intake lane and surrounding roads.	3829/6471	
	Objection – destroy the open aspect of the green belt.	3853/10349	
	Objection – new houses are needed in Dunnington, but not the numbers envisioned.	3858/10368	
	Comment – poor road access to the village.	3866/10386	
	Comment - development will create greater need for additional retail, education and leisure facilities.	3870/10396	
	Comment – homes are better built on the proposed traveller site than on the hilltops and slopes and land surrounding the cemetery.	3876/10411	
	Objection – a huge detrimental impact to the village’s resources and add further traffic and pollution to the village.	3887/10432	
	Comment – there are some issues that would need to be looked at before any planned developments are approved, these are to deal with the inadequacy of sewerage, surface water drainage and the run off from houses, acknowledge that	3918/10456	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	more houses would mean more cars joining the lengthy queues on the A1079.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – formally proposed as greenbelt, it in productive agricultural use, the village suffers from serious water drainage issues, result in road safety issues, congestion on village exits, additional land would be needed to require access and alternation to Intake Lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village.	3932/10471	
	Objection - inappropriate development, ruining the openness of the greenbelt.	3934/10478	
	Objection – this is greenbelt, access would require widening the old lad leading to Hagg Wood, loss of historic character, visual amenity, increase in traffic would be a safety hazard to children at the playground, the junction is already a difficult one as the traffic on Hull Road is heavy at al times and there are no traffic lights at the junction.	3941/10489	
	Comment – Development will put further strain on the village sewerage and surface water drainage system.	3944/10495	
	Objection – greenbelt and in productive agricultural use, development will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of residents of existing residents, threatens to increase surface water drainage issues, significant impact on narrow country roads, site would need further land to provide access, highway safety issues, the four land ends junction onto the A1079 with no lights is already hazardous, cause further congestion on an already busy road, infrastructure cannot cope.	3945/10502	
	Objection – localised flooding during heavy rain, frequent power failures, road network cannot cope with extra traffic, parking blight in Dunnington, Grimston roundabout cannot cope with traffic currently.	3952/10515	
	Objection – land is in formally proposed greenbelt, productive agricultural land, define open character of the village, new dwellings would dominate and seriously impact on the visual amenity of residents, threaten the destruction of ancient native hedgerows, affect surface and sewerage drainage capacity, need for considerable infrastructure works along narrow lane to gain access, increase traffic on the busy junction adjacent to the children’s play area, hazardous junction is without traffic lights and will increase congestion and risk of accident.	3955/10527	
	Objection – serious problems of congestion and little visibility on roads.	3996/10606	
	Objection – village infrastructure, drainage and roads are operating at maximum usage. Areas of land are often submerged by flood water.	3999/10611	
	Comment – roads in Dunnington would need to be altered due to increased traffic and need for footpaths.	4029/10662	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – roads to and from the village are very dangerous and congested.	4032/10669	
	Objection – valuable agricultural land as well as green belt, damaging residents’ visual amenity, serious surface water/drainage issues. Intake lane is a quite country lane, route 6 for cyclists, this would increase traffic and danger for walkers and cyclists.	4045/10703	
	Objection – this site cannot be accessed without the purchase of additional land to link it to Intake Lane. This lane is already busy and the Children’s Play area and sports club runs along side it. Any further traffic will cause safety concerns.	4092/10779	
	Objection – formally proposed greenbelt land, would have significant impact on the narrow country lane which access to the site would have to be gained, highway safety issues, the four lane ends junction is already hazardous.	4108/4808	
	Objection – this site has no obvious access and would require purchase to provide access, the land is productive agricultural land ad greenbelt, serious surface water drainage problems, increase in traffic would increase the danger to an unacceptable level.	4142/10854	
	Objection - detrimental impact and further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues, need further land acquisition to provide access, increase traffic resulting in highway safety issues, four lanes end junction is already hazardous.	4208/10952	
	Objection – significant impact on the narrow country lanes and alteration would seriously harm the character of the village, damaging visual amenity of existing residents, further threaten the serious surface water drainage issues, the land is in productive agricultural use and greenbelt, the site needs further purchase to provide access, development would result in highway safety issues and congestion at the junction.	4214/10958	
	Objection – damaging to visual amenity, serious surface water drainage issues, proposed greenbelt, need for more land to provide access, highway safety issues, busy junction, dwellings will impact on highways and parking elsewhere in the village.	4215/10961	
	Objection – greenbelt location, access via a narrow rural lane, widening this would destroy mature ancient hedges and harm the character of this part of the village. The proposed development would create traffic hazards in the location of the children’s play area on Intake Lane.	4234/10999	
	Objection – impact on the openness of the greenbelt.	4252/11028	
Comment – any development must ensure that the historic village retains its character, the surface water drainage and sewerage issues must be addressed need for traffic lights at the junction of Hull Road and common road. It is unclear how	4257/11040		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	access will be achieved to this site.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Comment – the development should take into account wildlife, access and drainage problems.	4270/11083	
	Objection - access would be onto the existing single track road, which widens at Kerver Lane. This carries significant traffic from both Kerver Lane and Holly Tree / Horsefield Way developments. The road is currently unsuitable for the traffic that it carries during the winter months when access beyond the Dunnington Playing Fields is severely compromised.	4373/11330	
	Objection- this site is land locked and would require further land purchase to provide access, it is classed as greenbelt due to its open nature, it is in productive agricultural use, Intake Lane is a narrow country lane, any alternation of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of the village, it would destroy ancient hedgerow, additional traffic would create further traffic safety issues.	4401/4905	
	Objection – loss of greenbelt, sewerage system over loaded, roads are narrow and could not cope with increase of traffic.	4503/11535	
	Any new estates would spoil the village and it would become an urban town. The expense would be astronomical to provide new drainage, sewage, roads, school, surgeries and shops.	4549/11553	
	Objection – part of the greenbelt, no evidence to show that existing brownfield sites have been assessed for suitability.	4582/6463	
	Objection – greenbelt land, detrimental effect on visual amenity, dominant impact of new development, safety of children due to increase of traffic, congestion on the roads.	4588/5993	
	Objection – the roads are too narrow and crowded with traffic already, the school cannot take any more pupils.	4591/11572	
	Objection – no access from Intake Lane, greenbelt status, infrastructure cannot support more development, lanes are inadequate for increase in traffic, site is productive agricultural land, considerable visual impact and alter the character of the village.	4626/11581	
	Objection – increase in traffic movements, threaten serious drainage and surface water issues, significantly impact on the open character of the village, pressure on medical and health care facilities.	4640/11770	
Objection – adversely impact the character of the village, infrastructure will not cope, school is full and expansion would be detrimental to the education it provides, the roads are narrow and unsuitable for an increase in traffic, potentially lead to	4643/6067		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	increased hazards, widening the roads would further detract from the current character and displace ancient native hedgerows.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – greenbelt, detrimental impact on the visual amenity on the village and existing properties, increase in traffic.	4692/11981	
	Objection – detrimental impact on the visual amenity, surface water drainage, impact on highways and parking.	4747/12034	
	Objection – greenbelt, detrimental impact on the visual amenity on the village and existing properties, increase in traffic.	4776/12066	
	Objection – ruin the openness of the greenbelt and varied wildlife.	4782/12078	
	Objection – greenbelt, detrimental impact on the visual amenity on the village and existing properties, increase in traffic.	4784/12082	
	Objection – greenbelt and surface water drainage issues, access issues, safety issues surrounding an increased volume of traffic.	4794/6071	
	Objection – do not understand the need to develop the surrounding area so extensively as York has high skill levels and low employment.	4798/12100	
	Objection – site is in productive agricultural use and in the greenbelt, increase serious surface water drainage issues.	4804/12106	
	Objection – lack of infrastructure and lack of suitable roads, increase in traffic through the village, green belt area.	4806/12112	
	Objection – flood risk, drainage of surface water, how will the existing road system cope with additional housing?	4809/12118	
	Objection – greenbelt, increase the surface water drainage issue, increase in vehicles which will impact on an already hazardous junction.	4821/12138	
	Objection – housing proposed does not make a lot of sense.	5106/12208	
	Comment – house building must happen, however smaller properties are required for first time buyers and older people wishing to downsize. This is the most viable site in the village as the drainage outflow is relatively close, it will mean developing the greenbelt and the need to widen and alter the lane, therefore losing its country feel.	5107/12212	
	Objection – impact of the increase in traffic, environmental problems of damaging wildlife habitats, hedgerows, surface water and drainage issues.	5173/12314	
	Objection – impact of the increase in traffic, environmental problems of damaging wildlife habitats, hedgerows, surface water and drainage issues.	5174/12319	
Objection – greenbelt land, open countryside, negative visual impact on existing homes, increase in traffic through the village, roadside parking is hazardous, needs at	5185/12386		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the pubs, school and doctors would be exacerbated.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – impact of the increase in traffic, environmental problems of damaging wildlife habitats, hedgerows, surface water and drainage issues.	5191/12412	
	Comment – recognise need to provide homes, serious need to consider existing drainage problems, and it should not change the nature of approach roads, the number of homes required in Dunnington is questionable and needs further justification.	5208/12439	
	Objection – the school is at its limit, parking and traffic is already congested and cycling is difficult, this site is a haven for wildlife, the drainage of the area is poor, and development would have a detrimental effect on visual amenity of the residents.	5212/12475	
	Objection – Greenbelt land designed to stop urban sprawl, this would generate a substantial increase in road traffic.	5219/12486	
	Objection – this site should be designated at Greenbelt.	5223/12505	
	Comment – any housing development should take into account the character and setting of the village. The drainage system is insufficient for peak rainfall and results in surface water flooding, the road infrastructure also requires upgrading. The School capacity must not be depleted by development, there must be protection of natural habitat, character and setting of village, protection of wildlife.	5230/12530	
	Objection – Intake Lane would have to have access down the road past the Children’s play area and would increase traffic levels, any changes to the roads would affect the character of the village. Explain why a small village needs such a large increase in houses.	5258/14349	
	Comment – this is poor access with no proper road currently available and a Children’s play area near by, this site would need proper access provided.	5294/14425	
	Objection – this would greatly increase the population of the village and would effect the infrastructure in a detrimental way. The local primary school is at capacity and there are surface water issues, parking is already an issue on narrow village roads.	5300/14451	
	Objection – there is currently no access to the proposed site, additional land would need to be acquired, increase traffic and dangers at junctions, parking issues at doctors, shops and businesses, impact on the local primary school to expand.	5303/14461	
Objection – Greenbelt land, land is in use for agriculture, this development is not infilling, planning permission at The Market Garden has an agricultural occupancy, this suggests that the plot of land is regarded as agricultural land, there is no access to Intake Lane and Eastfield lane is very narrow. Dunnington suffers from low water pressure, this will significantly impact on the open character of the village.	5377/14594		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – this goes against the design statement and it is unclear as to whether any consideration has been given to ascertain whether demand exists. The original development plan produced by City of York Council (CYC) stated that no housing development would be considered in Dunnington as the local amenities and infrastructure could not be substantially developed. How has this changed? The village suffers from flood risk and issues of surface water drainage. Roads are congested and dangerous.	5387/14621	
	Objection – site has access issues and would probably need extra land for access. The lane is already bus and passes a children’s play area.	5414/14702	
	Objection – site has access issues and would probably need extra land for access. The lane is already bus and passes a children’s play area.	5415/14705	
	Objection – this site is greenbelt land, there would be an increased risk of flooding in the area, the sewers were designed for a much smaller community and are already backing up, the access roads were not constructed to modern standards and increased traffic is likely to lead to accidents.	5467/14816	
	Objection – residents of Dunnington have increasing difficulty accessing the A1079 and Stamford Bridge Road at peak times. Building of housing will exacerbate this issue. It will significantly increase the hazards associated with peak time traffic in a locality that is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic and associated congestion.	5554/13022	
	Objection – Dunnington infrastructure cannot maintain this level of development and the historic nature of the village will be badly affected with such growth. The small streets through the village can barely cope with the current level of traffic and not sure what sort of improvements could be made to ensure the safety of residents and the free flow of traffic.	5623/13233	
	Objection – the increased traffic generated by these new developments is a serious concern. It will have a direct impact on the already hazardous junction at Church Balk/Eastfield Lane/Church Lane with attendant safety implications. The number of homes proposed would significantly increase traffic flow and parking problems throughout the village, such problems are already a major safety concern and the proposed developments will exacerbate them to an alarming degree. The existing village amenities are ill-equipped to cope with such large scale development, least of all the school which already appears close to capacity. Whilst acknowledge that new homes are needed in the area, the scale of the development would lead to over development of the village and completely destroy its character.	5668/6076	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Comment – hope that the new sites will be as well planned as the past new builds which have not detracted from the village scene.	5687/13403	
	Objection – this would damage the village, village already has traffic difficulties and a lack of off street parking.	5827/13793	
	Objection – greenbelt land and should remain as so.	6039/5984	
	Comment – present traffic issues, village is already congested, this site is particularly unsuitable as traffic would have to go right through the village and there would be no easy direct exit. Existing drainage problems.	6125/15551	
	Comment – need for additional purchase of land for access, an increase in traffic.	6140/15605	
	Objection – increase of traffic in the village.	6148/15628	
	Objection – significant impact on the narrow lane from which access would have to be gained, alteration would cause serious harm to the character of the village, result in highway safety issues through additional traffic. Development would further threaten the serious surface water drainage issue.	6151/15637	
	Support – understand growth must happen in the right place and at the right speed, primary school places are a concerns as the school is over subscribe	6157/15652	
	Comment – any development should ensure that the developer is required to improve the infrastructure of the village including improving drainage and sewerage system.	6184/15722	
	Comment – in favour of affordable housing however the developer would have to make sure improvements to the road infrastructure improving safety of vehicle users and pedestrians, concerns over levels of traffic, local primary school has almost reach capacity.	6187/15726	
	Objection – significant impact on a narrow country lane, highway safety issues, busy junction with Common Road.	6210/6146	
	Objection – negative impact on the primary school, impact on the safety of the children accessing the play area, hazardous four lane ends junction onto the A1079.	6212/6151	
	Objection – need homes but not to this extent, greenbelt land.	6220/15762	
	Objection – some development is necessary, however believe there is more suitable sites such as the field on the left side of Church Balk and the field known as the Bull Balks, which has the advantage of being near the school.	6234/15802	
	Objection – this would spoil the area.	6237/15809	
	Objection – green belt area, impact on access and local traffic, be very dangerous past the children’s play park and village which is already congested.	6238/15813	
Objection – greenbelt and agricultural use, detrimental effect on visual amenity and	6242/6168		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surface water drainage, impact on narrow country roads and alteration would harm the character of the area, destruction of the native ancient hedgerow, the site cannot be accessed without further acquisition of land, highway safety issues at an already busy junction, four lanes end junction is hazardous.		
Site H35 Land At Intake Lane, Dunnington Continued	Objection – significant impact upon a narrow country lane, affect the rural character of the village, increase in road traffic which would be hazardous, implications of surface water drainage issues.	6252/6179	
	Objection – additional traffic on narrow roads, greenbelt land.	6257/6184	
	Objection – greenbelt, agricultural land, safety issues from increase of traffic passing the children’s play area.	6259/15832	
	Objection – flooding issues, road network could not cope with influx of vehicles, insufficient support services, the school is at capacity.	6270/15849	
	Objection – increase the number of residents will affect the nursery, primary school and village amenities and this needs to be considered.	6272/15858	
	Objection – alternation of the narrow lane would cause significant harm to the character of this village, result in highway safety issues, Children’s play area along Intake Lane, congestion due to parked cars adjacent to the play area, safety risk posed by increased traffic.	6282/15876	
	Objection – adverse effect of traffic congestion where the village play area is. Infrastructure of the village cannot sustain a major development and the increase in traffic, the local school and drainage system is at capacity.	6328/6209	
	Objection – greenbelt site, the infrastructure, schools, medical practices and road network cannot cope.	6366/16083	
	Objection – inappropriate development, spoiling the openness of the greenbelt.	6463/6381	
	Objection – productive agricultural land, detrimental impact on the visual amenity, surface water issues affecting the village, impact on a narrow country lane down which access would have to be gained, site cannot be developed with further land acquisition to provide access, highway safety issues, highway and parking impacts, four lanes end junction already hazardous.	6473/6402	
	Comment – there needs to be an expert report on the state of the sewage system and surface water runoff in the village, together with a full transport survey covering access, traffic movement and projected effects of increased traffic flow.	Petition 20	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton	Objection – proposal to build 36 houses on this site contravenes the conservation area policy.	78/12780	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – H36. Blairgowrie. (36 houses). In the current Development Plan, 4 th Set of Changes, most of this area is allocated as Open Space with the rest, a sizeable area, covering the existing burnt-out property and its surrounding garden. There have been previous efforts to have the whole allocated for housing (including when under Harrogate Borough Council), all successfully resisted. The Open Space area makes a valuable contribution to the Upper Poppleton Conservation Area and is referred to in the Village Design Statement. Only the area not allocated currently as Open Space, that is the house and its immediate garden area, should be considered for housing.	192/14002	
	Comment – This site lies in the Upper Poppleton Conservation Area. When originally designated it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot makes to the character of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is considered appropriate to allocate this area, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14083	English Heritage
	Comment – Low Poppleton Lane should be reopened. Would shorten the distance travelled and therefore reduce pollution and also reduce the congestion at the ring road junction and the A59/Station Road junction. Main Street is too congested now with traffic both parked and moving for the doctor's surgery and shops, to support 36 houses on the Blairgowrie site.	362/14197	
	Objection - see response 9. It is incredible that given the 'windfall' of the Sugar Beet site, other developments in the area are being considered. Development of the Blairgowrie House site will ruin the Conservation Area (See Poppleton Village Design Statement). The Green Belt and environment should be preserved.	801/3705	
	Objection - see response 9.	895/3615	
	Objection - see response 9. Far too many houses proposed.	901/3870	
	Objection - see response 9. Objection to the proposal to build site at the suggested volume. Rural development should be less than 30 dwellings per hectare.	969/16995	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – 36 houses is far too many. Already busy area will have even more traffic and parked cars. Car park for the Doctor’s Surgery and is becoming increasingly busy so it would be very beneficial to have an area designated for off street parking.	1217/17118	
	Objection - see response 9. Concerned about the semi-rural community being lost in urban sprawl. Not convinced by the arguments for such a large amount of housing (and industrial) development in the area and very worried about increased traffic, pressure on Ousebank and Manor Schools and the threats to wildlife and other environmental impacts.	1231/17127	
	Objection - see response 9.	1579/17528	
	Objection - see response 9.	1580/17538	
	Objection - development of all these sites for housing will have a significant impact on traffic volumes on the A59, the outer ring road and Millfield Lane. Serious consideration should be given to the re-opening of Low Poppleton Lane which was closed some years ago to prevent heavy goods traffic using it to access the British Sugar factory when Manor School was on its old site.	1583/17546	
	Objection - see response 9. The area is already over populated, considering air pollution from the tip at Rufforth and sewage plant at Rawcliffe. These problems need rectifying before contemplating causing more. Narrow roads throughout areas concerned are also a major factor.	1585/3653	
	Objection - see response 9. Blairgowrie is such a lovely site and could be ruined by over development.	1588/4118	
	Comment – Site 36, land at Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton – recommend that this site is used for sheltered accommodation/retirement homes (similar to Hartrigg Oakes at New Earswick). Facility that is much needed locally and would release larger properties occupied by elderly persons into the growing housing market.	1589/17562	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection - see response 9.	1590/17582	
	Objection – completely out of scale, impossible strain on existing services and facilities. Already saturated with vehicles. The School (Ousebank) is over-subscribed, little Co-operative store on the green already causes traffic blockages.	1596/9924	
	Objection - see response 9.	1597/3902	
	Comment – any development must be restricted to a very low density, in order to retain the integrity of the existing substantial woodland connection between the adjoining agricultural land to the village greens, and maintenance of the woodland façade adjacent to Main St to retain the rural character of the centre of the village, consistent with in compliance with the current Poppleton Village Design Statement.	1599/9930	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection – The proposal would completely isolate one section of the village green that currently has a direct relationship to the heavily wooded area referred to. The current Poppleton Village Design Statement, states “Penetrations of green and trees from adjacent agricultural land into the village core must be protected and maintained to ensure a continued abundance of wildlife.” See no reason to alter this statement, and this proposal will contradict the existing design statement. The area designated for development has a single existing derelict house that has not been lived in for over 15 years, hence, the principle that this land is used from housing has long been undermined, and the woodland environment has been established. Consideration should be given to incorporating this area into the Green Belt, in order to ensure that Guideline 4 is established permanently.</p>		
<p>Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued</p>	<p>Objection - see response 9.</p>	1604/4125	
	<p>Objection – see Response 9. The continued urbanisation of the Green Belt will be a disaster.</p>	2009/6494	
	<p>Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.</p>	2416/6644	
	<p>Objection – increased traffic on to Main St in an already congested area. Access via School Lane on to an un-adopted road and School Site dangerous and should not be allowed. 36 houses too many on a tree lined site. Will trees be removed? When will the green belt plan be finalised?. Have no way of knowing where boundaries lie. A plan should be set.</p>	2422/6705	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9. Site would be far too crowded. It could be used for additional parking for the Old Forge Health Centre.</p>	2550/6853	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9. This area is particularly unsuited to dense housing development.</p>	2575/3520	
	<p>Objection – see Response 9.</p>	2580/6912	
	<p>Objection – see Response 9.</p>	2600/3527	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9.</p>	2601/3536	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9. Would create traffic problems particularly in the village adjacent to the surgery. Main Street is bad enough now.</p>	2604/3547	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9. Too much development will upset the balance of community life, and create traffic and pollution problems.</p>	2605/3551	
<p>Objection - see Response 9. Even with the new park and ride, the increased traffic will make Boroughbridge Road a nightmare to use.</p>	2606/3559		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton Continued	Objection - see Response 9. More cars will create more serious congestion.	2607/3567	
	Objection – Blairgowrie is a haven of wildlife, birds, owls, woodpeckers, magpies etc, foxes. Deer Stags and Roe visit and recuperate in the wood and to cap it all, badgers have a sett in this area.	2848/7585	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2855/3597	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2856/3606	
	Objection - see Response 9. Do not ruin the area with more and more houses.	2858/3628	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2860/3644	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2861/3662	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2862/3671	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2863/3680	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2864/3687	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to any Green Belt development in any village around York.	2865/3696	
	Objection - see Response 9. This would be an overdevelopment in the middle of a village. It should be developed but in a much more sympathetic way to its surroundings. A few houses like those in the immediate area would add to the community without changing it.	2866/3713	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2867/3719	
	Objection - see Response 9. Whilst it should be developed, 36 houses are too many especially taking in its position on the Village Green.	2868/3726	
	Support - see Response 9. Do not oppose the development of this site.	2870/7603	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2871/4530	
	Objection -see Response 9. This would be the beginning of the end for the Poppletons as a village and must be stopped at all costs. Poppleton School is already full to capacity.	2872/4533	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2873/3753	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2874/3762	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2875/3771	
Objection - see Response 9. All local amenities are already at breaking point, parking is a nightmare and the Junior School is unable to take any more pupils. There are enough people in the village.	2876/3780		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. The village feel is being lost with every new house being approved and all its local services cannot handle the increase ie. the Doctors Surgery, road networks, parking, schools etc.	2877/3789	
	Objection - see Response 9. Don't build more houses just to generate income for the Council to tax, don't turn York in to an overpopulated sprawl.	2878/3798	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2879/3807	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2880/3816	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2881/4539	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2882/3828	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2883/3837	
	Objection - see Response 9. Particularly object to the absurd number of houses proposed for site H36. Concerned about the amount of traffic and the increased demand put on local services such as schools.	2884/3853	
	Objection - see Response 9. Comment – Development in a Conservation area. Not opposed to development of this land for housing but believe the proposed 36 houses would be too many. Some of this land should be used to extend the Surgery car park in order to reduce the level of parking on Main Street and it would also be an ideal site for a children's play area to be accommodated within any residential development.	2885/3862	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the development of this site, but if it proceeds, the infrastructure must be in place before any further development.	2886/3876	
	Objection - see Response 9. Its in a Conservation Area with mature trees and 36 houses would totally ruin this unique area off Chantry Green.	2887/3884	
	Objection - see Response 9. More traffic, more pollution on the school walk, more accidents.	2888/3893	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2889/3908	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2890/3915	
	Objection - see Response 9. A nature reserve, wooden children's adventure playground or wooded area should be conserved for all to enjoy and the development of a maximum of 6 houses only.	2891/3924	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2892/3930	
Objection - see Response 9. Insufficient infrastructure to support the development.	2893/3939		
Objection - see Response 9.	2894/3948		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9.	2895/3957	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2896/3966	
	Objection - see Response 9. What will happen to the trees at Blairgowrie House?	2897/3975	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2911/4136	
	Objection - see Response 9. If the development was to go ahead, would need more schools, larger doctors surgery, improved public transport etc.	2912/4146	
	Objection - see Response 9. 12 houses would be appropriate for this site. More would be inappropriate.	2962/4153	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3004/7838	
	Objection – too many housed on one site. Conservation area – protected area.	3005/7843	
	Objection - see Response 9. Hugely concerned at the possible overdevelopment of this site. 36 houses is too many squeezed onto a sensitive site on Main Street.	3022/7858	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3029/4160	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3030/4168	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3032/4176	
	Objection -see Response 9. Should provide no more than 9 houses.	3037/4184	
	Objection - see Response 9. Houses should not be built in a Conservation Area. Building on this site would totally alter the character of the village.	3038/4191	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3039/4198	
	Objection - see Response 9. Over development in and around Poppleton, will lead to local congestion on the roads.	3040/4205	
	Objection - see Response 9. Inappropriate.	3041/4213	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3042/4220	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3043/7892	
	Objection - see Response 9. Too much development.	3044/4229	
Objection – number proposed is totally unrealistic and overwhelming for the site. Sabotage trees that are held under Tree Preservations Orders. Poppleton Conservation Area would be severely compromised by such a development.	3078/7953		
Objection – strong objection.	3099/7989		
Objection - see Response 9. The proposal to create 36 dwellings will have massive implications for the very centre of Upper Poppleton. Traffic congestion in the village green area is already at crisis point. 36 dwellings would generate an enormous amount of additional traffic, further exacerbating the problem. Such an intensive development would "Suburbanise" the very core of the old village.	3209/8267		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton Continued	Objection –conservation area. Designated wildlife area & bats breed there. Not a brownfield site. Trees on the site should be protected. The site should only be developed on the footprint of existing buildings. No access should be allowed from School Lane. Overcrowding problem – for the school. Overdevelop in the area. Ring road is already gridlocked.	3211/8275	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3248/4237	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3249/4246	
	Objection - see Response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved throughout the area.	3271/4253	
	Objection - see Response 9. Green Belt should not be eroded. 36 houses on the Blairgowrie site is too much to be reasonably considered. The road to this development would be an added danger. Farm land needs to be treasured.	3278/8421	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the number of houses proposed – too many.	3284/4263	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the number of houses proposed – too many.	3285/4272	
	Objection – write with great concern that the City Council have gone against the Poppleton Village Design Statement which they adopted on 28 August 2003. H36 on land adjacent to Chantry Green known locally as Field House. They are an integral part of the village core and “create a unique open space in the centre of the village.” These two fields should be removed from the proposed housing allocation and their “Green Spaces” designation returned.	3378/8671	
	Objection - see Response 9. The site is unsuitable for 36 houses so close to the centre of the village, adjoining Model Farm in a Conservation Area. Main grounds are traffic congestion and parking on Main St. Also concerned about the impact on sewerage, school places and the impact of the development on the character of the village.	3384/8686	
	Objection – over development of the conservation area. Not a brown field site. The site should only be developed on the footprint of existing buildings & access off Main St. Overcrowding to existing schools. No access to be allowed from School Lane. Trees on site should be retained. The site has become a haven for wild life bats. Over developments in area with 308 proposed houses on civil service land plus 998 proposed on Sugar Beet Site.	3396/8701	
	Objection – over development of the conservation area. Not a brown field site. The site should only be developed on the footprint of existing buildings & access off Main St. Overcrowding to existing schools. No access to be allowed from School Lane. Trees on site should be retained. The site has become a haven for wild life bats. Over developments in area with 308 proposed houses on civil service land plus 998 proposed on Sugar Beet Site.	3397/8703	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. This site would be overdevelopment and increase congestion.	3419/4287	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3423/4296	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3441/8803	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3443/8814	
	Objection – proposal to build 36 houses on Blairgowrie, a site central to the village of Upper Poppleton and within a Conservation Area. The site has restricted access to the Main Street and additional access across Village Green cannot be created other than by parliamentary statute.	3447/8831	
	Objection - see Response 9. Comment - adjoins large GP practice in an already congested village centre which has a dental surgery, post office, super store, pub, pharmacy, and estate agency.	3468/8929	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3472/8937	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3473/8946	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3474/8955	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3475/8965	
	Objection - see Response 9. The development is too large.	3479/8973	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3481/8981	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3482/8991	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3483/9000	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3484/9011	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure of the village will not support the influx of the proposed number of houses.	3485/9020	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3486/9030	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3487/9040	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure of Poppleton can not adequately support the proposals of the Local Plan.	3488/9049	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3490/9059	
Objection - see Response 9.	3491/9068		
Objection - see Response 9.	3492/9077		
Objection - see Response 9. Keep the Green Belt green and don't let development take place which would damage the charm of the village.	3493/9086		
Objection - see Response 9.	3494/9095		
Objection - see Response 9. Don't build any more houses in Poppleton and turn it into	3495/9104		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	another suburb of the City. Protect the Green Belt.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton Continued	Objection - see Response 9.	3502/9113	
	Objection - see Response 9. What is the point of the area being designated as a Conservation Area, then sites are developed for housing. The Green Belt should be preserved.	3503/9123	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3504/9133	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3505/9142	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3506/9151	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3550/9164	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3554/9174	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3555/9184	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3557/9202	
	Objection - see Response 9. Too many houses. Tree Belt, would not want this to be removed. Access. Could so with more parking for doctors. Parking on Main Street already a problem. Other access points to this plot?	3558/6062	
	Objection - see Response 9. The site does not have the necessary road access to support 36 dwellings.	3559/9216	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3560/9225	
	Objection - see Response 9. Please leave Poppleton as a village, rather than a City suburb.	3561/9233	
	Objection - see Response 9. Until the Outer Ring Road is dualled, no more development should be contemplated. The development of this site for 36 dwellings would spoil Upper Poppleton.	3563/9249	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3564/9258	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3565/9266	
	Objection - see Response 9. Another application has also been submitted for 36 houses on land opposite Chantry Green. This would equate for approx 100 extra cars – these developments are for too many houses and are not wanted.	3566/9275	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3567/9284	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3568/9294	
Objection - see Response 9. Concerned about over development of the site and the impact on roads and schools.	3623/9306		
Support - see Response 9.	3628/9329		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9.	3629/9335	
	Objection - see Response 9. This area does need some development but 36 houses is far too many particularly in this village centre location.	3630/9341	
	Objection - see Response 9. Development on this site will destroy the tranquillity of the little green area of Upper Poppleton, eroding the village feel. A much smaller number of houses may be acceptable.	3631/9347	
	Objection - see Response 9. Must preserve village life and maintain rural culture.	3633/9353	
	Objection - see Response 9. Concerned about turning the Poppletons into an urban sprawl and degrading the village status and increased traffic in and around the village.	3634/9359	
	Objection - see Response 9. Over development, should be 6 executive houses max.	3637/9369	
	Objection - see Response 9. It is really important to preserve the green areas in and around Poppleton.	3638/9378	
	Objection - see Response 9. It is vital to preserve green spaces in the village to avoid it becoming a built up suburb of York. This site should be identified as a site for a few houses with large gardens to preserve the large trees and green corridors.	3639/9385	
	Objection - see Response 9. 36 houses is too much, should be 1 house as it is currently.	3640/9394	
	Objection - see Response 9. Very concerned about the urban spread whether in Poppleton or elsewhere. Surely there are sufficient areas of brownfield within the existing city boundaries.	3641/9401	
	Objection - see Response 9. More houses will mean more cars, leading to more parking problems. Also, more people will lead to more pressure on the doctors surgery.	3642/9410	
	Objection - see Response 9. 3 or 4 houses would be better than 36 (No gardens if 36?)	3677/9419	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to any further development in Poppleton – any further development will create more congestion.	3728/10036	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3730/10051	
	Objection - see Response 9. Must preserve the Green Belt as much as possible and use empty upper floors of City centre shops before considering building new houses.	3731/10061	
	Objection - see Response 9. Must preserve the Green Belt as much as possible and use empty upper floors of City centre shops before considering building new houses.	3735/10073	
Objection - see Response 9. If migrants were reduced, then not so many houses	3738/10086		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would need to be built and the Green Belt would be preserved.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. 36 houses is over development. It would be better to make the site a car park, with open space.	3740/10097	
	Objection - see Response 9. Additional housing would put extra strain on local facilities and roads.	3741/10102	
	Objection - see Response 9. It is important to preserve the identity of Poppleton and any development will place more strain on infrastructure – roads, schools etc.	3742/10112	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3743/10122	
	Objection - see Response 9. Housing plans are oversubscribed and would result in overdevelopment. There are not enough school places to support the number of houses proposed.	3745/5799	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3746/10132	
	Objection - see Response 9. There is already a parking problem in that area and more housing will mean more traffic. Site would be better as sheltered accommodation / nursing home, as there are many ageing people in Poppleton. It would also provide some employment too.	3747/10137	
	Objection - see Response 9. Should only provide accommodation for old people on this site (like School Court – Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust)	3797/10226	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3815/7819	
	Objection - see Response 9. Overall, the additional housing proposals in this document will destroy Poppleton as a community, with increased traffic and schools unable to cope with the influx of pupils.	3911/4599	
	Objection - see Response 9. Making Poppleton an overgrown town.	3942/4626	
	Objection - see Response 9. Poppleton cannot cope with more housing, the school and Health Centre would not be able to cope.	3946/4635	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more development.	3947/4644	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the level of housing proposed and loss of Green Belt for development.	3966/10546	
Objection – strongly object to the building of 36 houses on the land at Blairgowrie, Main Street Upper Poppleton (H36). This land is in a Conservation Area and the proposal to build 36 houses on this site directly contravenes the intent of the Conservation Area. The village is already suffering due to the result of infill. Significantly increased the number of cars.	3976/10574		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to this development in a Conservation Area.	4055/4679	
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Comment - see Response 9. Any housing in the area should take account of transport needs and schools.	4077/4712	
	Objection - see Response 9. Lack of transport infrastructure to support the current housing stock in the area surrounding Poppleton, the proposed development will attract further traffic without any form of amelioration, which will significantly reduce safety and amenity in the local area.	4078/4721	
	Objection - see Response 9. 36 houses on this site will put strain on local roads and add to congestion.	4079/4730	
	Objection - see Response 9. The proposals cannot be accommodated with the current road network and will reduce road safety and amenity.	4080/4739	
	Objection - see Response 9.	4082/4748	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure cannot cope with such developments, roads would not cope with the number of vehicles, schools would not cope with the increase in the number of children, and the Green Belt should be retained so that villages remain villages.	4084/4758	
	Objection - see Response 9. The site should be considered for sheltered housing to allow people to downsize and release larger homes for families. A well designed scheme should be ok in the Conservation Area.	4085/5814	
	Objection - see Response 9. This site is a particularly cynical and objectional development within a conservation area.	4088/4776	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4097/4790	
	Objection – see Response 9. Should development be allowed in a Conservation Area? Expansion of the village would create traffic problems.	4103/4798	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4111/4818	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4127/4840	
	Objection – see Response 9. Such a development would have a significant impact on the infrastructure, parking, school and health centre.	4145/4858	
	Objection – see response 9. New housing would be a blot on the landscape.	4191/4891	
	Comment – see response 9. If building is allowed in Poppleton, builders should have to redevelop children’s play areas and improve the area.	4198/10926	
	Objection – see Response 9. Totally inappropriate and irresponsible to consider more than 4 houses on this site. This is a conservation area, trees within it are protected by a blanket Tree Preservation Order, the area to the rear of Model Farm is allocated for	4288/11122	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	green space and the development of the proposed scale goes totally against the adopted Village Design Statement.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – see Response 9. Poppleton is already a small town rather than a village and any further expansion apart from minor infilling will result in it just becoming a suburb of York. The infrastructure is already struggling to cope without adding additional burden. 36 houses on Main Street is over development – up to 10 dwellings is more realistic. People need space and gardens and parking space.	4386/11359	
	Objection – the houses proposed at H36 are in an area where there is already great congestion on the roads due to shops, dentist, GP surgery etc increasing the traffic in the area.	4392/11381	
	Objection - strongly object.	4416/5054	
	Objection – this development is unacceptable since it is both too dense and also within a Conservation Area.	4419/5061	
	Objection – relatively sizable developments. This will significantly affect it’s nature. By losing a large amount of green space around the village green a very pleasant and ‘open’ community space will be hemmed in by new developments. Already the impact of a smaller development of 9 homes has caused significant traffic issues in the centre of the village. The impact of another 30+ in the same location will mean the end of an open village centre which is becoming extremely rare in the country as a whole. Bringing traffic to an already growing village and losing some more of the green open spaces which just about separate it from York. There will be a further pressure on local services. The local schools are already oversubscribed, there will be pressure on other local services and infrastructure and there are as yet no indications seen which show how these issues will be addressed.	4422/11447	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4425/5067	
	Objection – see Response 9. If all the proposed building goes ahead in Poppleton, it will lose its rural charm and become a suburb of York. More houses means more cars and there are only 2 main roads. Consider more children for Poppleton School. Facilities and shops, surgeries etc will also have to cope with more demands.	4431/5077	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4435/5086	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4437/5095	
	Objection – see Response 9. The road infrastructure will not support the increased volume of traffic, the rural environment will be further eroded, it will add to the destruction of York’s essential character of a medium sized attractive City, Poppleton will become a suburb of housing estates and business parks and there is no excuse for	4438/5105	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developing in the Green Belt.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – see Response 9.	4439/5112	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4440/5119	
	Objection – see Response 9. More development will create more chaos on the bypass and Boroughbridge Road.	4441/5128	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4442/5136	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4443/5145	
	Objection – see Response 9. There are other areas of the City where such developments would not harm rural life or the environment.	4444/5152	
	Objection – see Response 9. This is now a wildlife area which is good for the environment, including owls, woodpeckers, swaths of snowdrops, and trees with conservation orders on them. It would create a more dangerous junction near the surgery and shops, which is already hazardous.	4445/5159	
	Objection – see Response 9. Poppleton is starting to become over developed and has lost its village feel. It has a wonderful community spirit, which would be spoilt by such developments.	4446/5166	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4447/5174	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4462/5182	
	Objection – see Response 9. Development will destroy a very attractive area.	4463/5191	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4650/5240	
	Objection – Village does not need to be enlarged further. Almost too large. Road overcrowded. Terrible congestion. Congestion by Village School. (illegal) parking. Destroying “village integrity”. Conservation Area. Could unoccupied office buildings in the City be used for housing?	4723/14258	
	Objection – see Response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved and not eaten into.	4755/5289	
	Comment – see Response 9. No objection, subject to sensitive development of this wooded site in the conservation area and full allowance in planning for school places, shops, roads, parking etc.	4756/5299	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4759/5308	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4767/5317	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4768/5325	
Objection – Conservation Area. Transform a semi-rural environment into a suburban one. 36 houses is completely inappropriate.	4829/12146		
Objection – opposed to the City of York Local Plan. Specifically the Strategic Housing	5223/12506		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Sites outside of the York ring roads. As a minimum, all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s Green Belt.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – opposed to the building of 36 homes on this site, the site is inhabited by badgers.	5280/14392	
	Objection - strongly object.	5282/14398	
	Objection - essential to preserve the separation with the main city conurbation. The existing sports field is currently extensively used for children’s football, and there is a desire to create a new cricket club in the village. Strongly oppose the proposed designation of the area referenced H36 as a strategic housing project. The village centre has a village green, that has been sub-divided into three areas over time, concerned is currently linked by a heavily wooded section of land along Main Street. The proposal would completely isolate one section of the village green that currently has a direct relationship to the heavily wooded area referred to. Poppleton Village Design Statement, states:- Penetrations of green and trees from adjacent agricultural land into the village core must be protected and maintained to ensure a continued abundance of wildlife. Believe the boundary depicting the centre of the village, highlighted in pink should be extended to encompass the whole area of the village green and surrounding property, as this properly represents the centre of the village. The area currently has a single existing derelict house that has not been lived in for over 15 years. Consideration should be given to incorporating this area into the Green Belt, in order to ensure that Guideline 4 is established permanently to all areas parts of the Green. If it is considered that Green Belt cannot be extended to the core of the village as I propose, then any development must be restricted to a very low density. The proposal to allocate a development of 36 dwellings on this site, is contrary to the Poppleton Village Design Statement and the assessment undertaken by the Technical Officer Assessment.	5332/14995	
	Objection – Poppleton has expanded incrementally and by and large seems to have coped. However, a further 306 houses on Millfield Lane destroys the separation from greater York, poses traffic problems and affects infrastructure. General concerns relate to the size and scale of the expansion planned to York. It is hard to see how the infrastructure will cope and how the very special nature of York will be preserved.	5408/14675	
	Objection – this amount of housing concentrated within a small area will have a significant detrimental impact on the semi-rural character. Problems with regard to demand for places at local schools. Place strain on the local GP practice. This currently is a wooded area, haven for wildlife and gives the village it’s semi-rural	5499/14872	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	character. Increases traffic on main street, and will spoil the character of this very attractive part of the village.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – will have very significant impact on existing infrastructure. Comment – do not object to the principle of H36, but strongly feel the scale of the proposal, with 36 dwellings, is too large. To follow the proposal will have a major impact on the nature of the village(s).	5620/13216	
	Objection – propose a density of housing that the local area cannot sustain. Too many houses in such a small area of land. Pressure on already full schools and the outer ring road.	5705/13442	
	Objection – the proposed number of houses would significantly negatively change this Conservation Area and part of the village.	5729/13502	
	Objection – will destroy yet another open space. Destroying trees and green space. Impact on the village environment.	5817/13765	
	Objection – impact on increased traffic. Green belt land. Reduces house values.	5829/13800	
	Objection - the trees should be protected. A mature hedge is under threat. This is a place for wildlife. The barn is home for bats and birds. The damage to the very feel of our rural village, by infilling of the green spaces, and the character of houses in long plots. The doctors is already too busy Poppleton Ousebank is over subscribed Manor is over subscribed More houses would need more schools and doctors building. The traffic. There are also parking issues. This is simply too much extra traffic for this area. This land is in a conservation area. Would like to suggest that Blair Gowrie is made into a Nature Reserve, protecting out trees, wildlife, hedgerows, and keeping it safe for the future, as a pocket when Poppleton has become part of an inner city sprawl. (Like inner city farms and Nature Reserves).	5852/15101	
	Objection - strongly disagree with the proposals to build on green belt sites. I also strongly object to the proposals for further extensive building within the villages, particularly H36 - far too many houses proposed, and H45 which will further reduce the notional green 'corridor' between Poppleton and York.	5879/15168	
	Comment - do not want lots of houses to be built on Blair Gowrie. A few would be fine, but lots would spoil the feel of the area. Want to keep the hedge and the trees. Walking to school we find baby birds that have jumped out of nests. We can follow mole hill trails. There are squirrels a lot of the time, and sometimes they cross the path in front of you. Mum says there are native bluebells and they are protected so it would be against the law. The house is haunted and there is a broken down barn where owls and bats could hide. Would like a path through there so we can go and	5881/15172	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>see more nature. Maybe four houses and a path through the nature would be good. Also, we always stop at the yellow gate. We cross there because there are cars parked by the doctors and we can't see round them to cross the road. If the yellow gate is a road, it won't be safe to cross anymore. Mum says there will be more children. That would be nice because I would like more friends. But you will have to build classrooms on the school because we are already too full. The doctors too is very busy, sometimes have to wait a few days.</p>		
<p>Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued</p>	<p>Objection - strongly object to the building of 36 houses on the land at Blairgowrie, Main Street Upper Poppleton (H36). This land is in a Conservation Area and the proposal to build 36 houses on this site directly contravenes the intent of the Conservation Area. The village centre is small and 'The Green' and Main Street are very rural. Pavements on both sides of the road have several stretches which are extremely narrow. At the Green there are no footpaths. Additional traffic caused by more families, will only make these problems worse. Between Poppleton Ousebank School and the Green there are very few safe places to cross. Crossing at the school is difficult, because of the number of cars picking up. The section of footpath outside Blair Gowrie is the first section of road with a clear footpath on both sides of the road and a view of traffic un-obscured by parked cars or a bend in the road. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access for houses on Blair Gowrie, is going to make traversing this school run terrifying and it will only be a matter of time before a child is killed. There is also the sheer number of houses involved. 36 families on Blair Gowrie and 5 on Long Ridge Lane, in addition to the 9 just built on 'The Green', will cause an unbearable strain on the services in Poppleton. The School Nursery is already oversubscribed. The School itself has too many children in three different year groups, as they have more children apply than they are supposed to take. Then there is the local Doctors Surgery, where you are already waiting several days. There simply isn't the services available in the area to sustain this many new people. Believe there has been an attempt to list Blair Gowrie Barn and that many of the mature trees have been protected. There are also native bluebells and bats in the woods and buildings. If development is made on this site, it should be in keeping with the natural state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees and having few and well spaced housing. A wonderful addition to this could be a walking and cycle path linking 'The Green, 'Main Street' and 'School Lane', providing a nature walk and safe route to school avoiding the narrow section further up Main Street.</p>	<p>5882/15173</p>	
	<p>Objection - see Response 9.</p>	<p>5948/6245</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H36 Land At Blairgowrie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection – opposed to the proposals for housing allocations and employment/safeguarded land on ST2 Millfield Lane, H45 131 Long Ridge Lane, SF19 & SF8 Northminster Business Park and most particularly H36 at Blairgowrie. Such numbers of houses in and around Poppleton would place a huge strain on the local services and have a negative impact on the traffic within the village.	6038/15455	
	Objection – to the suggestion of building 36 houses on the Blairgowrie site in Upper Poppleton from both a loss of wildlife habitat point of view, and also regarding the potential future usage of School Lane for access to some of the properties if ever built.	6050/15491	
	Objection - strong objection.	6131/15559	
	Objection - strong objection.	6133/15575	
	Objection - see response 9. The development appears too large for the area considered. Potential problems arise from access and traffic.	6190/6100	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6191/6108	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6203/6125	
	Objection - see response 9. For Poppleton to retain its village status, it is important it doesn't get swallowed up into the outskirts of York.	6206/6137	
	Objection – far too many for the area available and is out of character with the current density of housing. The trees in and around that area alongside Chantry Green add considerably to the charm and character of Main Street. Should be preserved. Significant traffic problems around the junction of Main Street, Station Road and Hodgson Lane – very congested area.	6321/15978	
	Objection – host to bats, on the national conservation list. Trees on this plot should have been the subject of a conservation order.	6346/16029	
	Objection – would transform a semi-rural environment into a suburban one: an irreversible step. While the principle of development of this site is cramming some 36 houses. The density and nature of the proposed development would fundamentally alter the heart of this unique village.	6360/16071	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6413/6277	
	Support - see response 9. Believe housing need of the City is great enough to warrant this development. Would also support the maximum possible quota of affordable housing on this development.	6414/6286	
	Objection - see response 9. Too many houses are proposed on this site, for the Conservation Area. The roads are already chaotic at times.	6418/6296	
	Objection – Conservation Area. No access from School Lane. Too many houses on one	6419/16139	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	site. Not a brownfield site.		
Site H36 Land At Blairgowerie House, Upper Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9.	6421/6302	
	Objection - see Response 9. The Green Belt should be retained intact.	6425/6313	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6438/6357	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6469/6399	
	Objection - see response 9. Blairgowerie House is in an area of considerable traffic congestion due to surgery, shops, chemist etc. Also, if the site were to be developed, it should be for more mature residents rather than family homes.	6481/6420	
	Objection - see response 9. Development in a Conservation Area is particularly unacceptable.	6483/6428	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby	Objection – concerned about how such a massive increase in residents will impact on the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton. Brownfield development should be exhausted before any development of green belt land takes place. Believe the land may be contaminated with asbestos waste from the former Clifton Airfield. Proposal would result in a doubling of traffic at the junction of Greystone Court and Eastfield Avenue. Primary schools are very full at present – what plans are there to provide another primary school? Seek assurances that the provision of health services expand in a manner commensurate with the proposed developments. Current Haxby shopping area is congested and does not lend itself to expansion, provision will therefore be required on the new development. Unlikely that new residents will work in the village unless encouragement is given to employers to provide light industrial opportunities before building commences. Concerned that the additional traffic will result in the annual mean Nitrogen Dioxide objective being exceeded at the junction of Wigginton Road and the ring road and in York Road and Eastfield Avenue.	63/12723	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – in 1994 the inspector considered that the development of this site would: ‘...be seen as an encroachment into the countryside and would markedly weaken the degree of separation between Haxby/Wigginton and New Earswick/York. In my opinion this would undermine one of the principal objectives of the green belt.’ Consequently, the development of this area seems likely to harm one of the elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York and should not be allocated.	238/14084	English Heritage
	Objection – already refused consent for good reason. Main reason why an application should not proceed concerns infrastructure and particularly drainage and sewerage. The land is ‘contaminated’ and local property has suffered severe subsidence with raft foundations having to secure property. The extent of remedial work needed for the infrastructure will be quite uneconomic compared to completely new sites where the infrastructure can be built in rather than upgraded in existing developments. This field represents a green divide between Haxby and the ring road and New Earswick. Presently there is a view to York Minster. This site contains some interesting wildlife – there is a barn owl, great crested newts, lesser newts and a variety of frogs.	730/16877	
	Objection – question the need for so many houses – where they are needed use up existing brownfield sites first – don’t spoil ‘green belt’ for the sake of convenience.	837/16923	
	Objection – in recent years Haxby and Wigginton have suffered flooding and surface water issues relating to the drainage and sewerage system which is barely adequate to cope with the existing pressures placed upon it. The increases in cumulative surface	1355/17329	Mr J Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	water run off from minor developments are likely to have had further impact on this. Additional homes will likely cripple the existing sewerage infrastructure. Environmental reports from 2006 show the land at risk to extreme flooding. Residents are concerned about the existing provision of school places and the effects the development will have on the Ralph Butterfield Primary School.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby continued	Objection – Haxby/Wigginton does not have the infrastructure in place for more homes/cars. New roads, schools and a large amount of recreational space will be needed – there is a need for more now. How will traffic get out of Greystone Court if built on?	1392/17343	
	Support/Comment – without having a material impact on the visual or spatial considerations a modest increase from 34 to 47 dwellings could be achieved on site whilst still creating a woodland belt to screen the built edge and providing a large area of public space.	1714/9802	Westfield Lodge Ltd & Crackmount Investments Ltd
	Objection - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1898	NFU
	Objection – Wigginton Road and Haxby Road are unable to cope with the traffic in the mornings and evenings on a weekday. To add further traffic to these roads will just bring things to a total standstill.	1908/85	
	Objection – the Haxby/Wigginton development areas show little thought on access	1947/218	
	Comment – at present driving in Usher lane in Haxby is akin to taking an obstacle course. This arises from lack of parking in the Village area and shoppers, visitors and those using other facilities using Usher lane to park and walk back to the village	2280/6516	
	Objection - site is an area at risk of extreme flooding. What will happen to footpath running from Greystone Court behind Ashwood Glade? Only two sewerage pumping stations. What provision will be made for extra demand on system? Volume of traffic approaching junction with Eastfield Avenue will create problems. What provision is being made for additional school requirements?	2310/3271	
	Objection - should not consider building on green belt. No requirement or need when plenty of brown field sites to develop. Insufficient jobs or infrastructure to support proposal.	2343/3298	
	Objection – totally inappropriate development on green belt putting strain on local infrastructures.	2411/6571	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6645	
	Objection – access to the houses will cause distress and lots of traffic onto Greystone Court. The site has great crested newts, owls and a range of other species of	2419/6697	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	protected wildlife which could be lost. This is green belt land and should be maintained this way.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby continued	Objection- already overcrowding in the village leading to problems for residents regarding parking. There is congestion on the roads, which will add to increased congestion on the northern ring road. Waiting lists exist for primary schools in the village. There are a lot of patients registered with the surgery and I doubt the practice will be able to cope with many more. Have doctors been consulted?	2456/6732	
	Objection- building on green belt area in Haxby. Saturated as it is. The street cleaners cannot cope with this part of Haxby as it is. More maintenance will be needed and where's the money coming from? Life is going to less than peaceful as more traffic uses Usher Lane and Oaken Grove.	2461/6740	
	Objection –development would fundamentally alter the character of the area making it much busier and adding to already congested traffic access problems. Traffic volumes would become unacceptably high. In all it seem a great deal of disruption to the area for the sake of 34 houses on green field land.	2473/6759	
	Objection – yet more cars trying to get out onto the York Road?	2484/6769	
	Objection – schools due to declining birth rates in Haxby were reduced – will the council pay to rebuild them? Where are all the people living in the additional homes planned in Haxby going to work and how will they be able to travel out of Haxby on already congested roads. Bus service to Haxby is excellent but with vast increased traffic levels this service will experience severe delays to a point where it could be unusable at peak times. Cycling and walking could be the only viable way to travel out of Haxby at peak times.	2549/6848	
	Objection – do not consider the Plan to be sustainable within the local infrastructure. It will destroy the beauty and character of the rural setting. The green belt is there to protect the setting and for the benefit of the surrounding area. Drainage is a key issue and previous developments were turned down because of this and also the amount of traffic that would be generated. Access from side streets and onto the by-pass is difficult on heavily congested roads. Will there be enough employment for new comers/ what about schooling for children? Schools are already working to capacity. The medical centre will not be able to cope with an increase in numbers.	2553/6869	
	Objection – present primary school is full. No parking, increased congestion at peak times, heavy plant access over years of development, bus services – increase in travelling times, therefore, people less likely to use the service. Station will only work if fares are affordable	2586/6937	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – site is alongside Westfield Beck which is already over capacity – any further influx of surface water from this proposed development would place other houses near the beck at high risk of flooding.	2638/6992	
	Objection – site H37 is clearly shown in the areas preventing coalescence in the York Green Belt Character Areas. Increased traffic on Eastfield – delays are already experienced. Possible contamination of the site from materials (Ex PO Exchange) some 20+ years ago.	2684/7129	
	Objection – site H37 is clearly shown in the areas preventing coalescence in the York Green Belt Character Areas. Increased traffic on Eastfield – delays are already experienced. Possible contamination of the site from materials (Ex Post Office Exchange) some 20+ years ago.	2685/7133	
	Comment – what strategies have been put in place to support this development e.g. transport; schools and other vital services?	2756/7284	
	Objection- it would put undue pressure on the areas infrastructure.	2759/7292	
	Objection – opposed to the proposals to build housing at Greystone Court, Haxby north stage 1 and 2. A population growth of 45% cannot in any way be sustained by the infrastructure. Huge number of children requiring schooling. The ring road is nearly always gridlocked. Have no park, hardly any recreational areas. Need more open spaces not less. Any greenbelt land is precious and should never be built on. All efforts should be put into locating existing empty houses and utilizing them. Others should be built within the city on brownfield sites.	2763/7304	
	Objection – demands on our infrastructure. Drainage problems are becoming more common. Traffic causes huge bottlenecks. Facilities such as the Health Centre are already running at full capacity with little room for expansion. Increases in numbers of families with children would put pressure on schools which cannot quickly be coped with.	2766/7310	
	Objection – Green Belt land. Detrimental impact on the visual aspect of the area. Lovely sense of community, increase in properties would have a negative impact on this.	2775/7344	
Comment – proposals will have an extensive effect on existing facilities. Drainage and sewerage arrangements struggle now so reassurances would be necessary that facilities would be developed to deal with waste adequately. Amount of extra traffic. Limited parking arrangements. Ensure additional school places are provided plus the safety concerns of more children using York Road to Joseph Rowntree School. Provision of additional healthcare facilities.	2799/7429		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection – must be done in such a way that the drains and road systems are built in advance of the houses. Haxby has already huge problems with traffic to and from York. Drainage barely copes now in a downpour. The system is at its maximum. Road access to the proposed areas is currently adequate for the number of local vehicles. It would be a particular problem with regard to heavy vehicles. The roads leading through the Haxby/Wigginton areas and to the outer ring road and into York are already heavily congested at times. This would greatly increased by the addition of a new huge population. The drainage and sewage systems are working at their maximum. Local medical services would be even more stretched than they are now. A new school(s) would be needed. The shopping and other facilities in Haxby/Wigginton would also have to be “upgraded”.</p>	2828/7495	
	<p>Objection – the cul de sac will become a through road. Respect of risk of road traffic accidents. Greystone Court as an access road is not wide enough. The land is clay based and houses have experienced subsidence. The volume of traffic, congested during peak times. Wildlife on this field would be at risk. Have barn owls & bats in this field. Building on this land will raise water table, flooding of the garden.</p>	2850/7589	
	<p>Objection- proposed development is too big- too many new houses. Inadequate local facilities to cope with the projected increase in population. Lack of open space in haxby and Wigginton. Local drainage is already poor. All available brownfield sites in York should be utilised before expanding the size of haxby. Local roads will not be able to cope with the likely increase in traffic. Haxby railway station will need to be opened as a matter of priority.</p>	2937/7675	
	<p>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 of Haxby which will surely become congested. Need to be further facilities such as schools, shops, leisure and medical facilities/services. Where? 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.</p>	2940/7684	
	<p>Objection – Haxby cannot take any more traffic along York Road. A ‘School Bus’ would help. Do not want traffic to be ‘Gridlocked’. Available alternative sites are at Poppleton Lane and the area where the Sugar Beat factory was.</p>	2960/7734	
	<p>Objection – please no more houses. Poppleton has many more spaces suitable. Along Millfield Lane in Poppleton, would be ideal for development and close to new ‘Park & Ride’.</p>	2978/7759	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection –local infrastructure needs to show ability to cope and then only after all available brownfield sites in the city have been utilised. The site has always been designated green belt land and refused permission on at least two occasions over the last 28 years. Properties nearby are know by insurance companies as being in a flood plain. Also after WWII old residents believe toxic waste was dumped and buried at one end of the site.	3024/7867	
	Objection – potential population growth of the village will just not be able to cope. Do not want any more pressure piled onto the local schools. The drainage and telecommunications are not up to scratch.	3065/7932	
	Objection – Haxby/Wigginton running to maximum with schools, traffic etc – roads will be congested and parking is difficult now. Schools are bursting now.	3127/8054	
	Objection – Haxby’s infrastructure could not cope with this huge increase (H37, ST9 and SF4) Traffic in and out of Haxby at peak times is already congested – as is the outer ring road. Parking in the village centre is already difficult. There would be too much pressure on local schools and recreational areas. Drainage is a problem in Haxby.	3145/8095	
	Comment – if it is deemed necessary to develop green belt sites... it would be extremely important to greatly improve infrastructure. In Haxby and Wigginton there is already a problem with flooding. Therefore, the drainage system and sewerage need to be much improved. The roads are all in a very poor state of repair which will only be exacerbated if over 700 properties are built. A suggestion that improved public transport and/or rail commute to York be considered prior to further development.	3210/8271	
	Objection – this is green belt land. This is agricultural land. Extra housing will require major expansion of the sewerage infrastructure across the north of the city before any further building can take place (at Clifton Moor, Wigginton/Haxby and Strensall)	3254/8358	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed for Haxby (H3, H37, ST9) is unreasonable. The town infrastructure is just about managing with the population as it is. The proposed plan would give a population growth of around 45%.. and would put a great strain on the towns infrastructure and community. A smaller increase could have perhaps been absorbed but not the numbers planned. York Road is already busy, any increase of traffic would cause problems with air quality and even longer queues. There is already a desperate need for recreational land in Haxby and the green spaces available per number of population falls short of government recommendations. A large increase of population will also put great strain on the	3257/8370	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	health centre, dentist etc. Parking in the village is inadequate. There are not enough primary school places for the existing population of Haxby. A new school should be built before any building is undertaken.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – strongly opposed to development on York’s green belt. Plans for York seem most naive with little thought to improving infrastructure. Haxby itself has accepted development over the years changing it from a small farming village into the bustling town of today. The roads, schools and health centre are already at capacity. The proposed developments do not take into account the gridlocked traffic faced by Outer York. There is no outline on how this infrastructure will be improved.	3319/8500	
	Objection – proposals to build many more houses in Haxby were thrown out years ago due to lack of facilities. Schools would become overcrowded. Medical services would become overstretched. Shops would suffer because there would be nowhere to park. Where are all the jobs in this area? The ring road is already frequently snarled up. Finally the drainage system will not support a lot of new homes.	3344/8528	
	Objection – does the need for housing supersede the need to provide sufficient infrastructure to support the additional population.	3346/8531	
	Objection – in total agreement with concerns raised by Haxby Town Council – all brownfield sites must be utilised before any Greenfield sites are considered. Haxby is struggling to cope with existing volumes of traffic and lack of parking.	3354/8558	
	Objection – Haxby/Wigginton is an over populated area with an infrastructure that is already collapsing.	3370/8647	
	Objection – Greystone Court is a quiet street, building additional houses the following will occur; Increased traffic flow, potential safety hazard; Increased noise and pollution levels due to traffic congestion; Delays in getting out of Haxby before 8:30 am; Additional delays for emergency services; Further congestion and noise; Schools – cannot cope at present with reception classes busting at the seams; and housing close to a railway line, fast link road and beck all being potential hazards for children	3375/8665	
	Objection – strongly oppose the proposed building of 34 homes in Greystone Court as this street cannot cope with any additional traffic. This land has always been designated as green belt to keep a green area between Haxby and New Earswick. Haxby is already saturated with housing. There are no leisure facilities, no park and no green areas.	3381/8677	
	Objection – the building of more houses in Haxby will completely spoil the village – just too many people for a community to absorb. Parking, appointments for doctors/dentists and the volume of traffic will be impossible.	3382/8678	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – huge and unsustainable increase in housing for a relatively small area – what is wrong with the brownfield sites in York. Parking in Haxby is already difficult, getting an appointment with a doctor takes a long time, school place are limited.	3403/8716	
	Objection – agree with Haxby Town council in opposing plans for such a massive increase in housing on land identified as H37, ST09 and SF4. Concerns are; the ring road is very congested; as a keen walker at least 3 footpaths can no longer be used as it is now far too dangerous to cross the ring road; problems with flooding – the water table is high in this area; and drains are unable to cope with high rainfall now. Comment – It would be unwise to build so many more homes in Haxby unless; new roads are built; the Haxby Station is opened; a new school is built at ST9; a further health centre will be needed; and a further shopping area will be needed	3407/8721	
	Objection – was confident that the green belt land surrounding Haxby was safeguarded from development. These fields are vital to maintaining the town as a friendly peaceful, safe and healthy place to bring up children. Haxby is not designed to accommodate an extra 100+ houses, never mind 1600+ houses. The road system gets too congested. The extra cars would also be a safety issue for children travelling to and from school on their bikes. The primary schools are already very full. The secondary schools are already over subscribed. There are already drainage problems in Haxby. The ring road is already a very busy road. Green belt land should remain as such.	3418/8738	
	Objection – strongly opposed to the future housing development in Haxby (H37, ST09 and SF4). There will be a massive increase in traffic in a village that cannot cope with traffic congestion now. There are limited parking spaces. Existing drains need replacing. There is a lack of primary school places. Haxby and Wigginton Health Centre have 20000 patients – how will they manage in the future?	3420/8741	
	Objection – strongly opposed to future developments on land identified as ST9, SF4 and H37. Do not want to live in a large town with a population growth of 45%. This will make extreme demands on the town’s infrastructure. Issues will include increased traffic and reduced air quality, extreme pressure on all services, inadequate parking in the middle of Haxby and increased problems with poor drainage. Any future development should only occur when the infrastructure can cope and after all brownfield sites are developed.	3444/8820	
	Objection – concern with continued development (at Greystone Court) and now live in a serious at risk flood zone. Fear the Greystone Court Development would push Westfield Beck over the tipping point.	3465/8900	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – the area of Haxby is at saturation point – it is inconceivable that an overall increase of 45% is planned. Haxby centre suffers parking problems with innumerable road traffic offences occurring daily. The drainage system is already at maximum capacity. Each of H37, ST09 SF4 is in the green belt. What ever happened to using brown field first?	3520/9453	
	Objection – increased traffic on already busy roads. Not enough parking in the village centre – concerned that this will only get worse. Lack of facilities for such an increased population (school places, shopping centres with adequate parking, small local library with few computers). Loss of village atmosphere.	3521/9456	
	Objection – the sewers serving Haxby are at their peak capacity now. Major new installations are needed which would adversely affect the whole of Haxby and District. Roads in and around proposed development in Haxby are inadequate now. Insufficient schools, medical centre. The access from Greystones Court is too narrow to support more traffic. High water table in area – ponds used to occupy this land. The Beck surrounding this area has a 'Risk of Flooding'. Serious subsidence has been experienced in adjacent Hilbra Avenue. Possible contamination issues as previously used as land fill. This is green belt land and should not be used.	3522/9458	
	Objection – not enough places at the local primary schools now; not enough parking facilities at the local GP surgery now; the cemetery at Haxby is filling rapidly now ;and would there be enough recreational space for all new residents?	3543/9502	
	Objection –brownfield sites in York remain undeveloped; housing will add to congestion on feeder roads in and out of York and the northern ring road; bus services are inadequate; car parking in Haxby main Street is overcrowded now; insufficient places at schools to cope with an upsurge of children; and 16500 homes = 3300 more cars	3544/9504	
	Objection – local infrastructure cannot cope. Traffic in Haxby/Wigginton is very heavy. Can existing schools cope with an influx of pupils? Concerned that the drainage/sewerage system would be unable to cope with nearly 800 new homes.	3593/9573	
	Comment – the sewage and drainage system in Haxby is in need of major repair. Land at the bottom of Greystone Court floods from time to time. Hope there is going to be another doctor's surgery, including more dentists and more play areas for children. More parking areas will be needed as roads and parking are very busy now.	3602/9587	
	Objection – education – massive impact as only one school in Haxby, more housing will put significant pressure on education facilities. Roads – There would be a huge increase in the number of vehicles using local roads. Pollution – more houses, more	3606/9594	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	vehicles = more pollution. Environmental – loss of habitat for wildlife, noise pollution, increase in CO2 emissions		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – the whole village and infrastructure, schools, traffic, drainage etc should be taken care of before going ahead with such a hair brained scheme.	3617/9623	
	Objection – ST9 and H37 represents an unjustified extension of urban sprawl. Existing facilities could not accommodate an enormous population increase. There is no hint of how or when the necessary infrastructure might be provided. Specific issues include: Drainage – both Haxby and Wigginton have always suffered from bad drainage. The addition of 800 new homes will exacerbate an age old problem. Roads – Existing roads are wholly inadequate, construction traffic would cause major disruption. The northern ring road is already seriously congested and would become more so. The effect on parking spaces can only be imagined. There is only one petrol filling station. The addition of 1000 cars will seriously affect traffic flow. Schools – the two primary schools in Haxby are already full. Provision of additional spaces has to be made before and new homes are occupied. Medical facilities – these will probably need to be expanded to handle the population increase	3619/9626	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not good enough. The main village road cannot cope with any more congestion. What about the need for bus services and schools and play areas? The outer ring road will be a nightmare. Overcrowding is no way to live.	3620/9632	
	Objection – opposed to future development of land identified in Haxby. A massive increase in residents will impact on infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton. Issues include increased traffic, reduced air quality, extreme pressure on services, inadequate parking, poor drainage which will only be exacerbated by an increase in housing. There will be a need to provide allotments and an increase in recreational land. Any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope.	3632/9645	
	Objection – oppose plans to develop sites H37, ST9 and SF4 as they will cause extreme difficulties to the present residents well being causing; overloading of drainage on an already poor system; pressure on school and medical services and transport; parking issues; congestion; shops and leisure facilities would not cope; and fear of flooding	3651/9664	
	Objection – do not have the infrastructure to take on the Plan. The medical services will struggle to cope. The water table is an issue. Shops (two small supermarkets) three schools, road problems (level crossings) and the Oaken Grove rat run are all issues.	3656/9671	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – there is no provision for extra school places since Oaken Grove School was closed. It is already difficult to book appointments with doctors and dentist surgeries. No public parking in Haxby. There are only two small supermarkets so would the ring road become more congested as extra residents access Monks Cross and Clifton Moor? York Road and the ring road are already grid locked. New buildings used the existing sewerage and drains in the '70s and still leads to problems now	3683/9711	
	Objection – the number of proposed houses to be built is far too many especially at Haxby. More houses on the scale proposed would destroy the 'village' feel apart from adding to the traffic in the area.	3729/10041	
	Comment – York Road can't take any more traffic than it does now, it often comes to a dead stop.	3779/10194	
	Comment – York Road cannot cope with traffic now.	3780/10198	
	Objection – totally opposed to the proposals for future development on land identified as H37, ST9 and SF4. The plans propose a massive increase in population of around 45% which would place catastrophic demands on the town's infrastructure with a huge increase in traffic and reduced air quality, not to mention the extreme pressure it will place on all local services such as schools shops and parking etc. and it can only make the current poor drainage worse.	3793/10214	
	Objection – totally opposed to the proposals for future development on land identified as H37, ST09 and SF4. The plans propose a massive increase in population of around 45% which would place catastrophic demands on the town's infrastructure with a huge increase in traffic and reduced air quality, not to mention the extreme pressure it will place on all local services such as schools shops and parking etc. and it can only make the current poor drainage worse.	3794/10218	
	Objection – totally oppose the proposed plans to build 781 homes in Haxby. (followed by a further 870 homes at a later stage). Haxby has suffered from the appalling state of the village drainage and the roads are in a disgraceful state of repair. A new school will be required and the demands on the present medical centre will be overwhelming.	3800/10248	
	Objection –the massive increase of residents these will create will render Haxby to a standstill. Haxby is a 'village' and residents wish it to remain so. A 45% increase in traffic will devastate the roads which are only lanes anyway. Most of the shopping area would be unable to cope and a massive gridlock would exist not to mention enough schools for children plus a cemetery would be needed. Pressure would increase dramatically on all services and recreation land would be lost. The drainage	3850/10337	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in Haxby is not 100%.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – the housing proposals spell disaster for the community unless new roads are put in place	3857/10362	
	Objection – strongly opposed to the development – the present infrastructure cannot cope, the main outer ring road is already over used. Haxby and Wigginton (together with Rawcliffe, Huntington and Clifton) have excellent schools and with a large population growth from the proposed development would have a disastrous effect on these schools. The drainage in Haxby and Wigginton areas is already inadequate. Should any development take place it should only be on available brown field sites and not at any time on green field sites? Parking of cars opposite Ralph Butterfield School on Station Road is a serious accident waiting to happen. Any further development in the Haxby/Wigginton area will only greatly increase this problem.	3859/10372	
	Objection – areas where we are lacking should be dealt with before any additional building is permitted. There is a need for: extension to the cemetery; more allotments; and substantially larger recreational land. The plan would result in a population growth of about 455 this is not realistic in view of the extreme demands on the village infrastructure. There will be increased traffic and reduced air quality (especially on York Road). Concerns around the availability of primary school places, inadequate parking in town centre and severe drainage problems.	3867/10389	
	Objection – areas where we are lacking should be dealt with before any additional building is permitted. There is a need for: extension to the cemetery; more allotments; and substantially larger recreational land. The plan would result in a population growth of about 455 this is not realistic in view of the extreme demands on the village infrastructure. There will be increased traffic and reduced air quality (especially on York Road). Concerns around the availability of primary school places, inadequate parking in town centre and severe drainage problems.	3868/10391	
	Objection – the facilities in Haxby cannot cope with more houses being built. The drains cannot cope now and are blocked all the time. The traffic is terrible in the village. The roads are in a terrible state and with more traffic who knows what they will be like.	3872/10404	
	Objection – strongly opposed to future developments in the town – the proposed plans to build so many new houses will impact on present infrastructure in many ways, already York Road is at times congested. What will happen if the emergency services are unable to access homes because of traffic congestion? Schools – will more be built and where? Also doctors surgeries? More recreational sites will be	3925/10462	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	needed, larger community centres, more car parking – where are all these things going to go? Any future development should only take place when the infrastructure can cope with it. Are there any brown field sites available in York that can be utilised instead?		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection –opposed to new houses in Haxby.	3956/10534	
	Objection – opposed to the scale of growth proposed for Haxby.	3967/10559	
	Objection – existing roads will be gridlocked. Haxby was originally built as a village. The layout of roads, the infrastructure and facilities were all originally provided for the requirements of that time. Now have problems with parking and with all the additional housing the old drainage systems can barely cope with present volumes. In the recent past there have been serious flooding issues. It is generally known that there is a high water table in Haxby. Any new development would not have to be as an increased burden on the existing Haxby infrastructure, and would therefore need to be provided with road communications out of or around Haxby. There would need to be independent facilities for sewerage and surface water and not connected to further overload existing resources. Amongst other requirements there will be a need for additional schools, medical facilities and recreation.	3982/10592	
	Support – having seen the plan and proposals, feel that except for H37 the scheme would be a disaster for Haxby & Wigginton residents.	3987/10597	
	Objection – unable to cope with an increased population, put extreme pressure on the towns infrastructure. Increased volume of traffic. Drains system is already running to capacity, flooding is getting worse. Schools will not cope. The doctor’s surgery will be unable to cope. Poor air quality. Public transport in the area is already poor. Bin collections will take even longer. Do not receive post most days till about 3:30pm. Road will need to be repaired. Also feel that properties in the area will be de-valued considerably.	4002/10615	
	Comment – have no objections to have only 30 homes built at H37. Should build a shopping area first to serve Wigginton and the new build area.	4016/10643	
	Objection – traffic queues from the bypass and railway crossing back almost to the ambulance station. Roads just won’t cope with it. Drains, Haxby has a very high water table. Loss of the greenbelt. The Westside of the City has plenty of room. More houses means more families therefore more schools.	4043/10693	
	Objection – increased traffic flow, potential safety hazard. Increased noise and pollution levels due to traffic congestion. Schools cannot cope at present. Housing close to railway line.	4047/10711	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – the traffic situation is already difficult. No further development should proceed until definite plans are agreed to improve transport conditions to and from York, in particular. A solution would be to utilise the railway line.	4048/10712	
	Objection – roads are completely choc-a-bloc. Drains and sewers are literally full now. Schools are full. There is not much parking. What about the doctor’s surgery.	4066/10747	
	Objection – the proposal will undoubtedly put immense strain on the existing amenities of, both Haxby and Wigginton village, which already unable to cope with the existing population. The Council have given no indication or guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with the additional strain such development will put on the area. Infrastructure in Haxby will be unable to cope with such a dramatic increase in the number of people requiring such things as: access to schools, GP and medical services, local public transport, traffic access and suitable road systems, parking, drainage, shop employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young people, facilities and support for older and more vulnerable people. Potential for increase in crime and anti-social behaviour without police presence, and numerous other associated concerns.	4158/10876	
	Objection – the proposal will undoubtedly put immense strain on the existing amenities of, both Haxby and Wigginton village, which already unable to cope with the existing population. The Council have given no indication or guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with the additional strain such development will put on the area. Infrastructure in Haxby will be unable to cope with such a dramatic increase in the number of people requiring such things as: access to schools, GP and medical services, local public transport, traffic access and suitable road systems, parking, drainage, shop employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young people, facilities and support for older and more vulnerable people. Potential for increase in crime and anti-social behaviour without police presence, and numerous other associated concerns.	4159/10882	
	Comment – new residents will all have to use the congested Eastfield Avenue. A major problem will be the mini-roundabout where Eastfield Avenue meets York Road. Imagine the mayhem that the extra car usage will cause.	4199/10930	
	Objection – it is well known that Haxby already has a problem with drainage. How will this be addressed when planning for further developments? Ralph Butterfield school (as seen in City of York Council information) is already at capacity. What provision will be made for what will be a huge increase in demand in the Haxby area? At peak times it is already difficult to get out of Haxby and Wigginton. This will increase in	4200/10934	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	demand and probably create gridlock. There is a present shortage of parking spaces in the village. The need for parking will increase. Recreational activities/spaces. These are limited and an increase will be needed. Would this be provided and where could this be. Have the local GPs/health centres indicated that they can cope with a considerable increase in population requiring their services? Increase in traffic, particularly queuing traffic, will create unhealthy emissions. Particularly at peak times, which will also be the times when children are walking to school. This will also effect cyclists. Haxby has a village atmosphere which is sometimes difficult to achieve now with a squeezed infrastructure. An increase in population will inevitably lead to the loss of this relaxed environment with increasing frustrations and a pressured existence.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection –object to the plans to build 34 houses at Greystone Court as this will add to the traffic problems previously mentioned.	4201/10940	
	Objection – opposed to the proposals by City of York Council to build a further 1,651 more houses in and around Haxby over the next 1-15 years. Massive detrimental impact on the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton. At present York Road in Haxby is very congested at various times of the day. Traffic and air quality will only get worse. How will the 3 schools in the area cope with such an influx of potential students? Doctors – Already difficult to get an appointment so with a further influx of potentially in excess of 3,000 people, this will be impossible. Haxby and Wigginton already suffers with poor drainage in a number of areas. With more property proposed, this will put more pressure on drains already struggling to cope.	4216/10965	
	Objection – sewage drainage in the whole of the Haxby area is totally incapable functioning properly at present. Without any radical restructuring of sewage system in the whole of Haxby, what the effect will be on the sewage system and resident’s health, remain to be seen.	4253/11064	
	Objection – it would create more cars on the already congested roads around Haxby. It would put pressure on the existing facilities, schools are already oversubscribed. During building work it will create problems for the existing residents.	4282/11101	
	Objection – how can the Council justify increasing the existing population of Haxby by 43%? Local services will be overwhelmed.	4283/11104	
	Comment – Haxby has been built on a series of lakes and ponds. Most residents of Haxby experience standing water in the gardens at certain times, and many have had to install soak-aways to deal with surface water. Indeed, some people have quite deep floods every winter/spring. A large oak, ask or sycamore tree, such as we have	4285/11114	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in Haxby and in the neighbouring fields, can move up to 40,000 gallons water per year out of the ground and into the atmosphere by the process known as transpiration. When this process occurs, the water table falls. Cutting down these old trees would have rather serious consequences.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Comment – Drainage - All Haxby and Wigginton has this problem. Sewage – Overflow into Westfield Beck two to three times a year. Inadequate sewage system to Haxby and Wigginton. Electric – Running at limit now. Doctors – Cuts to services over subscribed now. Hospitals – Cuts to services. Will not cope with higher population increase. Cemetery – Full needs more space. Haxby and Wigginton has already been overdeveloped in the past and will never recover from more. The land is needed for the area to be food sustainable and ecologically diverse for wildlife. Traffic in Haxby and Wigginton is gridlocked already and this will increase un-sustainability.	4297/11143	
	Objection – unsuitable for this size of village because: Drainage and Sewers – working to a capacity at present. Traffic – Horrendous queues trying to cross the bypass at peak times. Schools – Inadequate schools for proposed housing development. Medical – Medical centre working to a capacity at present time.	4298/11148	
	Objection – by adding on a block of mixed housing to the perimeter of Haxby, a ‘second town’ may be created that lacks the cohesion and charm of the former. The wrap this development around the cemetery is insensitive to many and will destroy the peaceful nature reserve that has evolved. Haxby has inherent problems with water and drainage due to outdated sewers that would be unable to cope with increased population. The roads, often tarmac imposed on concrete, are now breaking up.	4359/11299	
	Objection – Haxby (and Wigginton) has developed significantly over the years to achieve ‘town’ status and at this time has now outgrown its services and amenities. The addition of a significant number of dwellings in the area would be catastrophic and is completely unacceptable. Believe that Haxby is already over-populated and the introduction of additional properties on the scale suggested would swamp all of our amenities and services in the area.	4371/11326	
	Objection – in particular Haxby’s drainage, roads, schools and health service are all at capacity. And the level crossings add to the congestion. More generally the hospital is on a site that lacks growth potential.	4379/11341	
	Objection – fail to see how the Haxby infrastructure can handle anymore buildings and shops. The roads can’t handle anymore traffic. Schools are at breaking point. Local doctors and hospital is fully booked. The drains in Haxby are not big enough to	4397/11611	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	handle anymore.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – lets keep some “Green areas” around York for people to enjoy a country walk, to preserve wild life habitats our wild flowers around Haxby moor & for a feel good factor for people so helping their well being & health. Would have a severe strain on our health centre. Our roads would become grid locked even more around the village & ring road. Parking, shops, extra sewerage & thoughts to build a new school to cope when Oaken Grove School has closed down, ludicrous thinking.	4427/11453	
	Objection – the roads from Haxby & Wigginton to the A1237 and York have difficulty coping with traffic at busy times. Are new roads to be built? Schools are now full. There are the children who will live in there new house to be educated? Medical Services for present residents are barely adequate. Are medical services to be improved? Are decent car parks to be installed and if so, where? Lane by pass needs to be upgraded to dual carriageway. Until this is achieved there should be no thought to further develop north of the by pass.	4475/11492	
	Objection – proposed expansion of the population of Haxby, totally unacceptable. Without prior improvement to our local road system – especially involving the widening of the A1237 ring road – and expansion of village parking facilities, essential changes to our drainage facility, the Council’s Local Plan is completely unrealistic.	4481/11495	
	Objection – access and egress is very difficult now. Drainage system is inadequate. The 3 primary schools are full. Need a site meeting to discuss alternative options.	4482/11501	
	Objection – the infrastructure at Haxby is inadequate to support a massive population growth. Residents of Haxby will have to put up with the misery of Haxby construction traffic for many years. Green Belt land should not be used for development before brown field sites are exhausted. Massive increased pressure on all services including primary school places and inadequate parking in the centre of Haxby.	4491/11514	
	Objection – will have a seriously negative and damaging affect on the town as a whole. Extra demand on already poor drainage which will cause even more problems with it. Not enough primary school places. Not enough buses and the service is already poor. Flooding because everywhere will be built on. Increased volume of traffic. Poor air quality and pollution, which will have a damaging affect on people’s health, even more serious to people with existing health problems. Postal service will be affected. Not enough parking in the town for all the extra cars. Increased demand on doctors. De-value peoples houses. Lose the sense of local community. Too much of a demand on local facilities like shops and banks. It will have an affect on wildlife, destroying their natural habitat.	4492/11518	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby has not got the allocated green space. Green Belt not sold off.	4687/14218	
	Objection – increase in population could not be met by services now in existence such as medical, education, sewerage, drainage, recreation and shops. Volume of traffic would cause major problems. Already congested cul-de-sac. Plus delays caused by the Railway Crossing. Deemed an area at risk of extreme flooding. Shelter for a smaller varied species of birds and animals would be removed and all the habitats destroyed.	4688/14221	
	Objection – extreme inadequacy of current infrastructure. Drains are appalling. Roads congested. Bus service is limited. Fields proposed are medieval ridge and furrow fields. Haxby is already the victim of 1970s piecemeal over development with little regard for open space/amenities.	4690/11980	
	Objection – “damage” caused to the green field areas. Increase the number of vehicles. Current roads would be inundated with private cars and goods vehicles. Roads already heavily congested at times. Drainage and sewerage systems working at their maximum would be “over loaded”. Local medical services even more stretched. A new school(s) would be needed. Shopping and other facilities have to be “upgraded”.	4701/11991	
	Objection – Haxby grossly over developed. Existing facilities cannot cope. Parking is practically impossible; drainage system is at breaking point. Road system. Plans for Haxby to have a railway station have been shelved. If any more housing development is done, logical to build with access to the ring road. Leaflet did not include any mention of this development.	4717/12009	
	Objection – development on Green Belt. The drainage system, congested roads, not enough schools, the lack of green spaces for recreation. Great crested newts were found. Garden floods, road floods. Flooding/Drainage problems. Congestion, air pollution? Parking in Haxby is a nightmare. Medical centre is full. Schools full to capacity. Infrastructure cannot accommodate any more large housing.	4817/12135	
	Objection – infrastructure in Haxby cannot cope with the proposed development, specifically the roads, the surface water drainage, the sewage disposal and primary schools.	4822/14212	
	Objection – old sewerage network not being able to cope. Traffic, Usher Lane is narrow. At peak times traffic crawls. Schools, the three primary schools in the area are nearly full to capacity.	4832/12155	
	Comment – the village of Haxby which has been re-designated a Town is already at capacity. Recent developments have meant the village is very congested with little car parking facilities. Luckily some of the historic character remains, but this could be easily lost with further development. Generally the road structure is very congested.	5112/12221	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>The outer ring road A1237 often is very slow moving. Much of Haxby and Wigginton is very low lying with previously many ponds some of which no longer exist. Drainage is especially poor. With the infrastructure unable to cope with heavy rainfall. Roads flooding with sewers backing up occurs as it does in our cul de sac. More houses will make the situation worse. The age profile of Haxby & Wigginton means the local GP Practice is under strain with many people having difficulties getting quick appointments or having to wait 3 weeks or more to get an appointment with their own GP. Not that long ago Oaken Grove Primary School was closed and most of it demolished. Local Primary Schools are already very full without more children. At present we do not have a Rector, but how can limited Clergy and Lay resources cope with the ever expanding need for their help.</p>		
<p>Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued</p>	<p>Objection – do not believe that the city has within its resources the ability to upgrade and add to the infrastructure of Haxby and its surrounds in order to successfully accommodate these homes. Referring to the City of York Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan it is a list of aspirations that is hoped that the developers and government will fund.</p>	5139/12256	
	<p>Objection – Haxby is a lovely community and the quality of life of its residents will be adversely affected by this proposal. There are already traffic problems heading into York along the York Road at times of peak flow, particularly when the rail crossing is in use. Creating an extra 1500 or so houses would mean a potential additional 3000 cars attempting to use this route. The existing on road 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 cycle route dries up altogether along the Haxby Road north of the hospital. The schools in the area are already 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.</p>	5158/12290	
	<p>Objection – any further housing development in the village. Current housing market is that young people aspiring to own their own home have to pay a very large premium on the price they pay for a new house so the developer can provide the council with affordable housing. The increased cost of new housing obviously pushes up prices of existing properties in the area meaning first time buyers are left unable to purchase their own property. Other ways to fund Social housing should be found that don't distort the private housing market.</p>	5274/14376	
	<p>Objection – road infrastructure from both Haxby and Wigginton to the B1237 is already overloaded. The B1237 is similarly at breaking point. It is impossible to understand the</p>	5276/14385	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Council's thinking on this plan given that there are no plans to dual the ring road at this point. Do not believe this is a workable plan unless the road infrastructure to enter and exit Haxby and Wigginton is significantly improved before additional housing is built. There are also implications for schools, health services etc but the road infrastructure is main objection.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – utterly against the proposed erosion of the Green Belt in the Haxby & Wigginton areas identified as H37, ST9 and SF4. Don't believe the infrastructure of the area can cope with another potential 1600–1700 homes. Additional demands which will be placed on local schools, parking and drainage. Unsuitable recreational facilities. Further anti-social behaviour will occur due to boredom.	5286/14406	
	Objection – view related to all York proposed developments which are considered to have a detrimental affect on an existing community. Surely 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. Services, schools, healthcare and all the other necessary infrastructure can then be adequately built in to meet specific needs.	5289/14416	
	Comment – homes are connected to an overload sewer and during the many years of complaints with both Yorkshire Water and City of York Council many statements, anecdotal and written, regarding the state of the drainage for Haxby which requires significant investment for it to be effective. Traffic levels currently in Haxby, these will be significantly worse, at times during times during the rush hour the traffic can be queuing from the ring road roundabout to Holly Tree Lane, this also needs to be addressed. Haxby is already developed to a level which is bordering on full capacity.	5290/14413	
	Objection – suffer with excessive backlogs of traffic during peak times. This road is the only access way for children going to Joseph Rowntree School by foot twice a day. Increased traffic also means increased noise and air pollution along this already busy and dangerous road. Inadequate parking for its village amenities. Local primary schools would also increase in classroom size. Would affect the health, safety and quality for life for the current residents of Haxby. Not in agreement with this.	5291/14420	
	Objection – current infrastructure (roads, drains etc) already are struggling with the loads put on them by the existing population. A1237 ring road is extremely congested during rush hour. The danger flooding in the area, as the more land is build over the more difficult it is for rain water to drain away.	5307/14466	
Comment – connected that the flood defences are inadequate at the moment and the	5320/14486		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>building of another 34 homes in H37, Greystone Court will place additional strain on the system unless significant changes are made. Objection – The drainage of the entire Haxby and Wigginton area is suspect, a further addition of 34 homes, 747 homes and possibly 870 homes mentioned in developments H37 and ST09 and SF4 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.</p>		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection – opposed to any large scale future housing development in Haxby. Would place extreme and unacceptable demands on the town’s already pressured infrastructure. Increased traffic is major worry together with increased pressures on the already over subscribed primary schools. The parking in the centre of Haxby is already inadequate to say the least. Existing drainage is very poor. North Lane often suffers sewage floods because of this. Promises to improve the drainage in Haxby have never materialised. Strongly oppose any future housing developments on a large scale within the town of Haxby.</p>	5324/14496	
	<p>Objection – understand that new homes are required. The problem is when it will have a negative impact on the existing environment and those who live in it. School placement are already stretched. Moved here to avoid those types of areas and the inevitable trouble that large estates bring with them.</p>	5326/14500	
	<p>Objection – opposing future development on the lands identified as ST9, SF4 and H37. Such a massive increase of residents in Haxby will detrimentally impact on Haxby and Wigginton’s infrastructure. Areas of increased traffic, poorer air quality and generally (car parking in Haxby, school places, poor drainage). Should only be considered once the appropriate infrastructure is in place and all available brown sites in York City have been utilised.</p>	5329/14503	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the development of 1600+ houses in the Haxby area. The infrastructure simply wouldn’t cope with additional people and cars. Increased strain on: Local transport both private and public – with increased noise, pollution. Park and ride isn’t big enough and car parking is already at a premium rate in the city centre. York ring road is already very slow moving during rush hour. Schools – the local primary schools are already full, which will lead to catchment areas reducing further. The only way to accommodate more children is to build another school. Haxby surgery is already running at full capacity to provide care to the community. Hospital – under strain already. Services provided by the Council. Council taxes are high enough already. Drainage – the local drainage system is already poor and struggles. Village</p>	5330/14506	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Feel – its appeal was that it still felt like a village. Air quality – additional houses will lead to increase in traffic and a reduction of air quality in the area. Some of the land proposed for the building can be used for farming. Children and Adults all require parks and countryside.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – existing access roads are barely adequate to cater for peak traffic. Believe that a 45% local population increase will have a dramatic effect on the traffic flow. Although believe that the other local gas, water, electricity, sewerage etc infrastructure will yet again be unable to cater for the increase without significant improvement. Have no faith in statements about adding major infrastructure improvements as and when needed because for example the planned improvements to the outer ring road have been repeatedly put back. Need to see is improvements to all the facilities completed first.	5331/14509	
	Objection – Haxby’s infrastructure is already under pressure. Specific areas of concern are traffic congestion, parking and access to public facilities, schooling and potential increase in anti social behaviour.	5333/14513	
	Objection – impact on Haxby of over 1600 new houses. Do not have the infrastructure to cope with the huge traffic demands especially on York road. Extreme pressure on all services including primary schools. Oaken Grove school was knocked down only approx 10 years ago. Inadequate parking in Haxby Centre. Existing poor drainage. Should be considering the use of all brown fields sites in the city before destroying the beautiful countryside.	5361/14563	
	Objection – there is not adequate services of travel infrastructure to sustain a development leading to a 45% increase in the population of Haxby. Schools, play areas, local shops and pubs would find it hard to cope. There are only 3 roads out of the area and currently no train station, therefore peak time travelling would become difficult. The road surface on some roads is already at a very poor standard. Also feel that the small town nature of the area would be destroyed leading to a decreased standard of living. Feel that if really need to do this, must build in the infrastructure first and not the properties.	5362/14566	
	Comment – trying to put shops in other outlying locations in the village has already proved unsuccessful (failed development on Oak Tree Lane). The development to the South of Haxby is less problematic, but will still add to traffic concerns.	5364/14570	The Netfysh
	Objection – strain on the local schools. The amount of traffic in and out. Council closed a primary school so the primary school places are limited. Also worried about the effect on doctors.	5368/14576	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – submit a strong disapproval to the York Plan, especially to the building of homes at Haxby (H37 Greystone Court, ST9 Haxby North and SF4 Haxby North. Population growth of around 45% will make extreme problems to Haxby town’s infrastructure. Schools, healthcare, Road gridlock, even now 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.	5383/14608	
	Objection – massive expansion of housing is planned for Haxby without setting out the changes required to, and funding sources for, the infrastructure to support this increase in population. Usher Lane, Station Road and York Road can all be expected to suffer severe traffic problems. North York ring road is already heavily congested as well. Drainage in Haxby already has issues and is unlikely to cope with such large increases in demands. Primary schools will be inadequate, especially since Oaken Grove was closed some years ago due to the lack of requirement for young families. The proposed site for the railway station is also likely to make traffic in the town even worse, so does not provide a solution. The infrastructure to enable/support it needs to be put in place first.	5384/14611	
	Objection – opposed to any further expansion of the population (and housing stock) within Haxby and Wigginton and other areas without any due care and diligence being made to the transportation and infrastructure for the existing residents. Traffic and congestion build and backup on the main A1237 ring–road. How much assessment has been done to look at school populations within the area, are we not critically short of school places?	5399/14652	
	Objection – primary school places are stretched in Haxby and Wigginton. Serious investment in the infrastructure. Ring road is often overloaded at several times during the day without adding significantly more residents in Haxby. Parking for amenities in Haxby is already overstretched, as all amenities are congregated along the Village. Whether there is enough parks and other recreational land. Still cant find the answer to whether the ring road will be upgraded or new schools built in Haxby then perhaps you need to think about how the information is presented. In summary, unless the infrastructure issues are addressed as part of the population expansion then strongly oppose the building of 1,600 new houses in Haxby.	5400/14657	
	Objection –development of the H37 site south of Hilbra Ave from Greystone Court is on land that may well be contaminated. Survey for house purchase, contrary to the latest environment agency website map, shows part of the H37 field being historic landfill,	5413/14699	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>local word has it that asbestos is buried there. Additionally, the field adjacent to site H37 definitely is registered landfill, and would be concerned that even if site H37 is not directly landfilled, it could have suffered from leaching from the adjacent landfill, water table. The land has protected species on it, or feeding from it, so any development needs to take this into account so as to preserve their habitat. Water Voles are definitely present. The water table is high in Hilbra Avenue, and at times of high rainfall the drainage ditch behind properties already fills to the top and occasionally causes flooding. Foul and surface water drains can struggle to cope, and these are unlikely to meet additional demand. Site H37 appears from the documentation to have been originally discounted for inclusion in the local plan, as it results in the Southern border of Haxby moving further south which would threaten to damage the clear dividing line between Haxby and New Earswick. For some unexplained reason site H37 has now been included which would alter that southern border, change the appearance of the area from the ring road and mean that Haxby would be encroaching towards New Earswick.</p>		
<p>Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued</p>	<p>Objection – Greystone Court is too valuable a public open space leisure to lose, being especially important for the youth of Haxby and Wigginton.</p>	<p>5418/14711</p>	
	<p>Objection – if more and more houses are built to the north of these 2 pinch points. There should be no additional building on any of the 3 proposed sites (H37; ST9; SF4) until the ring road junction is improved ideally with a full size 2 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 at the roundabout. This would help reduce queuing at the ring road junction with the consequent relief on congestion back into Haxby. Ample land around the junction to add lanes and make improvements. Until this can be done there should be no more developments around Haxby. Inadequate parking.</p>	<p>5420/14721</p>	
	<p>Objection – Haxby already has too much traffic and too little infrastructure to deal with the problem. Where would build the infrastructure to manage the massive increase. The centre of the village has no more space to allow parking facilities, where do you plan to increase the need for extra parking for all the extra vehicles that will be using the village? When will you build a new school that will surely be needed for a development of this size? Haxby has a healthcare that is already overcrowded. There is a brownfield site where the Vickers Company used to be located, Why was this not considered? Suggestion was why not put all the proposed building sites in this location and build a small town with all the relevant infrastructure including park and rises,</p>	<p>5471/14821</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	schools, surgeries etc.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – population growth has not dramatically changed in the last 10 years so there seems to be some contradictions in policy here or at the very least they're not joined up. New houses will place greater strains on the current infrastructure. The outer ring road, which is barely able to support the volume of traffic using it and is regularly being upgraded, are being made hastily and without considering the long term. Like to see the data sources that has been used both in past and current planning projections and why they must now be contradicting each other.	5488/14851	
	Objection – no account of the extra burden 1000s of cars and people will have on the infrastructure and social element of small villages/towns like Haxby and Wigginton. Mockery of the “Green Belt”.	5491/14855	
	Objection – volume of traffic that would be added to the Eastfield Avenue and York Road areas of Haxby. The railway crossing on York road can add to the traffic congestion when the barrier is down. Greystone Court is a quiet cul-de-sac. The proposed access route to the H37 area of land is very close to existing homes in this cul-de-sac. Ecological factor. Natural habitat for many species of wild life.	5495/14866	
	Objection – the transport links are poor. There is only one safe walking and cycle route towards York via the underpass. There is no pavement along Wigginton Road for safe walking towards York or Clifton Moor. The bus service although frequent, is certainly not very quick. Outer Ring road on this side of the city is only a single carriageway link joining three major roads –the A59, A19 and the A64 on which the traffic is regularly at a standstill. There is no benefit to Haxby by having the railway line running through the village as there is no station. The Haxby Gates level crossing causes delays. Will there be any provision for traffic calming and pedestrians prior to the increase in construction traffic? In conclusion if the public transport is not improved, there will be a 45% increase in road traffic in line with the future proposals on roads which are nearly at saturation point. Other education facilities will have to be provided. Health Facilities – The Haxby and Wigginton health centre would have to increase in size. Increase in population will bring more crime to the village. Employment 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, Leeds and out of town centres. While the village shops are adequate for daily necessities, I expect at present most families travel to Monks Cross, Clifton Moor or York Layerthorpe for their weekly shopping. The village shops are not suitable for the population of Haxby and Wigginton today – even without an increase.	5501/14875	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby can not take any more houses been built on this scale. There are only 2 roads to use to get to the ring road.	5503/14882	
	Objection – Haxby cannot cope with this sort of population increase. The increase of traffic would be huge and the backlog to get into York on a morning will be ridiculous. School, we will need another. Always very difficult to park. Haxby already has problems with youths. Huge affect it had on the drains. But the main drainage problem will be because Haxby is built on springs. Haxby frequently floods and this problem will not get any better – water has to go somewhere. Area at the end of Usher Lane is rich in wildlife, with deer, foxes, badgers, birds of prey, newts and their habitat will just be destroyed.	5517/14925	
	Objection – the local roads are not wide enough to cope with the extra traffic, assuming you do not intend to build a new shopping centre into yet another urbanization. There are plenty of underdeveloped brownfield sites. Already drive to Harrogate everyday for job, where are the jobs to support this influx of people, York is closing businesses everyday.	5545/14975	
	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.	5581/13079	
	Objection –people have chosen to live in Haxby as it is a village community with rural surroundings. Trying to destroy that. Drainage has proved to be inadequate. 3 primary schools and the addition of the levels of housing proposed would mean another was required (despite one being close not long ago). Our doctor surgery is beyond capacity and simply could not cope. Parking in the village is already difficult. The roads through the village are busy. York can not take any more traffic. Proposals would remove all sense of community.	5585/13090	
	Objection –influx of people will place a great strain on local resources, amenities and facilities. Oaken Grove Primary School was closed because of falling numbers. Presumably a new school will have to be built to cater for rising numbers if the proposals go ahead. The local traffic infrastructure is inadequate.	5587/13097	
	Objection – strongly object to the majority of proposals contained within the Local Plan, particularly in connection with those aspects affecting Haxby and Wigginton.	5588/13102	
	Objection – do not understand when there is so many brownfield sites laying dormant around York – why there is the need to develop and pollute greenbelt land around this village. There are numerous opportunities to develop derelict or brownfield sites. The small country lanes cannot take the traffic let alone the construction traffic that would	5590/13110	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be required to build them. The drainage can barely cope at present – what will happen when we lose this considerable amount of 'soft landscape' to tarmac and built up environment?		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – concerned as the present infrastructure is barely able to cope now resulting in blocked drains, gardens flooded. The whole infrastructure of the villages would need to be greatly improved. Schools and the Health Centre are already at full capacity and the traffic already suffers delays. Completely unsustainable. Traffic flow is already a problem Access from side roads onto the Village, Mill Lane, Station and York Road can be very difficult at all times. Frustrations and delays would have a serious impact on the quality of life and people's health. The village is very busy now and parking is extremely difficult and will become more so can foresee gridlock and I feel these plans have not been properly thought through. Prone to bad drainage, standing water and flooding.	5597/13128	
	Objection – roads have trouble coping with the pressure of traffic. Adding more to this is clearly not sensible. A primary school that could have served the new houses to the North of Haxby was shut down several years ago. The other school close by clearly has no space to expand without severely damaging the educational environment for the children. Haxby Station was refused funding recently. In any case a meeting largely concluded it was a hasty and ill-thought-through plan which ought to be more carefully planned. Haxby does not have the infrastructure to cope with further expansion without turning it into a low quality, commuter, sleeper town.	5605/13158	
	Objection – have outstanding schools, excellent facilities and a doctor's surgery that you can get appointments at quite quickly. All these things will be affected by over 1500 new homes, which could equate to over 3000 more residents in the area. Not equipped for more residents. Are you going to provide new routes to the bypass? Our drains can't cope at the moment. Are you going to update all the drainage systems in Haxby? Will you be providing a new school to accommodate all the new families or are you going to compromise our outstanding schools? Will you provide money to increase the doctor's practice to provide more GPs to cover all the new patients? Going to again provide the hospital with extra money to fund new members of staff and new buildings/ departments to cope with all the extra referrals?	5607/13166	
	Objection – have outstanding schools, excellent facilities and a doctor's surgery that you can get appointments at quite quickly. All these things will be affected by over 1500 new homes, which could equate to over 3000 more residents in the area. Not equipped for more residents. Are you going to provide new routes to the bypass? Our	5608/13169	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	drains can't cope at the moment. Are you going to update all the drainage systems in Haxby? Will you be providing a new school to accommodate all the new families or are you going to compromise our outstanding schools? Will you provide money to increase the doctor's practice to provide more GPs to cover all the new patients? Going to again provide the hospital with extra money to fund new members of staff and new buildings/ departments to cope with all the extra referrals?		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – whilst the smaller development at Greystone Court may not put any significant extra pressure upon infrastructure and amenities, the addition of 1,600 homes in stages 1 and 2 absolutely will, not least to a small town where access to the A1237 is already slow at peak travel times via York Road. The village centre is already congested at weekends, parking is difficult. School places are already at a premium, services will be further stretched and Haxby will lose much of the green area. Already reached our limits in terms of capacity, and to expand further is to lose the character and essence of our community.	5613/13193	
	Objection – capacity of drainage systems. Unaware of subsequent improvements and the inability to cope, especially with surface, water is all too evident. Traffic movement is an everyday problem. Further developments can only worsen the situation. Capacity at existing schools is at present inadequate, Oaken Grove having been closed some time ago, unable to find provision to remedy this in the Local Planning document. Coupled with the proposed expansion into designated 'greenbelt' rather than utilising 'brown field' sites seems to be unnecessary and certainly undesirable.	5615/13197	
	Objection – Haxby which has been re-designated as a Town is already at capacity. Very congested village with little car parking. Increase in traffic will make matters even worse. The infrastructure of drainage is very poor and unable to cope with heavy rainfall. Local primary schools are already at capacity and not long ago Oaken Grove School was closed and demolished therefore where are we to put an influx of children. The age profile of Haxby and Wigginton means that local GP Practice is under strain. There is also a problem with the aged and lonely people within the Parish. Do have caring agencies, including the Church, supporting these people but the parish is already overstretched.	5621/13220	
	Objection – drainage system. Traffic congestion is already a problem. How would this centre core cope with additional homes planned for stages 1 and 2? It was only a few years ago that a school was closed in Oaken Grove, another one will now be required!	5625/13238	
	Objection - Haxby is a lovely community and the quality of life of its residents will be adversely affected by this proposal. Already traffic problems. Existing on road cycle	5626/13241	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	route does not provide a viable alternative for parents attempting to ferry children to and from school and for anyone working in the centre. The schools in the area are already 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?		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby has already expanded far enough and even the present infrastructure cannot cope, in particular traffic, inadequate drainage. Drainage in Haxby is poor and in addition surface flooding on my property. Haxby should remain its present size with improvements made to the infrastructure. A case has not been made as to why more houses are required in the York area.	5627/13244	
	Objection – village facilities are already at full capacity. Parking and driving is dangerous, not enough child minder/nursery/school places. Public transport links would not cope; the medical facilities in the village will be over stretched. The infrastructure in Haxby is not in a position to support additional housing on the scale that is proposed.	5635/13267	
	Support – the need for additional housing in and around the Haxby area. Comment – without a railway station to support the expansion then Haxby road will become gridlocked. Would consideration be made to include a train station in the plans, would expect most of the occupants of the new houses to be working families who potentially will have two cars each needing to leave Haxby during rush hour. Would suggest that building a station to the north of Haxby would also encourage cars from Strensall to use the train thus releasing a great amount of pressure from the northern part of the ring road.	5651/13291	
	Objection - believe the traffic volume is already at its limit and with this amount of proposed housing it can only get worse if no plans are made to make a further access road in or out of Haxby. Unless another road is planned, do not see how York road can accommodate any more traffic.	5654/13300	
	Objection – do not understand how this amount of land was calculated and how extending a cul-de-sac by 34 houses (for 1.4ha) was confused with 0.2 ha which would only be 4 houses. 34 houses does not appear to be a “small extension”. Needs to recognise the huge impact of the additional cars on an already overstretched road network. If access was taken from Greystone Court, it is already extremely difficult to access adjoining Eastfield Avenue. Transport Section does not consider the detail of the local development, which could cause significant issues for York Road. Stated that the development will “Significantly improve the visual appearance of the southern boundary of Haxby” but it is not clear who has decided this and on what basis. Current	5663/13328	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>boundary is an ancient hedge but the proposed build would see part of a field used for development and no ancient boundary will be used to define this. The area proposed was rejected by Government planning in a previous submission. There appears to be no map showing what part of site 6 will be developed. Proposal conflicts with principle of retaining open land to prevent communities merging into one another and the city and to preserve the identity of settlements and villages. From next year, all classrooms are being used at Headlands Primary School. The additional school places required by this development could not be catered for. Other local schools are also at capacity. A flood risk assessment will be required in line with policy FR1 of the Plan. New development will be expected to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in line with policy FR2 and will not be permitted to allow outflow from ground water and/or land drainage to enter public sewers in line with policy FR3. There is potential to not follow the policy and cause drainage issues. Wildlife assessments on the land were undertaken during winter when wildlife isn't prevalent. Barn owls, bats, sparrow hawks, kestrels, deer, mice and pheasants all use this land. There is a concern that the development would destroy habitats.</p>		
<p>Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued</p>	<p>Objection – parking. During the day this is already at full capacity. York Road Haxby is already totally congested. The character of the centre of Haxby would deteriorate. The present shopping facilities would be inadequate. The rural character would be lost. York Road level crossing already causes major tail-backs. Only one petrol garage in Haxby. Frequently overwhelmed. Providing products, goods and services for the extra housing will mean very many more lorries coming into Haxby. There are too many already. An extra 1000+ vehicles would turn the whole Haxby/ Wigginton area into an intolerable traffic jam. Would lower the quality of life in this area.</p>	<p>5664/13331</p>	
	<p>Objection - this will destroy the character and environment of our local community. Do not have the infrastructure to deal with this kind of expansion. Already have problems with parking, traffic, existing poor drainage and air quality (York Road).</p>	<p>5672/13352</p>	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the Draft Local Plans proposals to 34 new homes on 3½ acres of land at Greystone Court to the south of Haxby. Absolutely inappropriate and completely unsustainable. Put immense strain on the existing amenities of, both Haxby and Wigginton village, which already are unable to cope. Given no indication or guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope. Without huge investment in the infrastructure Haxby will be unable to cope with such a dramatic increase in the number of people requiring things such as: access to schools, GP and medical services, local public transport, traffic access and suitable road systems,</p>	<p>5673/13362</p>	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young people, facilities and support for older and more vulnerable people, potential for increase in crime and anti-social behaviour without a local resident police presence, and numerous other associated concerns. Would see the entire area turned into a massive building site for the foreseeable future and the increase in construction traffic will create enormous congestion on the village road system which already has limited parking and will inevitably jeopardise road safety and security.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – development of green belt land around York. Haxby already has an extremely large population and its roads and infrastructure are already pretty much at their maximum capacity. Without any planned upgrading of roads and schools. To build on green belt should be criminal when large tracts of brown belt land remain undeveloped or get repeatedly postponed such as the enormous tract of British sugar/York Central. York's USP is that it is not a large sprawling urban environment like Leeds or Sheffield. York is a unique place in the UK. Every possibility of literally ruining York.	5676/13376	
	Objection – applications for development of this land has been turned down on previous occasions for good reason. The infrastructure and particularly drainage and sewerage. Unable to cope. The transport infrastructure is totally inadequate. Development of this land will have a detrimental effect on the biodiversity this land provides. Once completed this development will increase the proximity to New Earswick resulting in cohesion of communities. This development will in no doubt 'set a precedent' for the remainder of the field to be developed. The capacity at the local school (Headlands) would need to be addressed. The proposed development is said to continue over 5 years. Residents within the proximity of this development will in effect be living on a building site. Haxby has a unique 'village' feel, something of a rarity in York. Any further developments of this area will ruin this.	5680/13385	
	Objection - the local countryside is home to many wild animals which would certainly lose their homes, habitats would be lost. Aware that there may be house needs I wonder whether there are other 'open' spaces around York which could be used or even take time to renovate empty houses. I think this is unfair considering running views, especially when people have purchased properties based on views and location. The basic infrastructure in Haxby struggles already. Mentioned how drainage is poor.	5685/13396	
	Objection – Haxby is a village, will change its nature. Cannot accommodate such changes, would be too much traffic, particularly on the main road and there is insufficient parking already in the centre. Local facilities/shopping would be	5692/13415	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overwhelmed/congested. The character of Haxby which is impossible to quantify in a housing plan would be changed for ever. Developments need to respect the fact that this is not a sprawling part of the City of York, but a separate entity - a village.		
	Objection – Haxby has grown far too much past its original village boundary already, inevitably put an excessive load on the local Haxby infrastructure. Would certainly cause problems with traffic. The already congested routes to York and other areas will become impossible for local residents. Schools already under pressure could be expected to add thousands more pupils to their numbers. Issues with parking, flooding and drainage and the general quality of the local environment must all suffer.	5697/13422	
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – Haxby has grown far too much past it’s original village boundary already, inevitably put an excessive load on the local Haxby infrastructure. Would certainly cause problems with traffic. The already congested routes to York and other areas will become impossible for local residents. Schools already under pressure, could be expected to add thousands more pupils to their numbers. Issues with parking, flooding and drainage and the general quality of the local environment must all suffer.	5698/13426	
	Objection - would be enormously detrimental to the Haxby community. Believe that such a massive increase in the village’s population would overload the villages infrastructure. Transport, congestion, local services, schools parking. Of equal importance is the social impact. What makes Haxby unique is the way the population has increased gradually and overtime new arrivals have integrated slowly, very 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 villager of strangers who have no sense of place or attachment to our community, think this would be divisive simply because of the sheer weight of numbers.	5699/13430	
	Objection – current amenities can only just cope with the current population and associated traffic. These extra houses should not be built until the local infrastructure and road network has been improved. The additional commuters produced by the new houses will add to the large problems that already exist with the local roads. Alternative – There are several other areas to the south of the city where the ring road has flyovers which would be much more suitable for the increase in traffic associated with housing developments.	5707/13448	
	Objection - current infrastructure in the Haxby & Wigginton area will not support such a large number of new houses/people. Much of the drainage in Haxby is already inadequate. Proposed additional Housing in the Eastfield area (H37) is likely to make this situation worse, unless significant investment/improvements are carried out to the	5709/13453	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>drainage in the area. The limited roads in and out are already full to capacity. Increase in pollution and reduced air quality, especially for children walking & cycling to school! In addition, the already heavily congested Outer Ring Road would also be much worse. Additional "Park & Ride" sites/services will not be the answer. The Oaken Grove Primary/Junior School at the North end of Haxby was closed/demolished some years ago and the proposed number of Houses at the North end of Haxby would mean a new one would need to be built. With the closure of Burnholme School, the recent new Building of Joseph Rowntree School is going to be stretched to accommodate additional children going forward.</p>		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection - how the area could cope with potentially an extra 1651 homes without substantial infrastructure improvements. The Government has imposed a duty on Councils to increase the housing stock, improve the environment, air pollution & congestion within its city boundaries but to do this it is pushing its problems out onto to the satellite towns without considering the impact on functioning, balanced communities.</p>	5715/13467	
	<p>Objection - concerned 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 etc. Concerned this will affect the value of my home with the massive increase in new properties. The way new housing estates are comprised of very close together town houses and lots of affordable housing with as many crammed in as possible will not be a good fit for the village/town. 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.</p>	5718/13478	
	<p>Objection – traffic level in Haxby is already extremely high. Population growth will exacerbate this and also reduce air quality. Parking in the centre is inadequate for further development of the town. The major problem, the drainage. In an area with a high water table and poor drainage, building such a large number of new homes will only increase the risk of flooding. Alternative sites should be sought which would have less impact on residents.</p>	5719/13480	
	<p>Objection - will place an excessive unsustainable strain on all aspects of the villages including the road/transport network, the local schools, the local amenities currently available to all age groups and the drains and sewerage systems which I understand is already under strain. Will destroy the local community feel of the villages that currently exists.</p>	5725/13492	
	<p>Objection – falls outside of the historic village boundary. Lies with an area of land</p>	5726/13493	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	identified as a protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village. Significant wild life interest, presence of protected species, water vole activity. The proposed site has also the potential to disturb hazards materials such as asbestos from land filling when the land was used for waste disposal disturbance. Add to the already increasing traffic problems. Unnecessary strain on schools, access through Greystone Court is inadequate.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – the local infrastructure, including roads, schools, shops, doctor’s surgery and other local amenities are currently at capacity and therefore strongly object to the proposals for the new development. Would destroy not benefit our villages and the city as a whole. Against the destruction of countryside and the cities green belt.	5727/13495	
	Objection - falls outside of the historic village boundary. Lies with an area of land identified as a protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village. Significant wild life interest, presence of protected species, water vole activity. The proposed site has also the potential to disturb hazards materials such as asbestos from land filling when the land was used for waste disposal disturbance. Add to the already increasing traffic problems. Unnecessary strain on schools, access through Greystone Court is inadequate.	5728/13496	
	Objection - falls outside of the historic village boundary. Lies with an area of land identified as a protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village. Significant wild life interest, presence of protected species, water vole activity. The proposed site has also the potential to disturb hazards materials such as asbestos from land filling when the land was used for waste disposal disturbance. Add to the already increasing traffic problems. Unnecessary strain on schools, access through Greystone Court is inadequate.	5732/13504	
	Objection - falls outside of the historic village boundary. Lies with an area of land identified as a protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village. Significant wild life interest, presence of protected species, water vole activity. The proposed site has also the potential to disturb hazards materials such as asbestos from land filling when the land was used for waste disposal disturbance. Add to the already increasing traffic problems. Unnecessary strain on schools, access through Greystone Court is inadequate.	5733/13505	
	Objection – will mean more demands on existing resources. Would be a need for more school places, more parking, more medical resources. Have enough trouble with drainage.	5737/13514	
	Comment – these new homes would cause more problems for the drainage systems,	5739/13522	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>already overloaded. Also traffic congestion will increase in the area.</p> <p>Objection - the additional traffic in the area would pose an increase in the possibility of an accident involving a child. Traffic is already heavy, increased volume in traffic would be detrimental to residents getting to and from their properties. Aware that there are water voles/barn owls and newts living in the area. Survey had been carried out to monitor these in December, breeding season for newts is April - July and voles March to October. Survey is sure to be incorrect as the habitats haven't been studied at the correct time. De value our properties and would also give way to further development in the surrounding area again causing increased traffic, danger to the children, poor air quality and access issues. Infrastructure and drainage could not cope with an influx of at least 1600 cars. The schools are already full, even if extra classrooms are built there would still not be enough room.</p>	5742/13543	
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection – Haxby’s infrastructure. Traffic, sewerage and drainage. Several hundred children walk down York Road to Joseph Rowntree School. Air quality for residents and pedestrians in York. Main sewers are not big enough to cope with flows associated.</p>	5796/13724	
	<p>Objection – car parking is already an issue. Schools and GP practices would also not be able to cope. Construction traffic. Haxby’s green belt land. Increased volumes of traffic & reduction of the air quality.</p>	5802/13739	
	<p>Objection - protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village of New Earswick. Significant wild life interest. Land was used for waste disposal. Increasing traffic problems. Strain on local schools.</p>	5823/13780	
	<p>Objection - protective barrier for Haxby to protect Haxby from coalescence with the neighbouring village of New Earswick. Significant wild life interest. Land was used for waste disposal. Increasing traffic problems. Strain on local schools.</p>	5824/13781	
	<p>Support – couldn’t the proposed infill at the bottom of Haxby also extend slightly eastward.</p>	5826/13785	
	<p>Objection – will transform this area, in a negative way. Additional traffic. Infrastructure of Haxby will not support the addition. Haxby has a village and community feel and atmosphere. This would be lost with the proposals to significantly increase the number of dwellings in the area.</p>	5835/13811	
	<p>Objection – concerns how the infrastructure will be affected. Schools – will there be enough places for children. Roads – very busy. Impact would be enormous. Village amenities and parking – difficult at most times. Affordable housing – could impact on the quality of lives of local residents, and the value of houses in the area. Drainage – sewer and drainage system within Haxby is already insufficient. Environmental –</p>	5843/13826	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	extreme negative impact on the general environment in the village - noise, air quality, traffic, pollution, and general dirt. The balance between green areas of parkland etc and the built up areas within the village would be affected. Healthcare - the doctor's surgery at Haxby/Wigginton is already at capacity. York Accident & Emergency department already struggles.		
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – infrastructure will not have the capacity to cope. Road congestion, primary school places, healthcare facilities, local GP & hospital, drainage issues.	5846/13837	
	Objection – very concerned at the plan to build more houses in Haxby. Don't feel the community would cope with more. The shops, health services, schools etc are just about adequate now. Struggle to get anywhere in the rush hours.	5851/15099	
	Objection - green belt land and therefore supposed to be protected. The proposed plans would lead to: immense disturbance over the prolonged building period suggested; congestion during and after the building process due to construction workers and subsequent residential traffic; increased demand for local schools which would not have enough places; increased pressure on parking in the two shopping areas in the village which can already be extremely busy; increased pollution levels. Have moved from a very busy area close with high pollution levels and seen a vast improvement in health, as a result no longer require an asthma inhaler. We chose an area to live with open spaces close by for a reason.	5859/15124	
	Comment - at a local level (Haxby), not opposed to some expansion into greenbelt land. However the numbers of additional dwellings proposed, believe is excessive. The local infrastructure simply cannot expand to cope with the number of houses proposed.	5860/15127	
	Objection – opposed to the planned new build in Haxby H37, ST9, EF4, as it is unsustainable, the sewage and drainage systems are already at maximum capacity, and could not cope with more houses. We already have a problem with traffic. The Primary Schools are full now so where would children go, and the Secondary schools are also full. There is a lack of parking in Haxby its self now. Also the Doctors Surgery is almost at its maximum so where would people go. H37 Greystone Court - The land here is marked as contaminated, but have been unable to ascertain as to what with. However in the twenty years lived here, never seen anything grown or grazed on it. It is also green belt land and has been turned down for planning twice. Access out of Greystone court on a morning rush hour is a pain as traffic is queued down Eastfield waiting to get onto York Road, extra traffic would be a nightmare.	5864/15131	
Comment - with regard to the outline plans for Haxby and Wigginton there does not appear to be a consideration to the need for new and better infrastructure for the area.	5869/15144		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection – it is important that the issues regarding shortage of new and affordable housing is addressed. However, in some areas, such as Haxby and Wigginton, the infrastructure, including roads, parking and schools are already stretched. There should be no consideration given to new housing developments in such areas until infrastructure issues are addressed. The junctions with the A1237 outer ring road at peak times are bottlenecks. This is causing costly delays and pollution. If an underpass was created for the road traffic it would help to increase traffic flow and cut down on congestion and associated problems.</p> <p>Comment – in the long term, would have no objections to a relatively large increase in the number of houses in Haxby and Wigginton, provided infrastructure and services were already in place to cope with the extra population and traffic. This should include the building of a rail station at Haxby with ample parking.</p>	5870/15147	
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection - feel very strongly that local services cannot cope with the proposed number of additional homes to be built in our area. Oaken Grove school was demolished and sold off to property developers as it was seen to be surplus to requirements. The main arteries out of Haxby and Wigginton are severely congested with traffic especially at peak times. The centre of the "village" has barely enough parking spaces to cope with the demand. A lot of existing properties have flooding their gardens, can the drains cope? The York bypass around Haxby cannot cope with the current levels of traffic the extra pressure on this road would be catastrophic.</p>	5873/15157	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposed large scale building of new homes in Haxby, H37, ST9 and ST4. The size of the proposal is far too large for the area. Feel it is currently at full capacity for the area in regards to people and vehicular traffic. Current problems that need to be addressed currently in the area are the very poor quality of the roads, drainage, foliage up keep, the traffic volume on Haxby Road and Wigginton Road. More people will mean more vehicular traffic and these will only worsen the air quality but make matters worse on already poor road surfaces and travel time on the two routes to the A1237. There will also be a higher number of vehicles passing through the current housing areas, which along with the problems already mentioned, would pose a higher danger to the large numbers of children. Further to this, such large scale building would result in large numbers of heavy vehicles being present in the area for the duration of the build, not only causing a higher safety risk but there would be the probability of the muck and grime from the sites being transferred into the surrounding road surfaces which would be both visually unappealing and possible danger to current road users. The primary schools in the area are in general very good; fear this would</p>	5876/15163	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>be reversed with further increase of child numbers.</p> <p>Comment – the water table in the area of the house is only about 360mm. the existing top water drainage of the area is inadequate and suspect the sewerage drainage for the area is also on the limit. A complete survey of the infrastructure for Haxby and Wigginton should be undertaken before any planning of future housing is done.</p>	5900/15214	
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	<p>Objection – extremely concerned at the outline proposals by the local council to develop Greenbelt land for housing around Haxby and Wigginton. Totally opposed to it anywhere, live in Wigginton it is too close to home. Greenbelt is greenbelt only once and once its gone we will never have it back. There are numerous alternative to building on what should be protected land. There are acres of wasteland, derelict sites and uninhabited properties around York that should be pursued first.</p>	5908/15229	
	<p>Objection – opposed to building on the green belt. Adding more people to Haxby and Wigginton will cause havoc in the village. Car parking is difficult on main street now.</p>	5968/15333	
	<p>Objection – opposed to building on the greenbelt. No schools, no access and no need.</p>	5975/15342	
	<p>Objection – opposed to building on the green belt, should use brownfield first. Should consider all necessary support services. Does not think that Haxby can absorb so many new houses without adverse effect on quality of life for everyone.</p>	5977/15347	
	<p>Objection – the proposed local plan for Haxby will increase the population by 45%. The increased demand on schooling, healthcare and traffic will be enormous. There is one road through the village which just about copes but at times is very busy. Parking is already inadequate which has a negative impact on the local shops.</p>	5981/15352	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposals for the development of Greenbelt land surrounding Haxby and Wigginton as this will have a massive impact on our quality of life in these communities. You understand that there is a need for more housing in York, but feel that the burden should be spread more evenly around the City. Haxby appears to be bearing more than its fair share of growth. A 44% increase in population is unsustainable and will permanently transform the nature of the village. Intolerable impact on your amenity both for the 10 years or so that the site is being built. Air quality will suffer. There is no indication of exactly how or when either the transport infrastructure (particularly the station) or the social infrastructure will be delivered. The traffic impact, on Haxby Road and Wigginton Road will be terrible. The Ring Road is already over capacity.</p>	6041/15463	
	<p>Objection - concern about the proposed housing developments in Haxby (ref H37, ST9 and SF4) - local services are already stretched and an increase of 45% in the local population will make this much worse. Particular issues are the congestion in the road</p>	6049/15487	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	network to and from Haxby/ Wigginton, lack of parking in the village and also that the primary schools are at/ near capacity. Impact on the quality of life for existing residents		
	Support – the move to develop at Clifton, Haxby, Wigginton and Monks Cross seems a more coherent plan for development, particularly as the four new railways stations are intended to serve these areas. Further development at H6 seems extraneous to the overall plans outlined in April 2013.	6121/15543	
Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued	Objection – so far as site H37 is concerned, there is objection to same in that it tends to create coalescence with the northern ring road and New Earswick. This site was the subject of a planning application, and on appeal, in the past and the application, rightfully, was unsuccessful then. Nothing has changed.	6135/15587	
	Objection – infrastructure. Road networks. Schools.	6171/15703	
	Objection – York Road is not coping with existing traffic. The railway crossing on this road also adds to the problem. There is also the ambulance station operation to consider. Parking in the town. Enlarging the town is totally inappropriate.	6181/15720	
	Objection – housing at a site behind Church Lane in Skelton. An economist. Object most strongly that no social or economic reason has been proposed or offered to justify the massive expansion of housing land. Beautiful historic city. Strained nature of the local road infrastructure. Skelton is a beautiful village.	6224/15775	
	Objection – land deemed unsuitable for building in 2011, what has changed in two years?	6225/15779	
	Objection – enormous strain on the infrastructure, especially the health centre.	6255/15827	
	Objection – traffic – York Road, Haxby already overcrowded 7:30 – 9:00am. Exit Usher Lane – long waits at all times. A1237 always heavy traffic. Parking in Haxby. Increased traffic, fumes, construction noise. Schools – is there capacity there? Health Centre. Infrastructure. Employment – where are the jobs for extra people? Would this become a dormitory of Leeds? Green belt – this is being eroded.	6278/15869	
	Objection – local roads are already severely congested. The ring road is unable to cope, traffic jams. Flooding during heavy rainfall. The local schools are already full, partly as a result of the closure and subsequent demolition.	6283/15879	
	Objection – increase in traffic and a road network which is already stretched. A19 and Monks Cross notorious for daily queues. Join the rat run along Eastfield Avenue. Recently noticed traffic survey apparatus in place on roads in Haxby and Wigginton. Suggest that their results are unrepresentative of normal traffic numbers as there is a marked decline in road use from mid July until mid September usually put down to	6298/15930	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>school holidays. New development at Monks Cross will draw even more traffic. The park and ride is used most by people who live greater distances from the centre. Increasing the population of Clifton and Haxby will only increase the number of cars heading towards the centre. While the ring road remains a single carriage way 'improvements' to existing roundabouts are not going to make a significant difference. The proposed reopening of a railway station in Haxby may well serve a few who can walk or bike to it, but again, in reality it will serve to draw traffic both through and around our town. Building first and provision for the existing population second. Potential problems with flooding.</p>		
<p>Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued</p>	<p>Objection – completely unsustainable, the already struggling drainage system. None of these issues have been improved. Traffic congestion. Parking it is quite simply a nightmare. Schools. Our infrastructure must be at breaking point already. Experiencing flooding.</p>	6300/15935	
	<p>Objection – Green Belt is sacrosanct. No real thought has been expressed regarding the water table. Problem of traffic to be considered.</p>	6332/15994	
	<p>Objection – would increase the traffic on Eastfield Avenue. Primary schools at capacity.</p>	6368/16085	
	<p>Objection – disaster. Roads will be blocked with traffic.</p>	6371/16093	
	<p>Objection – it an area of special scientific interest to protect the great crested newt and it's habitat for future generations.</p>	6377/16108	
	<p>Objection – blocked by traffic. Many cars are parked. Shopping facilities are not sufficient. Obviously more houses are needed but the numbers being quoted are double what is sensible and comfortable.</p>	6389/16130	
	<p>Objection – infrastructure would not be able to sustain building projects on the scale envisaged. Long lines of cars. Many of the roads and paths are in a very poor state of repair. More pressure on the water and sewerage systems. Destroying the green belt.</p>	6416/16138	
	<p>Objection – really destroy the character of our village. The roads are too small. Not cope with extra traffic/parking New school may have to be built.</p>	6442/16162	
	<p>Objection – the cars. The schools. The whole idea is awful.</p>	6446/16168	
	<p>Objection – totally against this proposal.</p>	6447/16170	
	<p>Objection – totally against this proposal.</p>	6448/16172	
	<p>Objection – roads and infrastructure will be unable to cope. Too large. Completely inappropriate for the size of this village. Brownfield sites?</p>	6451/16177	
	<p>Objection – more overcrowded. Roads won't be able to cope with the additional traffic. Bus routes aren't great.</p>	6452/16179	
<p>Objection – Haxby in particular cannot cope with any more traffic. Two level crossings.</p>	6456/16185		

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Comment –land referred to as site H37 is believed to be contaminated – anecdotal evidence is that this is asbestos from the former airfield at Clifton Moor. The position re such alleged contamination should be established before any attempt is made to proceed with development at this site south of Haxby.</p>	6522/16506	Cllrs P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
<p>Site H37 Land At Greystone Court, Haxby Continued</p>	<p>Objection – concerned by the increase in traffic caused by the proposed use of Greystone Court as an access route to H37 and the impact this will have on Eastfield Avenue and York Road. This would heighten the risk of accidents and impact on the existing congestion. Eastfield Avenue has a tight corner just before Greystone Court which is a known hazard. More evidence required to support the decision to use Greystone Court as access for the development proving impact is acceptable. Surface water drainage is already at unacceptable level in gardens surrounding the site and sewage outflow if borderline at best. Connecting to existing surface water drains is not acceptable. Site is located within Flood Zone 1 and FRA has not been undertaken by an independent authority. School places are currently fully subscribed and substantial investment would be needed in schools, doctor’s surgeries, parking and transport links. Varieties of species (water voles, bats, owls, sparrow hawks, pheasants and mice) use the land and they should be protected and their habitat retained. 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.</p>	Petition 8	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H38 Land RO Rufforth Primary School, Rufforth	Objection – whilst some housing development is necessary to maintain the vitality and viability of the village and support its infrastructure, objection arises from perceived loss of green belt, serious problems with the sewerage system, traffic increase and parking concerns. Emphasis should be on housing for young families rather than larger houses which have been the most recent additions to the village.	74/12753	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Comment – should this be developed, please note that the school will probably need additional classroom space.	192/14003	
	Objection – existing sewerage problems. Full and proper consultation with Yorkshire Water should occur before this site is progressed any further.	1355/17337	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1899	NFU
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6646	
	Objection – no more house building at Rufforth until the present sewage system has been greatly improved.	2462/6741	
	Objection – this is “backland” development.	2536/6822	
	Objection – green belt should be protected. Village cannot sustain more traffic. The sewage is a constant problem and could not cope. The school is at full capacity.	2548/6843	
	Objection – significant threat to the greenbelt implied in the plan. Building of 24 houses behind the school in Rufforth encroaches the current building line in the village. Facilities are very limited and a development of this nature will add additional strain and is a significant number of houses for a very small village.	2814/7472	
	Objection – to the plan to build houses to the rear of Middleton Close Rufforth & Rufforth School. In the Green Belt, sufficient land elsewhere in York to build on without going into the Green Belt.	2815/7474	
	Objection – field at the rear of Middlewood Close. 26 houses is going to bring a lot more traffic at the entrance to Middlewood Close driving in and out. With houses overlooking onto the rear of Middlewood Close gardens. People speeding it will be even worse if these houses are built.	3357/8608	
	Objection – inappropriate use of greenbelt land. Alter the character of the village, put stress on the services. There will be oversubscription to the primary school. Traffic – will greatly add to the problems. Middlewood Close is within an air field safeguarding area, development would be limited. Privacy of the residents of Middlewood Close severely compromised.	3542/9500	
	Comment –Rufforth needs a proportionate number of new, smaller family homes. No objection to the site behind Rufforth School, but know they have drainage problems	3879/10418	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	which would need to be sorted.		
Site H38 Land RO Rufforth Primary School, Rufforth continued	Comment – the choice of plot H38 for 24 houses in Rufforth does not seem reasonable provided the infrastructure in particular sewage and storm drainage is improved to benefit all houses in that area.	3880/10422	
	Comment – no objection to 24 houses being proposed behind Rufforth School (H38). Believe that the remain sustainable the village must grow a little but new houses should be build with young families in mind and be reasonably affordable. There are far too many large and expensive houses already within the village that do not sustain the school or pre-school for instance. If building is to take place here then the sewerage system must be upgraded not only for instance. If building is to take place here then the sewerage system must be upgraded not only for the new houses but for residents in the close area as there have been dreadful problems with the sewerage system over many years.	3980/10586	
	Objection – wish to make objections known to the proposal of building new houses in Rufforth. Green Belt land. Whether the school can absorb any increase in pupil numbers?	4001/10614	
	Support – allocation and confirms that the land is available for housing development which will be deliverable at the density proposed.	5164/12457	
	Objection – in particular, the inclusion of H38 is wholly inappropriate in view of the existing traffic and drainage problems in the village and do not believe it meets the criteria set out in Policy GB4.	5228/12534	
	Comment – consider that there is a need for further housing within Rufforth (H38) to keep the village and its primary school viable, but suggest that the number of houses be reduced to 20 family size 3 and 4 bed roomed houses to encourage family units into the village.	5238/12562	
	Objection – adverse effect on the character of the village, erosion of green field land. Currently grazing field. Hedge row. Attracts a wide variety of birds and other wild life. Adverse effect of development on wildlife and the York green belt, village of Rufforth does not have sufficient infrastructure to support the building of new houses. Main sewer has well documented issues with blocking due to lack of fall and therefore lack of flow. Development, it would need to be conditional upon the upgrade of the main sewer. Main road through the centre of Rufforth has issues with traffic. Proximity to the school entrance endangering the children at the school.	5460/14802	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H38 Land RO Rufforth Primary School, Rufforth continued	Objection - currently Green Belt land and prime agricultural land. The area you are considering is behind existing housing, not within existing housing. This development would be "off the building line". This would set precedence and leave more Green Belt land around Rufforth eligible for development, bringing even more problems. The only access to the land is through Middlewood Close, which is currently a small cul-de-sac of 15 houses, which is safe for children to play in. More than likely be an increase in traffic. This is hardly in the same scale as existing neighbouring property. This is not infilling, this is outside the built up area of the village. It certainly would prejudice the openness of the existing housing and the school The village school has recently had to be extended due to additional pupils and classroom ratios. Is there any proposal to increase it again with this additional housing estate? The drainage system at this side of the village is an absolute nightmare. Buzzards have returned to the area.	5660/13315	
	Objection – increased traffic through middle wood close. The current drainage issues/ the pressure on the school. The current poor bus service. The damage to green belt land.	5743/13546	
	Objection – sewage and water drainage system. Primary school is small. Issues with traffic. Also green belt land!	5798/13728	
	Objection – how will the drains cope? "Brownfield" sites in York, earmarked for housing, developed soon.	5803/13740	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington	Objection – planning inspector decided this site should be in the green belt in 1994 and there have been no material changes in the circumstances affecting this site and the neighbouring area. The inspector concluded that development would radically affect the character of the village, the proposal must therefore be withdrawn.	61/12684	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection – this site has already been part of a public enquiry 1992/3 (as site D75). The existence of a further housing development would have a significant adverse effect upon the special character of a rural part of the village. The area is used extensively by villagers for walking with dogs, children and horses. H39 should be withdrawn from the Local Plan	657/16803	
	Objection – danger that if the access is linked to Church Lane Beckside will become a rat run unless only foot and pram and cycle access is allowed through from the present road end and cars from the proposed new houses exit via Church Lane. Understand that an earlier proposal to build on this site was turned down at central government level on the ground that there should be no link from Beckside to Church Lane, and that the land was valuable to the green belt. Told that this decision is irreversible. Certainly hope so because strongly object to this proposal.	1008/17013	
	Objection – seem to be determined to change their character forever too. Village will no long be the village. The development is too large and will surround the village school, a school that is in no way large enough to cope with such a large number of new incomers. And what of the environment for the children during construction, surrounded by noise and dust.	1259/17136	
	Objection – without such an approach, there can be no confidence in the actual deliverability of the relevant housing allocations. The RSPB would be happy to meet with you to discuss this issue further.	1399/17368	RSPB
	Objection - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/1900	NFU
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6647	
	Support – agree with possible more housing in Beckside and back of school. Objection – Level of traffic through village, on safety especially Beckside. Would like traffic lights and pedestrian crossing at the junction.	2658/7038	
	Objection –the local area can barely cope now. More area under concrete = more run off and the problem made worse. The school is pretty much at capacity now. Parking around the school? Roads and congestion – capacity in peak times. Traffic safety. This is a historic village with a lot of character and that will change. Have enough brown field sites in this country due to the changes in economic output that could be utilised	2720/7214	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	with some imagination.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – opposed to the idea of new housing off Becksides. Encroaching heavily on the greenbelt. Wildlife around here is in abundance especially the protected bats who reside within the field you are proposing to use for new housing. Elvington Church is mentioned within the Doomsday book, having so much traffic both in the short term and long term travelling along that lane will have a huge impact on the structure of the place. Becksides road itself has a stream running by the side and it is already collapsing and could lead to flooding. The school is full and has been for a few years and will be for years to come. Living off Becksides in Alvin Walk is a safe haven for our young children. They play safe, learn to ride their bikes and know that they will not be in danger with through traffic. Other children from the estate come up to Alvin Walk and play safely there.	2760/7294	
	Objection – put additional pressure on existing infrastructure. Destroy the wildlife of this field. Negatively affect character of the village and quality of life of local residents. Access to the village is poor.	3011/7846	
	Objection – cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents. Building of 25 houses will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water, supplying, electricity, roads etc.). Will destroy the wildlife. Proposal to build houses at the end of the quiet cul de sac.	3031/7878	
	Objection – cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents. Additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water, supplying, electricity, roads etc.). Will destroy the wildlife of this field. Development will negatively affect character of the village.	3046/7898	
	Objection –Becksides and Church Lane, behind the school and the huge development of 5,800 houses proposed between Elvington and York. Introduction of these new developments would impact on the village amenities. The traffic in the village is already very busy. There are HGVs and agricultural vehicles going through the village all day every day. Village school here and Fulford Secondary School. These would become over subscribed. The village was flooded again. If we start building more houses in the village and the surrounding areas it will cause more flooding.	3106/8006	
	Objection – completely against the proposed plans at the top of Becksides, behind the school and further into the green belt between Elvington and York. The shape of the village with a tight inset boundary and size of the community support the local businesses well, and village life is thriving. Significant increase would push them above capacity to the detriment of all pupils. Without the evidence for new jobs – there is	3108/8011	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	none I have seen – there is no need for the extra houses. The village main street is already often congested with HGVs and agricultural traffic.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – Elvington has a busy road. 25 houses would have an impact on the conservation area of the village. Impact on the environment and wildlife 'living' in the area. Increased traffic through Beckside itself. Young families, added road safety issues. Green Belt. Land was proposed for a similar plan and removed from the Green Belt, rejected by the Planning Office and returned to Green Belt.	3113/8019	
	Objection – Public Inquiry in 1992/1993 ruled against the removal of sites in Elvington from the Green Belt. Difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village. Provide access by way of extending Beckside is as equally objectionable as the original proposal to provide access from Church Lane. Unacceptable congestion. Adversely affect the character of the village and the amenities of local residents. The field is a home for rare bats and owls. Protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	3135/8073	
	Objection – severely detrimental to the rural nature of the village. If access has to occur solely through Beckside itself, then an additional 25 houses would seriously impact on Beckside itself. If the plan were to include Church Lane, even 25 houses would make a significant impact not only on the traffic but also on the character of the conservation area of the village. Development of a large housing estate would be out of proportion, shape and form to the rest of the village. Foundations of the church and the row of terrace houses in Church Lane.	3155/8127	
	Objection – Inspector’s conclusions delivered in 1994 were that these site should remain in the Green Belt. Nothing substantive has changed since then, and the Inspector’s arguments remain as valid today as they were then. Housing developments as a result of these proposed changes would disproportionately damage the character and setting. City of York Council itself also opposed removal of this site from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has a positive role in maintaining and protecting the character of the village, and a tight boundary needs to be retained around the village if this is not to be eroded. Centre of the village is a Conservation Area. Elvington should thus be considered an inset village only “of limited growth” for future planning purposes. Development on the sites identified in the Preferred Options document would be contrary to the established shape and form of the village, as outlined above. Further development in Elvington will impose additional traffic problems upon this already dangerous road. There is no apparent local need for significant further housing or industry in Elvington. This site H39 is virtually identical to that designated D75 at the	3220/8285	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	time of the 1992/3 Local Plan Inquiry. However, all arguments put forward in relation to the site D75 in 1992 remain totally valid. This site provides an ideal buffer between the dense Beckside suburban-style estate to the north, and Church Lane. It would be highly visually intrusive and would also represent a major encroachment into the countryside. The lack of a clear western boundary to this site is of grave concern. There is no logic in the definition of this site H39, or in development here westwards to a line which is simply a projection of the current western boundary of the estate beyond the hedgerow.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – built up congestion. More heavy goods vehicles; make accessing & leaving Elvington impossible. Very narrow in the middle of the village, more traffic would be dangerous. Traffic from a development between Dauby Lane and the B1228 would cause problems. Sewer and surface water drain running down. The Medical Centre struggles to cope with appointments for existing patients. The school is full. Elvington Conservation Area.	3532/9481	
	Objection – will add to existing congestion. More dangerous for children. The main sewer/surface water drain cannot cope. Surface water drains are old and regularly blocked. School and Medical Centre would not cope. Even more heavy goods vehicles using the B1228 thus causing more problems. Massive impact on York and surrounding areas in so many ways.	3539/9496	
	Objection – add traffic to the B1228 which already struggles to cope at peak times. Road surface in parts is appalling. Mean more cars coming on to Main Street. Pumps for the main sewer/water surface drain do not cope. Water drains regularly become blocked. The Medical Centre struggles to give an appointment. School would need extensive work to enable it to cope with more children. The existing infrastructure would not be able to cope with the proposed developments. Where would jobs be available? Strongly object to the development at Church Lane & Dauby Lane.	3598/9581	
	Objection – rural village. Additional housing will only add to this ever expanding flow of traffic. Increased traffic but also current amenities would be placed under pressure, for example the school.	3909/10452	
	Objection – public enquiry in 1992/1993 when the inspector concluded in his report hat: “There was no overriding need to make further provision of land for future development. It would be inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt due to difficulties in relation to access that would case harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents.” All aspects which had been taken into account during this enquiry are still valid now. This field is part of green belt until otherwise is	3936/10484	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proven. Building of 25 houses will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water supplying, electricity, roads etc.). It will transform Becksides from safe dead end into a busy road with additional traffic of 50 cars. It will destroy the wildlife of this field which is a home for bats and owls now. In the end the development will negatively affect character of the village and quality of life of local residents.</p>		
<p>Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued</p>	<p>Objection – have to recall results of public enquiry in 1992/1993 when the inspector concluded in his report that: “There was no overriding need to make further provision of land for future development. It would be inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt due to difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents.” Building of 25 houses will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water supplying, electricity, roads etc.). It will transform Becksides from safe dead end into a busy road with additional traffic of 50 cars. It will destroy the wildlife of this field which is a home for bats and owls now. No need to remind you that infrastructure in Elvington is already at full capacity. It includes school, GP, B1228 road and anti-flood systems which are not always could protect village from flood. Effectively you are proposing to increase quantity of houses in village by 25% without investing a penny into infrastructure which needs investment even without proposed development.</p>	<p>3978/10579</p>	
	<p>Objection – not a first time when field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane in Elvington was proposed for development. Recall results of public enquiry in 1992/1993 when the inspector concluded in his report that: “There was no overriding need to make further provision of land for future development. Inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt due to difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents.” All aspects which had been taken into account during this enquiry in 1992/1993 are still valid now. Will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water supplying, electricity, roads etc.). It will transform Becksides from a safe dead end into a busier road. Destroy the wildlife of this field. Development will negatively affect character of the village and quality of life of local residents. Infrastructure is already at full capacity. The availability of teaching space in the school is already at bursting point with no/limited space/funds to expand. Access to see a GP in an already extremely busy surgery. The terrible state of the B1228 road. No real work in Elvington which means will have additional traffic on a road which hasn’t been properly resurfaced in at least 15 years. Elvington is prone to floods. Due to drainage systems that cannot cope with flash floods and heavy rain. The Greenbelt land around Elvington must remain a greenbelt in</p>	<p>4181/10912</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	order to: Maintain the village integrity. Keep natural surface drainage and help prevent future flooding. Prevent over stretching of local services, i.e. doctors and school.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Comment – do not object to building of houses. But strongly object access being given off Church Lane. This area is one of the most tranquil areas of the village and is already difficult to negotiate with a vehicle. Anymore traffic would make it dangerous and spoil the nature of the area.	4309/11185	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposed developments in the village of Elvington. The proposed developments on Becksides for 25 houses, and a further 100 houses on the Dauby Lane site would feel have too great an impact on the village structure and its way of life. These houses would have an initial environmental impact on what is already designated Green Belt land. The issue of access to this proposed Becksides development using Church Lane would have a massive impact, with the increase in the volume of traffic using it. Church Lane itself do not think would be suitable in size for this potential increase in volume of traffic. Increased threat to pedestrians, mainly children, on their way to school the village school at this time. The B1228 is already used by HGV's as a cut through from the A64 to the M62 and other routes. Increasing traffic flow even further can only have a detrimental effect upon the ongoing structural integrity of the bridge.</p> <p>Comment – the increase in housing on the Becksides development was previously proposed in 1992 when it was declined for many of the reasons already mentioned above. The proposed developments are not designed for local needs but for a net immigration to the village.</p>	4348/11268	
	Objection – the amount of housing would affect the overall rural nature of this area. There would be many issues around access and congestion and this hasn't been tackled in any detail so can't be considered. There have been previous objections to development in this area and it has been ruled that the land remain in Green Belt and feel that this must remain to be the case.	4358/11291	
	Objection – will destroy the quiet country atmosphere. Traffic situation is not good and very congested. When there is heavy rain the water reaches Main Street so fast it bubbles out of the man hole covers and often raises them up making a traffic hazard. Extra run off would greatly add to this problem.	4733/12025	
	Objection – Becksides is currently a safe dead end where children can play outside. To build two additional houses at this site would transform Becksides to a busier road with the potential for additional traffic of 50 cars with increased risks associated with through roads. The field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane is home to Owls and	5146/12267	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>bats. The development of this area would destroy the wildlife of this field. This would negatively affect the character of the village and quality of life for local residents and put additional strain on sewage, water supplying, electricity and local roads. The field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane in Elvington have been proposed for development before. Therefore the results of the public enquiry in 1992/1993 have o be recalled. When the inspector concluded his report the following points were made: There was no overriding need. It would be inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt due to difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents. All aspects of this enquiry are still valid now. If the proposal for 97 houses between Dauby Lane and Elvington Lane goes ahead in addition to the development at Beckside and Church Lane this will add approximately 123 houses to the village of Elvington.. This will impact upon the school in Elvington. The doctors surgery is already extremely busy. The B1228 is a poorly maintained road and has not been properly resurfaced for 15 years. Elvington is prone to floods. Much of this is due to drainage systems that cannot cope with flash floods and heavy rains. Building on green belt land will lead to less land that is able to soak up rain. The proposed creation of new homes would increase the population of Elvington to 25% without any investment in the infrastructure creating a poorer quality of life for the current residents and additional residents moving into the area.</p>		
<p>Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued</p>	<p>Objection – Beckside is currently a safe dead end where children can play outside. To build two additional houses at this site would transform Beckside to a busier road with the potential for additional traffic of 50 cars with increased risks associated with through roads. The field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane is home to Owls and bats. The development of this area would destroy the wildlife of this field. This would negatively affect the character of the village and quality of life for local residents and put additional strain on sewage, water supplying, electricity and local roads. The field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane in Elvington have been proposed for development before. Therefore the results of the public enquiry in 1992/1993 have o be recalled. When the inspector concluded his report the following points were made: There was no overriding need. It would be inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt due to difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents. All aspects of this enquiry are still valid now. If the proposal for 97 houses between Dauby Lane and Elvington Lane goes ahead in addition to the development at Beckside and Church Lane this will add approximately 123 houses to the village of Elvington. This will impact upon the school</p>	<p>5147/12272</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in Elvington. The doctors surgery is already extremely busy. The B1228 is a poorly maintained road and has not been properly resurfaced for 15 years. Elvington is prone to floods. Much of this is due to drainage systems that cannot cope with flash floods and heavy rains. Building on green belt land will lead to less land that is able to soak up rain. The proposed creation of new homes would increase the population of Elvington to 25% without any investment in the infrastructure creating a poorer quality of life for the current residents and additional residents moving into the area.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – this development is in direct contravention of the green belt order put in place when the development of Beckside was completed. Neither Church Lane or Beckside are appropriate for the extra vehicle movements which will be created. Pedestrians on Church Lane will be at risk due to the lack of footpaths on both sides. The corner at the Church is “blind”. The current drainage system is not adequate for the addition of new housing, increasing the flash flooding risk.	5162/12292	
	Objection – wish to object to the City of York Local Plan. Specifically the Strategic Housing Sites outside of the York ring roads. As a minimum, all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s Green Belt.	5223/12507	
	Objection – would like to register opposition to the inclusion of the Church Lane site (H39) in Elvington in the sites proposed to come out of the Green Belt for housing. The site is adjacent to the Church Lane conservation area and the conversion to housing use would have a highly adverse effect on the character of Elvington as a village, including with regards increased traffic.	5235/12553	
	Objection – this development is in direct contravention of the green belt order put in place when the development of Beckside was completed. Neither Church Lane or Beckside are appropriate for the extra vehicle movements which will be created. Pedestrians on Church Lane will be at risk due to the lack of footpaths on both sides. The corner at the Church is “blind”. The current drainage system is not adequate for the addition of new housing, increasing the flash flooding risk.	5237/12560	
	Comment - whilst have no objection to some houses being built in Elvington, believe the current proposals are way in excess of what the village can cope with. The village school has about 120 pupils. If both the proposed developments go ahead, this could more than double the size of the school. The area around the school is already a traffic nightmare at 9am and 3pm. The amount of traffic is already a hazard. At rush hour, already have to queue at the junction with the Hull Road roundabout and these proposed developments would make the situation even worse. There is insufficient public transport from Elvington to York. Also it will blight the nature of the village, the	5259/14351	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	middle of which is a conservation area. There will be no benefit to the village community from so many residents using it as a dormitory town. There are no facilities for older children out of school hours. Drainage could be a serious problem.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Comment - Alvin Walk (off Church Lane, Elvington). Don't believe it should be necessary to build new houses within the village when a proposed 5000 houses are to be built less than 3 miles away. Would have thought that more consultation with those Alvin Walk and Church Lane residents directly affected, could and should have been the first priority. There are mature trees in place that should not be chopped down. The design of the housing should be such that houses overlooking each other should be kept to a minimum.	5284/14404	
	Objection - live in the Conservation area of Elvington. The whole has a unified, tranquil and peaceful aspect with many mature trees and which also serves as a rural amenity for many other villagers who walk here and exercise dogs and horses. Object to the proposed housing developments in Elvington as follows and for the following reasons. Plot H39. The proposal for 25 houses would be wholly out of proportion and form with the current, very rural aspect of Church Lane and would completely change the character of this part of the village. Green Belt here comprises land along the River Derwent which has been set aside as a Site of Special Scientific interest. A similar proposal to build houses on this field was rejected back in 1992. Thus feel that the reasons why the Planners rejected the previous proposal and retained the land as Green Belt still stand. Also concerned about access to the site. An additional 30 -40 cars using this narrow road would cause traffic problems. Also object to the idea of limiting road access solely to Beckside, an additional 30-40 cars would cause traffic problems in the very centre of the village. The village is a major route for heavy lorries.	5321/14489	
	Objection – development in Elvington is inappropriate. Public enquiry of 1992 concluded inappropriate to build here due to problems with public access, harm to the character of the village and pressure on local infrastructure. Prone to floods, building on green belt.	5422/14726	
	Objection – Beckside, the public enquiry of 1992 concluded that it would be inappropriate to build here due to problems with public access, harm to the character of the village and pressure on local infrastructure. Floods and building on green belt.	5423/14730	
	Objection – more housing will inevitably increase traffic. Issue with HGV's coming through the village at high speed. Don't have very wide pavements. Do not have any pedestrian crossings. More traffic will make the roads even more dangerous. Where	5439/14772	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will the access points be from Church Lane to the extended building site of Beckside? Church Lane is a very narrow road and is certainly not wide enough for 2 lanes. If Church Lane is an access road where will the cars belonging to the cottages park? Blind corner at the top of Church Lane near the church. Why are there plans to build in a greenbelt area?		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection - objection to the proposed development between Church Lane and Beckside at Elvington, City of York Council itself objected to in 1992. The proposed development would impact not only on the character of this charming street but also on the village as a whole. Church Lane junction is extremely hazardous at all times, not least due to HGVs choosing the B1228 as a shortcut to the M62.	5447/14782	
	Objection - the village has seen substantial growth in the last decade or two, and is in grave danger of losing its status as a village and much of its previous appeal. Another 100+ houses planned near the school and Beckside extension would be most unwelcome and would change the whole balance in the village. The village infrastructures are all under pressure would exacerbate the pressures already faced. The answer is to leave the village as a village and not to grow it much beyond its current size.	5450/14789	
	Support – do not object to the proposed housing development	5472/14824	
	Objection - extremely concerned as to the proposals being suggested in the local plan for the village of Elvington in that the proposed sites will remove land from the current green belt which would severely detract from the rural character of the village and overturns a number of decisions made through a public enquiry and Inspector. The inspector ruled that the land should remain in green belt, and in particular called out that should it be necessary to make further provision for future development then Church Lane should be excluded from this and remain within the green belt. York City Council, itself, rejected the plan to remove Church Lane from the Green belt after having originally proposed it. Church Lane is very rural and as stated by the inspector its basic character is one of open countryside rather than an open part of the village. Fail to see what has changed since the inspector and council previously objected to this proposal, and surely to overturn a decision made by an inspector something material must have changed or are you stating that the inspector and council made an incorrect decision in the past? Would cause access problems in Church Lane and Beckside. If access is purely via Beckside then this would seriously impact the cul de sac. If the plan is for any access via Church Lane, this would be detrimental to the conservation area which most of Church Lane falls within, and would be dangerous given the width	5571/13056	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of Church Lane. It would also impact on the use of the Village Hall and Church - posing safety risks for children as both locations mean that children are frequently in and around Church Lane. 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 to 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.		
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection - extremely concerned as to the proposals being suggested in the local plan for the village of Elvington in that the proposed sites will remove land from the current green belt which would severely detract from the rural character of the village and overturns a number of decisions made through a public enquiry and Inspector. The inspector ruled that the land should remain in green belt, and in particular called out that should it be necessary to make further provision for future development then Church Lane should be excluded from this and remain within the green belt. York City Council, itself, rejected the plan to remove Church Lane from the Green belt after having originally proposed it. Church Lane is very rural and as stated by the inspector its basic character is one of open countryside rather than an open part of the village. Fail to see what has changed since the inspector and council previously objected to this proposal, and surely to overturn a decision made by an inspector something material must have changed or are you stating that the inspector and council made an incorrect decision in the past? Would cause access problems in Church Lane and Beckside. If access is purely via Beckside then this would seriously impact the cul de sac. If the plan is for any access via Church Lane, this would be detrimental to the conservation area which most of Church Lane falls within, and would be dangerous given the width of Church Lane. It would also impact on the use of the Village Hall and Church - posing safety risks for children as both locations mean that children are frequently in and around Church Lane. 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 to 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.	5572/13059	
	Objection – adding pressure to the system (which H25, H39, E9 will and arguably so will the Strategic Development site at ST15) is unfair to the existing inhabitants of the village and must be avoided. The proposed housing scheme at H39 will greatly impact one of Elvington's few quiet areas, it would be incredibly sad if this were to happen.	5592/13116	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection - the plan to build 122 new homes in the village would further increase the total number of homes by over 25%, thereby changing the rural nature of the village, putting strain on the infrastructure and exacerbating the drainage problems which already exist.	5606/13161	
	Objection –any further significant developments in the village will adversely affect the community and the character of the village. The Planning Inspector has already decided that development on site H39 will not be allowed; he has decided that site H26 must be classified as Green Belt; he has also decided that the proposed Travelling Show Persons site must be returned to Green Belt in 2016. Both proposed sites in Elvington (H26 and H39) were designated as Green Belt by a Planning Inspector in 1994, and there have been no material changes in the circumstances affecting this site and the neighbouring area. Substantially disadvantage our high performing school, changing it from being in a delightful rural location, to the disadvantage of the village’s younger people. Also exacerbate the traffic problems. At present, Elvington has very poor public transport, if these proposed developments go ahead, it will increase the number of cars on an already busy road.	5677/13378	
	Objection - impinges on the green belt around the village and will transform the village into a small town, with the further developments in Dunnington/Whinthorpe there will be no clear boundaries between these villages and they will merge into the metropolitan area of York, in the same way that the villages in and around Leeds have lost their individual identities and become the sprawling city of Leeds. Potentially increase the number of cars using the village roads by another 250 cars. The village is already over capacity. As one of your proposed developments is behind the school, this restricts any further expansion of the school. It is extremely difficult at present to get an appointment with a doctor. Will increase the number of potential patients that will need to register. The village has a history of flooding. The addition of all of these proposed developments would hugely increase the waste and surface water into a drainage system that cannot cope.	5738/13516	
	Objection - currently the end of Becksie is a dead-end. It enables to the local children to play. The addition of extra houses at the end of this road will mean that they will be no longer be able to do this. Problems that will be encountered whilst the building work is being carried out. The large lorries making deliveries, the builders cars, vans, the noise from early starts, dirt along local roads etc. The local roads are already very busy. The local drains would not be able to cope with any further houses. Where would the Children go to school? The local primary school is already full to capacity.	5741/13539	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection –opposed to remove and develop Greenbelt around Elvington/Wheldrake, and further expansion of housing in Elvington, and the build of 'Whinthorpe'. Detrimental impact to the character of the Village of Elvington and the close community values and atmosphere due to the high number of housing proposed. Traffic safety and congestion to an already struggling busy route through Elvington. The schools which has a very credible history of great education will not cope with the additional influx of housing, and most likely be affected and thus the high level of education will suffer! The roads will not cope. Villages and surrounding countryside should be something to be very proud of and so why would York Council look to destroy something that many other cities would be jealous of!	5774/13656	
	Comment – concern is not with the extra housing but the additional traffic on Church Lane. Very small and already busy road, is not designed for the amount of traffic it already receives. Already a problem with parking. Worried about daughter crossing that road.	5781/13685	
	Objection –detrimental effect on the local wildlife. Harmful effect on the village’s overall character and a very adverse effect. Flooding. Traffic on Becksde. Impact on Becksde development – already large development. Services and Infrastructure – full capacity with its infrastructure.	5792/13718	
	Objection – ring road is jammed as it is. School does not have the capacity.	5816/13759	
	Objection – damage the rural character. Access through the narrow residential road. Better incorporated, instead, into a slight enlargement of the proposed Whinthorpe new town, where proper infrastructure can be planned for their residents.	5820/13773	
	Objection - the village is already too large as it is as we have 18 new houses going on the old nursery site. So with the extra traffic on the already unsafe Wheldrake lane junction, coupled with that of those houses proposed in the village, will make it highly unsafe for children and mothers with prams to walk. These extra houses will put an extra strain onto the already busy roads in the village.	5858/15120	
	Support – welcome and support the allocation of site H39 land to the North of Church Lane, Elvington. Sustainable settlement with access to local services and jobs.	6046/17457	
	Objection – limited bus service. If the exit for these proposed houses is into Church Lane higher up than Church Green, there is the added hazard of a blind bend.	6196/15730	
	Objection – as a judgement was made in 1994 by the Planning Inspector, it should remain in the green belt. The access roads to this site are totally unsuitable for any more traffic.	6229/15786	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H39 North Of Church Lane, Elvington continued	Objection – increase of 25% of the residential properties already in Elvington. Elvington Lane/York Road cannot sustain any further traffic. Safety of the children attending the local primary school. Greatly reduce a village atmosphere and ruin the pleasant surroundings. Elvington sits within a Green Belt. Traffic safety and congestion.	6281/15874	
	Comment – no problem with new houses in Church Lane – but the entrance and exit must be in the village. Near the church has cars badly parked 7 days a week – and it is a wonder there has not been a previous accident.	6445/16167	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe	Comment – concerned about the impact of increased numbers of vehicles from the additional homes proposed in Copmanthorpe on Askham Richard and Askham Bryan.	53/12606	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection – to add a further 560 houses to Copmanthorpe is not remotely sustainable. Infrastructure would need either wholesale replacement or significant upgrading. School and healthcare facilities already at capacity. Drainage system is already at capacity with regularly flooding of streets with surface water. Village already suffers from low water pressure. Village centre and shops could not cope with additional people and associated traffic. Manor Heath/A64/A1237 junction already suffers extreme congestion. With the added population, the level of commuting by car would soar with all the attendant problems of higher carbon emissions, poorer air quality, reduction in road safety and specifically on congestion and road safety at the Manor Heath/A64 junction. Loss of green belt land. This is the only open boundary enjoyed by the village – openness of this land, landscape value and wildlife would be lost.	57/12620	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – there are surface water and foul sewers crossing the site. The current positioning of the sewers will significantly affect the layout of the site. Alternatively, diversion of the sewers may be a suitable option.	295/14171	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe’s identity as a village.	917/3050	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. 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.	1053/3341	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/625	
	Objection – the road system would not be able to deal with the increased traffic flows. The sewerage system cannot cope with the volume of waste water, a great deal of investment would need to be made by Yorkshire Water before any further developments take place. The school would not be able to cater for more pupils without encroaching on the play areas. A great increase in the population could not be served by the village shop, leading more people to drive to supermarkets. The doctor’s surgeries could not cope with the increase in patients. The ‘village feel’ would be eroded by the vast developments proposed.	1124/17069	
	Objection – the infrastructure of the village is completely inadequate to cope with an anticipated additional 1200 residents in terms of water supply and sewerage, road widths, capacity of the A64 junction at Manor Heath, school provision, shopping and car parking facilities. Improvements to the facilities and infrastructure of the village	1176/17095	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	are required in advance of any additional housing development.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – new developments should avoid the sacrifice of good quality farmland. The land is on the terminal moraine and is better drained than any other agricultural sites around York and seems to be pretty productive land.	1207/17107	
	Objection – residents are concerned about the impact that 600 new homes will have on the existing infrastructure and amenities in the village. There are also grave concerns over the impact of potentially over a thousand more cars joining the A64 from Copmanthorpe everyday.	1355/17333	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.	1504/2181	
	Comment - Loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/2123	NFU
	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.	1884/9	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No thought has been given to infrastructure for these plans. No provision for roads. Schools are already full. Doctors’ surgeries could not handle more patients, shops inadequate, surface water drainage and sewage at capacity, bus service would not suffice. Proposals would be on prime farming land.	1885/15	
	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.	1886/23	
	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.	1888/35	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why not use Acaster Airfield, a brown field	1892/46	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	1917/116	
	Objection – development of up to 600 houses in green belt will for ever change the ‘village’ into a small town.	1931/147	
	Objection – the plan to build 600 or so new homes will go close to doubling the size of the settlement which will take away the character of the village. How about the infrastructure to cope with this level of development (roads, drainage, schools) and the loss of quality farmland in a green belt location. The semi-rural idyllic nature of much of outer York is important too just as its historic centre.	1933/9919	
	Objection – brownfield sites and non-agricultural land within the city boundary should be used first before building on prime agricultural land. The school is already full and cannot cater for the increased population proposed. There are no plans to increase the healthcare provision within the village to cope with the proposed increase in population. The junction of Manor Heath with the A64 is already a bottleneck and increased traffic will make that junction increasingly dangerous. The water supply currently suffers sub-standard pressure and cannot cope with the additional demand created by the proposed housing.	1937/169	
	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.	1940/176	
	Objection – before commencing any building work the infrastructure must be reinforced. The sewerage system and rainwater drains are at capacity. The exit roads from the village are already congested. The density of housing proposed is much greater with no allowance made for parking. The doctor’s surgeries and school are at full capacity. Parking at the shops is already difficult. Build on brownfield sites within the city rather than prime agricultural land.	1941/184	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will destroy a Viking village and make it into a small town. Land is green belt and demise of green belt has led to the	1942/189	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	near extinction of many indigenous species of animals, birds, insects and plants. No evidence of scientific and technical input into your proposals. Development cannot proceed unless the infrastructure of the village is enlarged to include shops, schools, doctors, public transport and various utilities. Highly unlikely that York can support the additional workforce hence an extremely large amount of traffic will head to Leeds on the A64.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – the infrastructure is not there to cope with the strain that development would put on schools, roads, water, sewerage, drainage and healthcare as they struggle to cope now. The loss of green belt and valuable agricultural land must be strongly resisted.	1943/194	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The number of new developments over such a short period of time will mean it will be difficult to attain the aims to develop strong, supportive and durable communities.	1954/236	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/250	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/258	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/266	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/274	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/281	
		1964/289	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/297	
	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.	1966/305	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be extremely dangerous.	1967/313	
	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.	1968/321	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/329	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should not be built on. Disruption and noise. No evidence that houses are needed. Number of homes should be reduced.	1970/337		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The additional units would put a huge burden on existing infrastructure, including water, sewage, roads, medical facilities, dentistry, school, playgroups etc.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/345	
		1972/353	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/360	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/368	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/375	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/381	
		1977/389	
		1978/397	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/404	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The existing village infrastructure could not cope with the projected houses, unless improvements can be made then these houses should not be built.	1980/412	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1981/420	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1982/427	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/435	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses. Countryside should be protected.	1985/445	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/453	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/461	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/469		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/476		
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	1990/484		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would be dangerous.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character of Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/491	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/499	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure measures should be provided as part of development rather than adding houses where easy green field target.	1993/507	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/521	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/528	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/536	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/544	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no objection.	1998/552	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/558	
		2000/566	
		2001/574	
	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.	2002/582	
	Objection – whilst welcome plans to build some low cost housing in the village, concerned about the number and density of homes planned and the loss of some of the amenities and character of the village. Traffic around the shop will be intolerable unless additional shopping facilities are provided at the other end of the village. Water pressure can be an issue currently and more homes will make this situation worse. Area currently used by walkers and dog-walkers, so this will need to be provided alongside the new development. Some of the land is prone to flooding.	2007/6484	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/609	
		2012/617	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/633		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/641		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/648		
	2016/656		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/664	
		2018/672	
		2019/678	
		2020/686	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/694	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/701	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/709	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/717	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/725	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/733	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/739	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/747	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/754	
		2030/761	
		2031/768	
		2032/774	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/781	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/789	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/797	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/805	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/813		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/821		
	2039/829		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. The proposed size and scale of the developments are completely out of scale and will irreversibly change the village for the worse. Loss of agricultural land and green belt. No planned investment in infrastructure. The increase in cars will make exiting the village difficult and impact	2040/837		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on village road safety. Sewerage and drainage struggles to cope with current demands. Capacity of Copmanthorpe and Woodthorpe primary schools will be unable to cope.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2041/845	
	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.	2042/853	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/861	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/869	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/877	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/884	
		2047/892	
	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.	2048/900	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/908	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/916	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/939	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/946	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.	2060/954	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited in village and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/960	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/968	
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.	2063/974		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/982		
	2065/990		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, 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.	2066/998	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1005	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1013	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1021	
		2070/1028	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1035	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1043	
		2073/1051	
		2074/1059	
	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.	2075/1067	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1075	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. School already full. Sewage system at capacity. Low water pressure.	2077/1083	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt land.	2078/1090	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1098	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Existing infrastructure, facilities and resources available to village residents are under serious pressure. Traffic volumes and vehicle speeds in and around the village are high enough already. The environmental and visual impact on the village will also be unacceptably large. Any new development on green belt land is not environmentally sound especially in this area which is predominantly agricultural.	2080/1105	
2081/1113			
2082/1121			
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	2083/1128		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	green belt.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1136	
		2085/1144	
		2086/1151	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or large enough to prevent people from travelling.	2087/1159	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1166	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1172	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1178	
		2091/1186	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1194	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1202	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1210	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new houses.	2095/1218	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1225	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1231	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1239	
		2099/1247	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Would ruin York.	2100/1254	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1262	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2102/1268		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2103/1276		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.	2104/1284		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2105/1291		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with	2106/1299		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	community leading to development of Local Plan.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2107/1307	
	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.	2108/1315	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2109/1323	
		2110/1331	
	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.	2111/1339	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites situation.	2112/1347	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1355	
		2114/1363	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2115/1371	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	2116/1379	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2117/1387	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2118/1395	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2119/1402	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2120/1409	
		2121/1417	
		2122/1425	
	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.	2129/1440	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1448	
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	2131/1456		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1464		
	2133/1472		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1480		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1488	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1495	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1503	
		2138/1511	
		2139/1519	
	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.	2140/1527	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2141/1535	
		2142/1551	
		2143/1558	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1566	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1574	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1581	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1589	
		2148/1597	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1605	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses is excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. If so many houses are needed would be better to build a small town rather than piecemeal in Copmanthorpe. 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. The volume of traffic is at present to capacity. Extra traffic would cause congestion and already have parking problems.	2150/1613		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1619		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be protected for future generations.	2152/1627		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1634	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1642	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1649	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1657	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1665	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1673	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1680	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1688	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2161/1696	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around York.	2162/1704	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1712	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1720	
		2165/1727	
		2166/1735	
		2167/1742	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1748	
	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.	2169/1756	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1763	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1771	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Any new housing will attract economic migrants from West Yorkshire as with good road access many villagers already travel to work in Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield and Manchester rather than work in York. Village services are at full stretch already, with areas regularly experiencing low water pressure. The school is over capacity and the drainage system is at capacity. Village	2172/1779	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	centre is a conservation area which is already congested with narrow roads and existing heavy traffic. Medical facilities are at full stretch. Increased traffic congestion will add to pollution and road safety will become more of an issue. Loss of prime agricultural land. Land is green belt. Land is home to many species of wildlife. Land to the west of the village is the only open aspect for residents as the village is bordered by A64 and railway. Landscape appraisal found that land to west of Copmanthorpe was perhaps the highest quality landscape surrounding the city, described as ancient and undisturbed rural landscape, well cared for and of high conservation and aesthetic value.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2173/1787	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor. Traffic leaving the village is already heavy and further vehicles will lead to more congestion. Drainage and sewage already appear to be at stretching point. Roadside parking is already on the increase. Existing shops and parking arrangements are at poor levels. Existing brownfield sites around the city should be used before green belt sites to restrict further damage to wildlife.	2174/1795	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2175/1802	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1808	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1816	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1823	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1831	
		2180/1847	
		2181/1855	
		2182/1861	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1869	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1877	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1885	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1893		
	2187/1909		
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	2188/1917		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	than currently the case in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1925	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1932	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues. 200 homes is more realistic. Increased traffic and demand on amenities is a problem.	2191/1939	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1947	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1955	
		2194/1963	
		2195/1971	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made? Increase in traffic using the two routes out of the village will increase pollution and will mean major road improvements are required to be completed before any increase in housing. Area is prime agricultural land. Who is going to rent or buy these proposed houses?	2196/1979	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1987	
		2198/1995	
		2199/2002	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2200/2010	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2017	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2025	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2033	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2041		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2049		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2055		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary. No explanation for how the	2207/2063		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	main sewerage is to be accommodated.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2071	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2078	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2086	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2094	
		2212/2102	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2110	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2118	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2133	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2141	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2149	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2157	
		2219/2165	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2173	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2189	
	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)?	2222/2197	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2205	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2211	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2219		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2227		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2235		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2242		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are 4 active badger setts on the	2229/2250		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proposed development site.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath be destroyed?	2230/2258	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2266	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2274	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2282	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2290	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 - 200.	2235/2297	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2305	
	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.	2237/2312	
	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.	2238/2320	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village could not cope with extra traffic.	2239/2328	
	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.	2240/2335	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2343	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2351	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2359	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2366	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2374		
	2246/2382		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2390		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2397	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2405	
		2250/2413	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2421	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2429	
	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.	2253/2437	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2445	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2453	
	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. Additional cars will have a huge effect on congestion. Scale of development will put a strain on the existing sewerage and drainage. Schools are already at capacity. Copmanthorpe is a conservation area. Brownfield sites should be used before green belt land.	2256/2461	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2469	
		2258/2476	
		2259/2484	
		2260/2492	
		2261/2500	
		2262/2508	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2263/2516		
	2264/2522		
	2265/2530		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2266/2538		
	2267/2546		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2554		
	2269/2562		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2270/2570	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2578	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely. It will change the nature of the village to that of a small town. Acomb would be better able to absorb development of the scale proposed. Loss of green belt. Traffic is already subject to extensive delays into York and onto the A64. Very limited parking facility in the centre of the village near the shops and narrow streets are not sufficient to allow on street parking. Already problems with drainage and sewage, more housing would cause more problems.	2272/2586	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2594	
	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.	2274/2602	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2608	
		2276/2615	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them. Scale of development is far too big for the village to cope with. Additional cars will have a huge effect on congestion. Scale of development will put a strain on the existing sewerage and drainage. Schools are already at capacity. Copmanthorpe is a conservation area. Brownfield sites should be used before green belt land.	2282/2633	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2641	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2649	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2657	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2665	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded. Proposal to make the village 48% larger is unviable. Brownfield or semi brownfield sites should be used instead of prime agricultural land. Already major congestion into the city. Extra traffic in the village. Need to replace major village infrastructure such as new school and increase capacity of water services. 70% of housing would be for immigration related housing.	2287/2673	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel.	2288/2681		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2289/2689	
		2290/2696	
		2291/2704	
		2292/2712	
		2293/2720	
		2294/2728	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2295/2736	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2296/2744	
		2297/2752	
		2298/2760	
		2299/2768	
		2300/2776	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2301/2784	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2792	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2800	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2808	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2816	
		2306/2824	
		2318/2832	
		2319/2840	
		2320/2848	
		2321/2855	
	2322/2863		
	2323/2871		
	2324/2879		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2887		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2895		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2903		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2909		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2917	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with YCC.	2330/2924	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2932	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2940	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2947	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3156	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3164	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2953	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2960	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2968	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2976	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2984	
		2374/2991	
		2375/2999	
		2376/3006	
		2377/3013	
		2378/3020	
		2379/3028	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3035		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3042		
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.	2382/3058		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3065		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3073		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3081	
	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.	2386/3089	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3096	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3104	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3111	
		2390/3119	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3127	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3133	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3141	
		2394/3148	
		2395/3172	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3178	
	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.	2397/3186	
	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”.	2410/3194	
	Objection – need to widen roads and pavements not wide already. Need to extend the school. There is not enough room to improve the shopping centre and car parking. Houses won’t be affordable to first time buyers. Getting onto the bypass is dangerous, what will it be like with all the new cars?	2414/6578	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6648	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3201		
	2449/3209		
	2450/3217		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of the village suffer from drainage	2451/3248		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	problems, impact of extra water supply and drainage will be tremendous. Should concentrate efforts on maintaining and upgrading the existing system to cope. Suffering roads will only become worse.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will no longer be a village. Traffic levels would be intolerable.	2452/3225	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Pumping station already over capacity. Insufficient mains water pressure in the village. What will vision be like with another 600 houses? What are the plans to widen the village roads to accommodate all the additional traffic? All improvements must be in place before any new housing. Where will new children go to school? Shops are barely sufficient at present. No space for new shops or parking improvements in the centre of the village. Will GPs be able to cope with additional residents?	2469/2627	
	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.	2488/3232	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2489/3240	
	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.	2490/3255	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3357	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.	2494/3365	
	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.	2495/3373	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3380	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3388	
		2498/3396	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3404	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3412	
	2501/3420		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3333	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3349	
	Objection – building on prime agricultural land reduces the country’s ability and capacity to grow our own food. Cannot see how the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe could cope as there are problems now with water, drainage and sewage. Serious improvements need to be made to that infrastructure before any additional development. There are problems exiting the village and additional traffic will make this so much worse. Believe that through the parish council and local community areas can be identified where houses can be built (where there is a definite and justified requirement) without destroying agricultural land and the character of the village.	2559/6889	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3310	
		2570/3318	
		2571/3325	
	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. Village is large enough already, such a large increase will detract from the village community. There are insufficient facilities for such an increase – only a small central car park which is frequently congested. School is fully subscribed and playgroups and clubs are running close to capacity. The three access routes are already extremely busy, the volume and speed of traffic is dangerous. We do not have the necessary infrastructure to cope with the additional volume of traffic. There is no commitment made to improving sewage and drainage for the village. Loss of prime farmland.	2589/3302	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3428	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3435	
	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?	2610/3443	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3451		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3458		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3466	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3474	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3482	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3490	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3498	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.	2640/6014	
	Objection – how will the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe be able to absorb these numbers? How will the vehicles gain access/egress from the A64? How will the village school accommodate the influx of pupils? Need for drainage improvements.	2678/7106	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3576	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3584	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3590	
	Objection - object to the proposed plan to build additional housing on the outskirts of Copmanthorpe. Protect the Environment - the proposal to build 600 houses on greenbelt land does not meet this requirement. The agricultural land is home to considerable wildlife. In addition, the environmental impact due to insufficient sewage and drainage will impact the rest of the village. The increased congestion as the traffic queues due to there only being two main entrances/exits to the village will add to CO2 emissions. Chose to live in Copmanthorpe as its near enough to the centre of York, but at the same time very quick to get to the middle of nowhere by foot or cycle. The green space to the west of the village is a lovely space for my family to cycle and we regularly do this. Within a few minutes we are out of the urban landscape, and away from it all. Your plan makes a mockery of the Greenbelt protection. If Greenbelt does not protect the space, what is the point of Greenbelt if the council can ignore it. These things are there to protect us and the environment - no different to having a speed limit on the roads. What is the point of having it if certain organisations can ignore it? Get York Moving - in terms of the economy in York, the only industry left is tourism. Many of the larger corporate employers have been driven away. This is no particular fault of York, this is the way of corporates	2762/7302	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>these day, attempting to find ever more difficult ways to save money, e.g. Outsourcing. I fail to understand how building 600 homes on the Leeds/Harrogate side of York will improve the York economy. Build Strong Communities - Your plan to increase the size of the community by 30% has certainly brought the existing community together to oppose the plans! The plans suggest the new housing will be much more dense compared to the existing village, leaving the village lop-sided. How do you intend on bringing these two communities together? I would not be surprised if there is an amount of animosity towards the new residents. Copmanthorpe Primary School is a good school, achieving great success in its last OFSTED report. With the increase of 30% of pupils, what will happen to this? There is no room on the existing site to accommodate such an increase in pupils (assuming you don't allow the playing fields or Forest School area to be built on), so is there a plan to build a new school? Having two separate schools hardly builds a strong community. More likely, divides it into two, as the rivalry between two schools becomes established. Create Jobs and Grow the Economy - Please could you explain how building additional houses in Copmanthorpe will create jobs in York? The majority of our friends and neighbours living in Copmanthorpe do not work in Copmanthorpe or York. Due to Copmanthorpe's ideal location on the A64, I think the new houses will only attract workers commuting out of York. Will the council be imposing conditions on developers to ensure that the sale of any new houses will be restricted to those taking up the new jobs proposed to be created in York? Writing to you on behalf of my three children (aged 5, 3 and 3) who are already well aware of the need to protect the environment and of the need to reduce, re-use and recycle. They cannot understand why anyone would want to build on open fields when there are other areas which could be renovated first. Part of their understanding is due to a book they love. Perhaps the council and those involved in these plans could read this book themselves, and to their own children: The book concerned is: 'The Trouble with Dragons' by Debi Gliori. See response for extract from book.</p>		
<p>Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued</p>	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.</p>	<p>2932/4000</p>	
	<p>Objection – opposed to plans to build a considerable number of house in the area (affordable homes) for people moving into the York area. Land is green belt and prime agricultural land. Would it not be more sensible to build on land inside the inner ring road, spreading the development on several communities instead of building in large numbers in certain areas. When the A64/ring road was upgraded several parcels of</p>	<p>2988/4523</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	land were made unworkable or ruined by excavation why has this land not been earmarked for development. i.e. opposite new Park & Ride site, opposite new college on Simbalk Lane and the land on the left hand side on the approach to Copmanthorpe village (Fox and Hounds entrance). If development goes ahead will need to increase and improve all services. These services are already at breaking point. In widening the roads into Copmanthorpe will the trees be retained or replaced that were donated by a late Doctor I Wedgewood. Is the proposed development a mixture of houses? Suggest that houses to purchase are built facing manor health and part buy are built unto the estate. A limit on the height of these properties should be placed also enough parking spaces provided. As it is proposed that these houses are going to be built for people with a limited income would it not be better to find a site near the centre of town near shops and employment. Why is there no proposed development in Bishopthorpe, Askham Bryan, Acaster Malbis?		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4007	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No economic justification for the number of houses proposed. No consideration of impact on the village of extra vehicles and residents. At the moment the road struggles and the condition of the roads is very poor. Exit route to the A1237 needs some improvement.	3047/7904	
	Objection – loss of green belt and agricultural land. Insufficient sewage and drainage will impact on the rest of the village. Increased congestion. How will building 600 homes on the Leeds/Harrogate side of York improve the York economy? No room on the existing school site to accommodate an increase in pupils. New homes will only attract workers commuting out of York.	3082/7960	
	Objection – village has poor road and drainage infrastructure, inadequate parking in the village centre, too much car traffic and a reduced bus service. Increasing the population by 40% would destroy the nature of the village utterly.	3134/8070	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4015	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely alter community.	3283/4023	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4039	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4047	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe. Parish Council preparing own	3292/4031	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan. Concern over safety on roads due to additional traffic.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	3318/4055	
	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.	3327/4062	
	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. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.	3330/4070	
	Objection – proposal to build more than 600 extra houses in Copmanthorpe is unacceptable and impractical. The close proximity of open country to the heart of Copmanthorpe is an essential part of the village's character. The infrastructure of the village could not cope with the extra demands. The roads are already too congested and the water supply and sewerage systems are scarcely adequate for the present population. Local resources (shops, surgeries, school, library) while sufficient for current residents could not meet the needs of so many incomers.	3331/8515	
	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.	3412/4078	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4086	
	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.	3414/4093	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4101	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4109	
	Objection – the area is already much developed and cannot accommodate more housing on the scale being suggested.	3418/8736	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8867	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8874		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8843		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8851	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8859	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6022	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe roads are already heavy with traffic and there is very little parking for village amenities. The junction onto the A64/A1237 is extremely busy. Green belt land – there are still brownfield sites available.	3511/9436	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don't see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6029	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6036	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increasing the population by another 1250 people isn't feasible because of poor infrastructure – schools, sewers, water supply and road junctions. New building should be on brownfield sites. These proposals sacrifice prime agricultural land and green belt. Tadcaster Road to Micklegate Bar cannot possibly cope with all the potential developments in Copmanthorpe and the Tadcaster Road area. This proposal will encourage ribbon development along the A64. The area already floods on a regular basis and new build proposals will easily cause major flooding.	3621/9636	
	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.	3626/9315	
	Objection – it is inappropriate for the village to have such a vast increase in population. Drainage is already struggling. School is already at its full capacity. Roads struggle to cope with the vast amount of traffic. Development will destroy the animal habitats, including bats which are protected species. Area is green belt and brown belt land should be used first.	3720/10014	
	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. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council's Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	3726/5999	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – additional 600 homes would put a strain on local amenities. Village would not cope with another 1000+ cars on already busy roads, this would affect safety. The existing junctions are already overly busy. Parking facilities are already insufficient. Public transport links in the village are poor. School is already at full capacity. Doctor’s oversubscribed, shops and services will suffer. Additional housing would create a further strain on the electricity supply. Current surface water drainage and sewage system problems exist often causing local flooding. Detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside.	3727/10029	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6007	
	Objection – believe there are other brownfield sites in and around York which would be better suited to such development. Any further increase in housing will put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure and irrevocably change the nature of the village. Land is prime agricultural land. The open spaces and fields surrounding the village are regularly used by residents. Traffic congestion in the village will substantially increase – safety concerns. Major improvements to the exit roads from the village will be needed to cope with the increase in traffic. Sewage and drainage capacity needs improving – already prone to flooding in heavy rain. Shopping facilities and health provision and parking need to be improved. Will housing be sold to people than work in York, rather than commute elsewhere?	3820/10280	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would increase village by approximately 40%. Infrastructure and services cannot cope.	3888/4559	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3889/4567	
		3903/4586	
	Objection – object to the quantity of houses plan in Copmanthorpe. There is not an adequate transport network to cope with the extra housing. York does not require the additional of this many house, the Council should look at empty properties first. If land is greenbelt it shouldn’t be built on.	3966/10557	
	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.	4057/4689	
	Objection – although appreciate there is a need for additional housing in York considered that the scale and density of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe is inappropriate for the area. The plan appears to make no improvements to the infrastructure of the village which would be adversely affected by the significant increase in population. Three areas of concern – traffic, drainage and parking.	4099/10797	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Copmanthorpe has a pleasant rural location with a strong village community spirit. Please don't turn the village into a sprawling suburb of York with the associated inherent problems which that may bring.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – opposed to new homes in Copmanthorpe.	4128/10826	
	Objection – concerned that increasing the population size of Copmanthorpe by 40-80% will have a significant negative impact on the primary school which is already having to convert parts of the building, losing the library and school hall, in order to accommodate the number of pupils. If further expansion is required they will have no choice but to build on the playing fields. The loss of playing fields is advised against.	4168/10894	
	Objection – any further development in the Dringhouses/Woodthorpe/Copmanthorpe area will further increase pressure on the Tadcaster Road route in/out of the city. At peak times time route cannot accommodate the current traffic load.	4305/11173	
	Objection – opposed to house building in Copmanthorpe.	4328/11235	
	Objection – objects to the scale of the proposed development. A gross overdevelopment. Sees no mention of any plan for any infrastructure.	4329/11241	
	Objection - there is no economic justification for the number of new houses proposed. The infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development. Drainage - surface water regularly causes flooding in parts of the village as the drains are already over capacity Sewage - pipework through and out of the village is already at capacity Roads - upwards of 1,000 additional vehicles needing to gain access to York or the A64 to commute to Leeds will overwhelm the village's already congested roads. In particular the junction of Manor Heath with the A64/A1237 was not built to provide access for the current levels of traffic, any more will cause huge problems throughout the village. This junction would be extremely expensive to improve. School - already at capacity, the proposed new estates will require either a second school or major enlargement of the current one and there is no space for this in the village Health and Welfare facilities - operating at capacity already Water supply - pressure in the village is not good and properties on the edge of the village already experience problems with low pressure.	4343/11615	
	Objection – level of development proposed in Copmanthorpe will have a detrimental effect on quality of life or a whole variety of practical and cultural reasons. Drainage are at capacity now and will need totally replacing, is this realistically going to happen? The school is at capacity and children will no longer be able to play safely on the streets.	4389/11374	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	<p>Objection - the plan proposed the building of 600 houses in this village – an increase of over 33% on the existing 1760 houses. This, in itself, is unacceptable in that the village amenities – schools, shops, doctors, dentists – etc. could not possibly cope with such a huge increase. In addition, the majority of the village infrastructure – roads, drainage, water supply, etc. - are already at full capacity. To highlight the matter of road traffic, there are only 3 entrances/exits from Copmanthorpe. Leaving the village at morning rush hour is already a nightmare since access to the ring road (A1237) and the A64 towards either Leeds or York is via Manor Heath. With the addition of a further 600 houses, it is reasonable to estimate that a further 1000 vehicles would be attempting this and this would be simply disastrous.</p>	4405/11412	
	<p>Objection - no regard has been made to our neighbourhood plan which is due for completion at the end of this year and therefore no regard has been allowed for the residents of Copmanthorpe to provide housing which would blend in and not destroy our village. The number of houses proposed (an additional 560) on top of 1750 at the present is totally unrealistic. The increase to the local population of 1500 people is also totally unrealistic: The school is already at capacity. Further building will destroy the play areas, so vital to children’s education. Local amenities are already operating at full capacity particularly the healthcare. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and car parking for these will be unable to cope. A major concern and objection to the plan is the amount of traffic which will be generated. There are 4 roads in/out of Copmanthorpe, two of which feed into the already congested A64, two through the villages of Bishopthorpe and Colton- neither would be able to cope with the huge increase in traffic. Not only will the road capacity be compromised but the environmental damage from such an increase will also be huge.</p>	4412/11425	
	<p>Objection - no regard has been made to our neighbourhood plan which is due for completion at the end of this year and therefore no regard has been allowed for the residents of Copmanthorpe to provide housing which would blend in and not destroy our village. The number of houses proposed (an additional 560) on top of 1750 at the present is totally unrealistic. The increase to the local population of 1500 people is also totally unrealistic: The school is already at capacity. Further building will destroy the play areas, so vital to children’s education. Local amenities are already operating at full capacity particularly the healthcare. Water, drainage and sewage will not cope. Local shops and car parking for these will be unable to cope. A major concern and objection to the plan is the amount of traffic which will be generated. There are 4 roads in/out of Copmanthorpe, two of which feed into the already congested A64, two</p>	4414/11437	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	through the villages of Bishopthorpe and Colton-neither would be able to cope with the huge increase in traffic. Not only will the road capacity be compromised but the environmental damage from such an increase will also be huge.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	4434/5200	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can’t cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5207	
	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.	4451/5215	
	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.	4737/5280	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5330	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Out of scale with village. In green belt. Needs significant investment in infrastructure. A64 already congested. Traffic in village would increase. Shortage of parking. Issues with sewage system. Impact on wildlife and flora. Area is site of a roman settlement.	4761/5336	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5344	
		4763/5352	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. Adding 600 to 800 houses would destroy what we have. Schools cannot cope with proposed increased numbers. Youth Groups of village at capacity. Problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. Problems with car parking and road system cannot cope with extra traffic.	4764/5360	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5368	
	4766/5376		
	4770/5384		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – current village infrastructure is already having to cope at full capacity. Local Parking would not be able to handle the 50% increase in the current population. Will have significant impact on local drainage and sewage. Drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at its full capacity. Proposal builds on green field land when brownfield should be targeted first. There has been no consideration of the increased health care needs for the community. Disruption to local wild life, in particular bats. It is prime farmland.	5137/12452	
	Objection – during wet weather the drainage and sewage system does not cope. The school, car parking in the village and the vehicle exit routes from the village are all currently operating at full capacity and could not cope with such a large expansion of housing, cars and primary school children from the proposed additional 600 houses in copmanthorpe in total.	5166/12303	
	Objection – along with other proposals for Copmanthorpe this site will fundamentally alter the nature of the village increasing its size by circa 40%. The housing density is inappropriate for a village and will further negatively affect the ambience of the village. What is the justification for greater housing density on Greenfield sites than on brownfield ones? There is no indication that there will be adequate vehicle parking arrangements for residents of the new housing. There is no indication in the plan as to why prime agricultural land should be developed for housing when there is a national requirement to ensure that the UK maximises its own food production. No indication in the plan that the Council will ensure that any and/or all developers of the houses the council wants to build will first ensure that all infrastructure improvements will be completed before any housing is commenced. No indication that the Council acknowledges that there are already infrastructure pressures in Copmanthorpe. The plans for Copmathorpe will be entirely self defeating.	5186/12391	
	Objection – high objection, present traffic is of serious concern. It is unimaginable the damage this proposal will do.	5200/12422	
	Objection – does not agree with plans for Copmanthorpe. The number of houses proposed is too high.	5202/12426	
	Objection - as a minimum, I think all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York's Green Belt. This should be the basis of the Plan.	5223/12508	
	Objection - object secondly to the scale of the development proposed for Copmanthorpe. The addition of 600 houses to the village would increase its size by around 35%, which is simply unsustainable. Many of the village amenities are already overstretched: the village school is full, the centre of the village struggles to cope with	5239/12575	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the car parking, the drains and sewers are already stretched to capacity and regularly flood with heavy rain, the water pressure is substandard at times of heavy demand, the electricity supply is regularly subject to faults, and the access points into the village by car are already incredibly congested. There would have to be significant investment in such infrastructure to enable any large-scale development to take place.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are thoroughly inappropriate given the size and atmosphere of the village, will have a catastrophic impact on life in the village and a significant impact on enjoyment and property values. Copmanthorpe is not an appropriate location.	5508/14896	
	Objection – if houses are built in Copmanthorpe all it will do will create cheap housing or people that work in Leeds. Where are all the children going to go to school in Copmanthorpe, the school is already full to the brim.	5511/14906	
	Objection – the proposals for so many houses would turn Copmanthorpe into a small town.	5514/14909	
	Objection – concerned that the village cannot cope with so many extra houses. The school is already full to capacity and so many more cars would add significantly to traffic. Not convinced that there is any real need to build so many extra houses given the state of the housing market and the numerous houses in the village that already can't sell.	5515/14915	
	Objection – do not think that the village of Copmanthorpe can support the proposed housing.	5516/14921	
	Objection – object to the plans for 600 houses in Copmanthorpe. The infrastructure cannot cope as it is and the A1237 requires upgrading before considering adding new houses. There are plenty of empty homes/offices in the York area that should be used first. Adding an extra 600 homes to Copmanthorpe is not sustainable, with 30% affordable homes will bring its own unique set of problems. York is an ancient city lets not turn it into a major city like Leeds. Copmanthorpe is a village lets not turn it into a town.	5518/14929	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed for the village is far too large. Do not see the evidence for why so many are needed and believe this would have a detrimental effect on the local community. The character of the houses proposed is not in keeping with the village. There is not sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with these houses. The main road through the village is heavily congested. Do not believe the local primary school has capacity to consider this plan in full. May impact on ability of children in current homes to attend Tadcaster Grammar.	5553/13016	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – too many houses to be built in Copmanthorpe. There is little or no infrastructure to support it with school places, few doctors, adequate access and egress roads and other vital facilities. Residents in the new homes will all need to get in their several cars per household to get to where the facilities are.	5556/13029	
	Objection – the scale of development proposed for Copmanthorpe is completely out of proportion to its current size. Areas of concern are: infrastructure – drains, roads, junction of Manor Heath and A64 slip road; primary school capacity and the feed to appropriate secondary schools; shopping and car parking facilities; adequate health car provision.	5747/13556	
	Objection – what about the increase in school capacity, doctors surgeries and dentists? How does Copmanthorpe school cope with the influx of families who will be occupying the hundreds of houses expected to be built there?	5750/13568	
	Comment – the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development. Key infrastructure problems are drainage and roads.	5760/13621	
	Objection – to add 560 to 1750 houses in Copmanthorpe is unsustainable as this would have a negative impact on all infrastructure and local services which would not be able to cope with additional houses. All services would require overhaul and significant upgrade including schools, drainage, highways, healthcare and local shops. Adding these houses would overwhelm the local highway network. Land is long established green belt land.	5766/13639	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure of the village cannot support the addition of the proposed housing. The roads are too narrow to allow vehicle flow where vehicles are parked on the road. Parking at the shop is at capacity. The drainage system seems at or beyond capacity. Water pressure is often poor, surely the addition of further households will exacerbate this? Loss of wildlife and good agricultural land.	5787/13704	
	Objection – too much housing proposed on Copmanthorpe boundary, these will bring in commuters from Leeds and not help York housing.	5799/15012	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6228	
	Objection – loss of wildlife. Essential that the green belt surrounding the western side of the village is left to counteract the pollution from the very busy, noisy A64. School is already overcrowded. Hundreds of new families would put a strain on what few community facilities exist in Copmanthorpe.	5807/6236	
	Objection – grave worries about the houses to be built in Copmanthorpe, in particular	5844/13831	
	5856/15114		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	roads and infrastructure. The roads in the village are at present disgusting and a danger to cyclists, how will they cope with an extra minimum 500 cars. In addition how will the cars leave the village to access the A64 it is bad enough with the number at present.		
Site H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe continued	Comment – in relation to the proposed housing in Copmanthorpe, where will 600 children go to school plus 600 vehicles or more trying to get out of Manor Heath onto the A64.	5909/15233	
	Objection – surely the villages have a right to preserve their history as well as the city centre?	5946/15296	
	Comment – some more housing will help sustain local services and hopefully improve public transport. The junction at the top of Manor Heath will need improvement. The school could do with more children from within the catchment to reduce school associated traffic caused by children coming in from outside the catchment.	6232/15796	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure. Existing problems at Manor Heath and Tadcaster Road junctions. Parking is a problem and Main Street not wide enough to deal with additional traffic. Lack of surface and sewage drainage. Loss of agricultural land. Primary school is full. No proposal to build a further GP surgery. Existing parking in the shopping centre is inadequate. Loss of dog walking routes.	6292/15907	
	Objection – lack of transport infrastructure. Existing problems at Manor Heath and Tadcaster Road junctions. Parking is a problem and Main Street not wide enough to deal with additional traffic. Lack of surface and sewage drainage. Loss of agricultural land. Primary school is full. No proposal to build a further GP surgery. Existing parking in the shopping centre is inadequate. Loss of dog walking routes.	6293/15913	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15923	
	Objection – the volume of houses proposed will change the whole character of the village. Loss of prime agricultural land. Appear to be no plans to accommodate the amount of extra traffic, people, drainage etc. School is already full.	6320/15976	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6325	
	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.	6433/6332	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6340	
	6435/6348		
	6457/6369		
	6467/6390		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H40 West Fields, 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.	6486/6436	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals are unsustainable and will have a detrimental affect on the physical and emotional environment of the village.	6525/16518	Brian Bell Carpets Ltd
	Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for housing.	Petition 9	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H41 Land ADJ 26 & 38 Church Lane, Bishopthorpe	Comment- Bishopthorpe conservation area. There will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the conservation area.	238/14085	English Heritage
	Comment - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/2124	NFU
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6649	
	Comment- it is considered that sites H41 and H42 identified as potential housing sites on the Bishopthorpe proposals map will not provide enough housing for the settlement to ensure its viability in the long run. H42 is a brown field site and may have visibility issues. Site H41 appears to be an orchard or sorts and a valuable strategic gap within the development limits in the village.	2769/7322	
	Objection- opposed to 24 new homes on two sites to the north of Bishopthorpe village.	4128/10830	
	Objection- specifically the strategic housing sites outside York and the ring roads. As a minimum all the land outside the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York's green belt. Don't believe that building a large housing estate separate from York will in any way safeguard York heritage rather than meeting local housing needs it will draw an influx of new people to York which is already struggling with problems of congestion.	5223/12509	
	Objection – there is already considerable congestion in Bishopthorpe and a further 24 homes will certainly not improve the situation.	5666/13333	
	Objection- agree wholeheartedly with Julian Sturdy's thoughts about the council's local plan re Bishopthorpe.	5889/15192	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H42 Builder Yard, Church Lane, Bishopthorpe	Comment- Bishopthorpe conservation area. Need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14086	English Heritage
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6650	
	comment- it is considered that sites H41 and H42 identified as potential housing sites on the Bishopthorpe proposals map will not provide enough housing for the settlement to ensure its viability in the long run. H42 is a brown field site and may have visibility issues. Site H41 appears to be an orchard or sorts and a valuable strategic gap within the development limits in the village.	2769/7323	
	Objection- opposed to 24 new homes on two sites to the north of Bishopthorpe village.	4128/10831	
	Objection- object to the Local Plan, specifically the strategic housing sites outside of the York ring roads. As a minimum I think all land outside of the A64 and A1237 should be considered as York’s Green belt. Don’t believe that building a large housing estate separate from York will in any way safeguard York heritage, rather than meeting local housing needs it will draw an influx of new people to York which is already struggling with problems of congestion.	5223/12510	
	Objection – there is already considerable congestion in Bishopthorpe and a further 24 homes will certainly not improve the situation.	5666/13334	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe	Comment- together with Askham Richard, Askham Bryan is a village often visited by residents of Copmanthorpe who are concerned that the numbers of these vehicles will increase if the proposals to build 600 additional homes in Copmanthorpe are allowed to go ahead.	53/12607	Askham Bryan Parish Council
	Objection – to add a further 560 houses with an additional population of almost 1500 persons is not remotely sustainable. The development of the ‘safeguarded’ land would double the size of Copmanthorpe and turn it into a town requiring substantial infrastructure investment.	57/12621	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Comment- would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this area are not harmed.	238/14087	English Heritage
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of new houses proposed would put at risk Copmanthorpe’s identity as a village.	917/3051	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only. 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.	1053/3342	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/626	
	Objection- the road system would not be able to deal with the increases traffic flows. The sewage system cannot cope. The primary school would not be able to cater for more pupils, shopping is catered for in the village at the present time, but a great increase in the population could not be served. This would lead to more people driving to supermarkets. Medical facilities the doctors surgeries could not cope with the increase in patients the proposed developments would bring. The communities ‘village feel’ would be eroded by the vast developments proposed; to the general detriment of the present population.	1124/17070	
	Objection- the infrastructure of the village is completely inadequate to cope with an additional 1200 residents in terms of water supply, sewerage and A64 junction at Manor Health. Improvements to the facilities and infrastructure of the villages are required in advance of any additional housing development. Only within the last year the committee rejected an application to build a wind measuring mast on the same land in connection with a wind farm proposal.	1176/17096	
	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.	1504/2182	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	1884/10	
	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 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.	1885/16	
	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.	1886/24	
	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.	1888/36	
	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.	1892/47	
	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.	1917/117	
	Objection- housing development needs to be limited planned realistically and fully thought through. Problem with the green belt encroachment again. Copmanthorpe is already a large village. Village character at heart. Doubling the size of the settlement and will take away the character that remains. How is the infrastructure going to cope with this. Drainage schools and so on also the loss of quality farmland in the green	1933/9920	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	belt location the semi rural idyllic nature of much of outer York is important too just as a historic centre.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	1940/177	
	Objection- Copmanthorpe infrastructure must be reinforced sewage system in Copmanthorpe is already at capacity. Like wise the rain water drains. The exit roads are already congested. There is no allowance made for car parking and the density of houses is much greater. The doctors are at full capacity and so is the school. Parking at the shops is very difficult. Why build on prime agricultural land instead of brown field sites within the city of York.	1941/185	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1942/190	
	Objection- The infrastructure in Copmanthorpe is not going to be able to cope with the strain that it would put on schools, roads, water, sewage, drainage and health care. The use of green belt land is very valuable agricultural land. Must strongly be resisted so it can be preserved for future generations. The wind farm was turned down about a year ago. They are not efficient use up of agricultural land and effect the habitat of the wildlife. Part of the ring road dual carriage way is ludicrous and would only increase the congestion.	1943/195	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis.	1954/237	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Areas of proposed development are habitat for rare farmland birds and mammals.	1959/251	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Habitat for some threatened species of wildlife would be lost in fields beyond Manor Heath.	1960/259	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1961/267	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change whole feel of village.	1962/275	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1963/282	
		1964/290	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise and volume of traffic from A64 already affecting lives.	1965/298	
	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.	1966/306	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road safety – another 600 cars would be	1967/314		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	extremely dangerous.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	1968/322	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town. York and surrounding villages do not need 22000 extra houses.	1969/330	
	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.	1970/338	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/346	
		1972/354	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of new services would make proposals unworkable.	1973/361	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Moor Lane too narrow to handle more traffic.	1974/369	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Use brown field sites. No need to concrete over green fields. Will create problems with regard to overcrowding.	1975/376	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1976/382	
		1977/390	
		1978/398	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York overcrowded with cars and people. Do not need further expansion.	1979/405	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1980/413	
		1981/421	
		1982/428	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads are not being maintained.	1983/436	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not suitable place for this amount of houses. Countryside should be protected.	1985/446	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village not a city. Already enough growth in the last years.	1986/454		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Entries and exits to village already congested. Further 1200 vehicles will make it impossible.	1987/462		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1988/470		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Volume of housing not necessary. Insufficient jobs in York for current population. Expansion not needed.	1989/477		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Develop city centre/sites near to city centre	1990/485		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy village character OF Copmanthorpe. At present insufficient police to deal with unruly elements which will get worse.	1991/492	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1992/500	
	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.	1993/508	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1994/522	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Is there a need for so many houses?	1995/529	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1996/537	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe cannot sustain this level of development. Would ruin pleasant rural village. Would become suburb of Leeds.	1997/545	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If keep on top of repairs to homes, roads, lights etc. would have no Objection.	1998/553	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1999/559	
		2000/567	
		2001/575	
	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.	2002/583	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2007/6485	
		2011/610	
		2012/618	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 1500 jobs have been lost in last 4 months. Do not destroy the lovely City of York.	2013/634	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2014/642		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should not expand too much and become a suburb of Leeds	2015/649		
	2016/657		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2017/665		
	2018/673		
	2019/679		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2020/687	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village too large as it stands. Roads are never repaired.	2021/695	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Economic situation is poor. Job creation needed before people can afford housing. Local people will be unable to afford them.	2022/702	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2023/710	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not many shops in village. Parking at shopping precinct often completely full.	2024/718	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter character of village.	2025/726	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads not maintained already without more roads being built. Copmanthorpe is a small village not a town. School already full.	2026/734	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2027/740	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plenty of other sites to build on before Copmanthorpe. Village infrastructure will not cope.	2028/748	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2029/755	
		2030/762	
		2031/769	
		2032/775	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development is too big.	2033/782	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and school cannot cope with extra cars and pupils.	2034/790	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Local shops poor. No parking around local facilities. Roads congested and in need of repair.	2035/798	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy character and fabric of village.	2036/806	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough shops or other facilities.	2037/814	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2038/822	
		2039/830	
2040/838			
2041/846			
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.	2042/854		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2043/862		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Residents on west side of Copmanthorpe already suffer constant noise from traffic. Proposed development will make this worse.	2044/870	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Public transport is woefully inadequate.	2045/878	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2046/885	
		2047/893	
	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.	2048/901	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Insufficient car parking already a problem.	2049/909	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service inadequate for social housing and modern mixes of housing would look terrible.	2050/917	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2058/940	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Already a problem with traffic which would become worse.	2059/947	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Enough run down properties in York to develop before spoiling countryside and animal habitats.	2060/955	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking very limited in village and amount of building proposed would make this worse creating more danger for pedestrians and cyclists.	2061/961	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2062/969	
	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.	2063/975	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2064/983	
		2065/991	
	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.	2066/999	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2067/1006	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Speeding traffic on Manor Heath a serious issue already, congestion will make it more dangerous.	2068/1014		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2069/1022		
	2070/1029		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will overwhelm all existing structures in area.	2071/1036	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2072/1044	
		2073/1052	
		2074/1060	
	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.	2075/1068	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How are all new residents going to get about as current bus service is inadequate?	2076/1076	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2077/1084	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village amenities not sufficient to accommodate significant increase in residents. Concerned about disregard for preserving green belt land.	2078/1091	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2079/1099	
		2080/1106	
		2081/1114	
		2082/1122	
	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.	2083/1129	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2084/1137	
		2085/1145	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2086/1152	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Retail area of village not good enough or large enough to prevent people from travelling.	2087/1160	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development alters nature of village.	2088/1167	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Number of extra cars generated by huge influx of new houses.	2089/1173		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2090/1179		
	2091/1187		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Manor Heath to A1237/A64 will become even more congested with additional rush hour traffic.	2092/1195		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2093/1203	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Parking already congested and dangerous.	2094/1211	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in number of cars generated will severely test parking in village which is already very often full. Insufficient industry to sustain occupants of new homes.	2095/1219	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2096/1226	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic pollution. Local bus service inadequate.	2097/1232	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2098/1240	
		2099/1248	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt land. Ruin York.	2100/1255	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt should be sacrosanct. Traffic problems on A64 near Tesco.	2101/1263	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2102/1269	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change character of village environment. Need to think about large number of smaller schemes for housing.	2103/1277	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Objection to scale of development and how a small village can accommodate this scale of development.	2104/1285	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No or inadequate level of consultation with community leading to development of Local Plan.	2105/1292	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green field sites designed to protect rare wildlife and rural culture of villages. Development on this scale will destroy both.	2106/1300	
	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.	2107/1308	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Building as proposed will take away identity of village life. Suggest a park or wild flower meadow.	2108/1316	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2109/1324	
		2110/1332	
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.	2111/1340		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main concern is brown/green field sites	2112/1348		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	situation.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2113/1356	
		2114/1364	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Noise from trains and A64 is enough.	2115/1372	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Vacant, unused and derelict buildings in and around York should be used before green belt land.	2116/1380	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change village into a sprawling suburb.	2117/1388	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2118/1396	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More flooding and loss of allotments.	2119/1403	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Development will spoil village.	2120/1410	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2121/1418	
		2122/1426	
	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.	2129/1441	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2130/1449	
	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.	2131/1457	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2132/1465	
		2133/1473	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Plans will create another Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield etc. the damage will be irreversible.	2134/1481	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will remove village feel.	2135/1489	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is a village. Scale of development unjustifiable. Increased amount of traffic which would be generated.	2136/1496	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1504	
		2138/1512	
	2139/1520		
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.	2140/1528		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2141/1536		
	2142/1552		
	2143/1559		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No consideration has been given to existing village community.	2144/1567	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would spoil outlook from village for those who live on Manor Heath.	2145/1575	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Type of houses being built may not be in line with current houses.	2146/1582	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2147/1590	
		2148/1598	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased traffic in and around village. Copmanthorpe already big enough.	2149/1606	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 houses is excessive and would have great impact on quality of life. If so many houses are needed would be better to build a small town rather than piecemeal in Copmanthorpe. 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 and already have parking problems.	2150/1614	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Maintenance is not at its best, without increasing population.	2151/1620	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Countryside and green space must be protected for future generations.	2152/1628	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2153/1635	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1643	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village has grown big enough. Problems already with drainage.	2155/1650	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads and pavements already in a poor state.	2156/1658	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not enough information on road layouts.	2157/1666	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2158/1674	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density of proposed developments inappropriate in rural village communities.	2159/1681	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2160/1689		
	2161/1697		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not the demand for 22000 houses around	2162/1705		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	York.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed density of housing will result in poor quality development.	2163/1713	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2164/1721	
		2165/1728	
		2166/1736	
		2167/1743	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy surrounding countryside and green belt area.	2168/1749	
	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.	2169/1757	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1764	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increased number of cars resulting from proposal will cause more accidents on A64/A1237 slip road.	2171/1772	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2172/1780	
		2173/1788	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. General amenities in village already poor.	2174/1796	
		2175/1803	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2176/1809	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too much traffic now and too many buses.	2177/1817	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need more information for sites such as layouts and how this will benefit community as a whole.	2178/1824	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1832	
		2180/1848	
		2181/1856	
		2182/1862	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concern over state of road surfaces.	2183/1870		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2184/1878		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village does not need to be any bigger. Build on brown sites. Not enough doctors, schools etc.	2185/1886		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2186/1894		
	2187/1910		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will dramatically destroy nature of village.	2188/1918		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Infrastructure cannot cope.	2189/1926	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2190/1933	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Drainage infrastructure needs improving. Not arguing against expansion and development but scale due to infrastructure issues. 200 homes is more realistic. Increased traffic and demand on amenities is a problem.	2191/1940	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need improved bus service. Concern over increase in traffic.	2192/1948	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2193/1956	
		2194/1964	
		2195/1972	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are people living in new houses to work? What arrangements for additional access through village to be made?	2196/1980	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2197/1988	
		2198/1996	
		2199/2003	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2200/2011	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village cannot cope – shops, school, doctors and roads.	2201/2018	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2202/2026	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads unsuitable for major traffic with little opportunity to widen main road.	2203/2034	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density inappropriate in rural village community.	2204/2042	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Does not have infrastructure. Copmanthorpe is a village not a town.	2205/2050	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Reduce number of homes to 200.	2206/2056		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. How is access through village on to A64 going to be managed? Another slip road is necessary.	2207/2064		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Schooling. Overpopulation.	2208/2072		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot cope with this amount of development.	2209/2079	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Acaster Malbis has a disused airfield which could be better used.	2210/2087	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2211/2095	
		2212/2103	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Necessary for health and well-being to have open green spaces and important to protect countryside for future generations.	2213/2111	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2214/2119	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Increase in traffic volumes unacceptable through village. Junction of Moor Lane and Station Road already dangerous.	2215/2134	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Facilities of village unable to provide for people now. Proposed development out of all proportion.	2216/2142	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If there are going to be 3 storey houses built, these will not fit in with village.	2217/2150	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2218/2158	
		2219/2166	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No bus service.	2220/2174	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe will change from a village into a commuter built up area.	2221/2190	
	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)?	2222/2198	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too many vehicles/buses through village now. Difficulty at busy times exiting Manor Heath onto A1036 at College times.	2223/2206	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed number of houses would destroy village nature of Copmanthorpe.	2224/2212	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2225/2220	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is large enough already.	2226/2228	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter nature of village.	2227/2236	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2228/2243	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. There are 4 active badger setts on the proposed development site.	2229/2251		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will the hedge and trees lining Manor Heath	2230/2259		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be destroyed?		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2231/2267	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. York road system already over congested.	2232/2275	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Sad if growth turned York into another large city taking away its unique history.	2233/2283	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2234/2291	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Accept more housing required but not on proposed scale. Suggest 150 - 200.	2235/2298	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Main street in village will not cope with extra traffic.	2236/2306	
	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.	2237/2313	
	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.	2238/2321	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Primary school already near capacity. Village could not cope with extra traffic.	2239/2329	
	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.	2240/2336	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2241/2344	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Concerned about impact on local school. Develop all brown field sites across York first.	2242/2352	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2243/2360	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads in Copmanthorpe already ruined from so much traffic. School overcrowded etc.	2244/2367	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2245/2375 2246/2383	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Road junctions in and out of Copmanthorpe congested now.	2247/2391		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Need facilities for proposed amount of houses. Insufficient car parking.	2248/2398		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2249/2406	
		2250/2414	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Where are all the cars going to get out on the A64 and bypass?	2251/2422	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2252/2430	
	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.	2253/2438	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals would further impair quality of life.	2254/2446	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2255/2454	
	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.	2256/2462	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2470	
		2258/2477	
		2259/2485	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2260/2493	
		2261/2501	
		2262/2509	
		2263/2517	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2264/2523	
		2265/2531	
		2266/2539	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal would increase number of properties by almost 40%. This is too high a percentage for any village to accept.	2267/2547	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2268/2555	
2269/2563			
2270/2571			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 plus new cars not acceptable.	2271/2579		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposed expansion will alter Copmanthorpe completely.	2272/2587		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2595		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village centre could not cope with increase in	2274/2603		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)	
	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.			
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2609		
		2276/2616		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Loss of amenity through building on land that currently has rights of way through them.	2282/2634		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. No employment for larger number of people housing will attract.	2283/2642		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2284/2650		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Agree Copmanthorpe needs more new homes but suggest 100 not 600.	2285/2658		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2286/2666		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Planning stipulations disregarded.	2287/2674		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More houses will destroy village feel of Copmanthorpe.	2288/2682		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis		2289/2690	
			2290/2697	
			2291/2705	
			2292/2713	
			2293/2721	
			2294/2729	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Should develop brown field sites and the large land banks that most builders own.	2295/2737		
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis		2296/2745	
			2297/2753	
			2298/2761	
			2299/2769	
		2300/2777		
		2301/2785		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would change community of village.	2302/2793			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2303/2801			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Once green field sites become brown field sites that piece of countryside is lost forever. Should be protected.	2304/2809			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2305/2817	
		2306/2825	
		2318/2833	
		2319/2841	
		2320/2849	
		2321/2856	
		2322/2864	
		2323/2872	
		2324/2880	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who is going to buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2888	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2896	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Look at wider issues. Who are the thousands queuing to come to York?	2327/2904	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Rush hour traffic already too heavy. A new road to Bilborough Top junction A64 now needed.	2328/2910	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2918	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why must we expand? This is a never ending spiral. The only extra permanent jobs will be with YCC.	2330/2925	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Not fair to change Copmanthorpe.	2331/2933	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A figure of 600 houses seems disproportionate. A figure approaching 50% of this will be more realistic.	2332/2941	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2333/2948	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will protect wildlife that inhabits these green filed sites?	2367/3157	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2368/3165	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of expansion will have enormous negative impact on culture, feel, community and essence of village.	2369/2954		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will alter dynamics of village turning it into a small town.	2370/2961		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Green belt wrong location.	2371/2969		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. New houses have been for sale in area for years, no more needed.	2372/2977		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2373/2985	
		2374/2992	
		2375/3000	
		2376/3007	
		2377/3014	
		2378/3021	
		2379/3029	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Brown field sites should be developed before other sites considered.	2380/3036	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal will again change character of village.	2381/3043	
	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.	2382/3059	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2383/3066	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Seems no proper consideration has been given to infrastructure.	2384/3074	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2385/3082	
	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.	2386/3090	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. 600 more houses means increasing size of village by 35%. Just not practical.	2387/3097	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Total congestion on ring road. New bypass or flyover will be required.	2388/3105	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2389/3112	
		2390/3120	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. All traffic will have to use main street – bad enough at present. Road cannot be widened.	2391/3128	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village community will be lost.	2392/3134	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2393/3142		
	2394/3149		
	2395/3173		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Gas and electric reinforcement schemes will be required causing major disruption in a small environment.	2396/3179		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe Continued	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.	2397/3187	
	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”.	2410/3195	
	Objection- all the roads will have to be widened, the footpaths aren’t wide enough and will cost a lot of money. It will cost an awful amount of money to extend the school, improve the shopping centre and car parking. There is not enough room. Not many people will be able to afford that especially first time buyers. The A64 and getting on and of the bypass is dangerous as it is. What is it going to be like with all the new cars that are going to travel on it?	2414/6579	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6651	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3202	
		2449/3210	
		2450/3218	
		2451/3249	
		2452/3226	
	Objection- what would the village be like with an additional six hundred houses?!	2469/2628	
	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.	2488/3233	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2489/3241	
	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.	2490/3256	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2493/3358		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Bus service has been reduced. Need road repairs not more cars.	2494/3366		
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.	2495/3374		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals will completely alter environment in Copmanthorpe.	2496/3381	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2497/3389	
		2498/3397	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. A little building in most rural locations would be of benefit. Copmanthorpe is already fully developed.	2499/3405	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2500/3413	
		2501/3421	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would fundamentally change character of village.	2524/3334	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would destroy nature of Copmanthorpe and remove amenity of open country views and land to walk.	2525/3350	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3311	
		2570/3319	
		2571/3326	
	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	2589/3303	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2608/3429	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Council has a duty of care for environment and green belt which must be upheld.	2609/3436	
	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?	2610/3444	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic safety and access.	2611/3452	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would become an overspill for York rather than keeping the village life.	2612/3459	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2613/3467	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Too high a concentration in one village. Should be more evenly distributed around York.	2614/3475	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2615/3483		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe exists as a village. Will become just another suburb and lose its character.	2616/3491		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2617/3499		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife on important greenfield	2640/6015		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	site. Noise of construction unreasonable. Traffic problems.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Comment – consideration needs to be given as to how vehicles from the development will access the A64. How will the village school accommodate the influx of pupils? There should be improvements in the drainage.	2678/7107	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3577	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Density implies low grade housing estate type development rather than a rural type environment.	2690/3585	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Has been rushed. Can't expect a conservative village to accept drastic planning.	2691/3591	
	Objection- cannot understand why anyone would want to build on open fields when there are other areas which could be renovated first.	2762/7303	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Traffic exiting Copmanthorpe at T-Junction leaving Manor Heath is congested. Don't need it to be worse.	2932/4001	
	Comment- in view of the present housing in the village would it not be more appropriate to build houses bungalows which are keeping.	2988/4524	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4008	
	Objection- no economic justification for the number of houses proposed. Made an impact on the village of extra vehicles and residents at the moment the road struggles and the condition of the roads in Copmanthorpe is very poor. Moor Lane the road is not suitable for new housing. Building houses so close to the railway line at the bottom of Moor Lane should be considered as not a good idea as recently it has been reported of a high speed rail link to York.	3047/7905	
	Objection- object to your proposed plan to build additional housing on the outskirts of Copmanthorpe. Protect the environment the proposal to build 600 new houses on a green belt land does not meet the requirement for many reasons. The agricultural land, insufficient sewage and drainage will impact on the rest of the village, increased congestion, land is also agricultural land. The plan makes a mockery of the green belt protection. Fail to understand how building 600 new homes on the Leeds/Harrogate site of York will improve York's economy. There is no room on the existing site to accommodate such an increase in pupils.	3082/7961	
Objection- poor road and damage infrastructure hopelessly inadequate parking in the village centre, too much car traffic and a reduced bus service. Would be to destroy the nature of the community utterly. The question of wind farms to smuggle outline plans for major industrial construction into the local plan.	3134/8071		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4016	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Copmanthorpe is between A64 and main railway line. Adding more traffic means more noise pollution and would completely alter community.	3283/4024	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4040	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Original planning of Acaster Airfield with link road to A64 gives better option. Should initially create jobs. Not justified.	3289/4048	
	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.	3292/4032	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable. Housing density higher than currently in Copmanthorpe.	3318/4056	
	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.	3327/4063	
	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. Brown field sites should be regenerated and used before considering green field sites.	3330/4071	
	Objection- the authors of the plan failed to take into any account of the work being undertaken by Copmanthorpe Parish Council and therefore of the interests and wishes of residents. The proposal in the plan to build an additional 600 houses in Copmanthorpe is unacceptable and impractical. The close proximity of open country to the heart of Copmanthorpe is an essential part of the village’s character. The infrastructure already cannot cope. The roads are too congested. The supply and sewage systems in the village are scarcely adequate for the present population. Local resources such as shops, schools, doctors, and library. Copmanthorpe could not meet the needs of some many incomers.	3331/8516	
	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.	3412/4079	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3413/4087	
	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.	3414/4094	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3415/4102	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will change village and surroundings into a sprawling town.	3416/4110	
	Objection- concerned about the proposed developments around Copmanthorpe this areas is already much developed and can not accommodate more housing in the scale that is being suggested.	3418/8737	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3451/8868	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Scale of development is excessive.	3497/8875	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8844	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Consider building a new town to north of York instead of this disruptive scheme.	3499/8852	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would be a need to reopen railway station as roads cannot cope with another 1000 cars in village.	3500/8860	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3501/6023	
	Objection- heavy with traffic and little parking. The traffic gridlocked when buses and lorries are trying to get through. The junction on to the A1237/A64 is extremely busy from 7am. The road is very narrow, green belt land should be kept permanently open to prevent urban sprawl and the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate. There are still Brownfield sites available. No need for this amount of houses to be built.	3511/9437	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Prefer to see new communities developed instead of disrupting existing ones. Don't see need to extend Copmanthorpe.	3552/6030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3553/6037	
	Objection- to increase the population of Copmanthorpe from 1750 to another 1200 people isn't sensible because of the schools, sewers, water supply and road functions. New building should be built on brown field sites. These proposals not only sacrifice agricultural land but also in the green belt. Tadcaster road from the college to Micklegate bar cannot cope. Could bear in mind the potential new developments on the old park and ride site at Askham Bar and the development of the old college site. Urban sprawl should be contained. This proposal will encourage ribbon development along the A64. Brownfield sites should be prioritised. Building these houses could	3621/9637	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cause flooding on a regular basis.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	3626/9316	
	Objection-object to the development in York and particularly the 600 houses in Copmanthorpe struggling with the drainage on Wilsop farm. The drains cannot cope already. The local school is already at full capacity. The roads struggle with vast amounts of traffic; it will destroy the habitats for the animals. Bats are supposed to be protected species. Green belt land- brown belt land should be used first.	3720/10015	
	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. Parish Council preparing own neighbourhood plan. Council’s Planning Team has not sought local input before publishing draft plan.	3726/6000	
	Objection- an additional 600 houses would put a strain on the village/local amenities. The village would not physically cope with another 1000 cars already on busy roads. Children’s safety will be affected. The existing junctions are already overly busy. Many accidents near the Copmanthorpe junction. Parking facilities is already insufficient. Current transport links are poor. The primary school is full. Additional houses will create a further strain on the electricity supply. Current surface water drainage and sewage system problems exist and local flooding. The wind farm proposal got rejected. Detrimental effect on the surrounding country side.	3727/10030	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6008	
	Objection- strongly objects the proposals for the substantial increase in housing in Copmanthorpe. I fail to see how the proposals can possibly be in the interests of the residents of this village and believe that there are other sites around York which would be better suited to such a development. Copmanthorpe is already a large village. The land surrounding Copmanthorpe is prime agricultural land why is the city council proposing to build on this rather than looking to develop brown field sites around the city. The open spaces and fields surrounding Copmanthorpe are regularly used by residents for general walking, bird watching, walking dogs and children who can play and roam safely all of which play an important part in the general wellbeing	3820/10281	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>of the residents. The traffic congestion will substantially increase. Major improvements to the exit roads from the village will be needed to cope with the increase in the traffic caused by such development. Traffic congestion will start to increase during the start and the finish of school. A high level of risk of a serious accident to those children who walk or cycle to school already exists and will worsen with the extra demand. How is the city council going to improve the infrastructure in the village to cope with the increase of demand? The sewage and drainage capacity of the village several areas of the village already prone to flooding after heavy rain. The council will need to replace the surface water and sewage pipes throughout the village. The shopping facilities and health provision what proposals are there going to be to improve the car parking and shopping facilities in the village. A lot of residents walk to and from the shops/church/surgery. The roads need to be wider. Whilst there may be an overall increase in housing in York what conditions will the city council impose on developers to ensure that any housing built will be sold to people who work in York rather than communities outside York such as Leeds and Manchester, the local plan proposals are predicted on an increase in jobs in York. How can the city council be confident that such jobs will materialise in the future and at a time of recession and job losses in York.</p>		
<p>Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued</p>	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would increase village by approximately 40%. Infrastructure and services cannot cope.</p>	3888/4560	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis</p>	3889/4568	
		3903/4587	
	<p>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.</p>	4057/4690	
	<p>Objection- although I appreciate there is a need for additional houses in York area. I believe the scale and density of housing proposed in Copmanthorpe is appropriate for the area. The plans appear to make no improvements to the infrastructure of the village which would be adversely affected by the significant increase in population. The four areas are traffic, drainage, parking and wind farm proposal.</p>	4099/10798	
	<p>Objection- nearly 600 new homes to the west of Copmanthorpe and a further 55 acres taken out the green belt and safeguarded for future development.</p>	4128/10827	
	<p>Objection- concerned that increasing the population size of Copmanthorpe by 40%-80% will have a significant negative impact on the primary school which already has to convert parts of the building losing the library and the school hall in order to</p>	4168/10895	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accommodate the number of pupils.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection- Copmanthorpe is only a small village. Infrastructure is unsuitable to bear with such a increase. Development in this area is a bad idea.	4328/11236	
	Objection- the Copmanthorpe development of 600 houses is far too large. If added to the potential of the "safeguarded land this could lead to over 1100 new homes. This is a gross over development. No mention in the plan about infrastructure.	4329/11242	
	Objection- no economic justification. The infrastructure cannot cope, drainage surface regularly causes flooding. Sewage is already at capacity. Roads are already congested junction of manor health. School is already full capacity. Health and welfare facilities operating at capacity already. Water supply pressure in the village is not good. Building on prime agricultural land. Wind farm was rejected. An addition 600 is not sustainable.	4343/11616	
	objection- Copmanthorpe itself, objections arise from the disproportionate scale of development an increase of 35% and will effect this will have on quality of life in the village as well as several practical concerns: it will mean that the whole feeling of being fundamentally rural location will change easy access to the fields for walking, rural views, the sense of being part of the countryside will be a lost to a land extent. The practical objections i have to the scale of development are the following: drainage- at the moment when there is heavy rainfall the drains are at the bottom of the road. If more housing are going to get built on the filed at the back this problem is going to get worse. The road we live in is very quiet where children can children can play on the streets. The school is at capacity now children are getting taught in corridors And there playing field will get knocked down which they appreciate.	4389/11375	
	Objection- an increase of over 33% on existing 1760 houses. In itself is unacceptable. The school, shops and whole village possibly cannot cope with this increase. The majority of the village's infrastructure roads, drainage and water supply are already at full capacity. Main street is already congested. To imagine that a few hundred more cars could be attempting to use this road is unthinkable and no thought seems to have been given to this.	4405/11413	
	Objection- no regard has been made to this neighbourhood plan. Green belt prime agricultural land or areas which could be refurbished could be used. Increasing and never ending cost of food so to destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous.	4412/11426	
	Objection- no regard has been made to this neighbourhood plan and it is meant to be finished by the end of this year. Green belt prime agricultural land or areas which could be refurbished could be used. Increasing and never ending cost of food so to	4414/11438	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	destroy prime agricultural land is ridiculous. Wildlife are going to get threatened the loss of this land would be devastating. The wind farm by Banks was refused to protect this area.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	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.	4434/5201	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Roads can’t cope. Some expansion is possible. 200 to 300 houses over 10 years more realistic.	4436/5208	
	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.	4451/5216	
	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.	4737/5281	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4758/5331	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Out of scale with village. In green belt. Needs significant investment in infrastructure. A64 already congested. Traffic in village would increase. Shortage of parking. Issues with sewage system. Impact on wildlife and flora. Area is site of a roman settlement.	4761/5337	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5345	
		4763/5353	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Village atmosphere will disappear. Adding 600 to 800 houses would destroy what we have. Schools cannot cope with proposed increased numbers. Youth Groups of village at capacity. Problems with flooding leading to sewage spilling over. Problems with car parking and road system cannot cope with extra traffic.	4764/5361	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4765/5369	
		4766/5377	
	4770/5385		
Objection - objection to the proposal build a further 600 house in the Copmanthorpe	5137/12453		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>area. The current village infrastructure already has to cope at full capacity. Local parking would not be able to handle the 50% increase in the current population. The building of these additional homes will have a significant impact on the local drainage and sewage and drains cannot cope already. The Local school already has its full capacity. The proposal builds on green field site. When brown fields should be targeted first. There has been no consideration of the increased health care needs of the community. Disruption to the local wildlife. In particular the bats that fly past houses on a regular basis. This is an area of prime farmland.</p>		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	<p>Comment- the council's proposal is to build an additional 600 houses in Copmanthorpe. The village currently has 1760 houses so this is an increase of more than one third. During wet weather the drainage and sewage system does not cope with the current housing stock. The school, the car parking in the village centre and the vehicle exit routes from the village are all currently operating at full capacity and could not cope with such a large expansion of housing, car and primary school children.</p>	5166/12304	
	<p>Objection- the Council's proposal for Companthorpe are inappropriate for the following reasons the proposal will fundamentally alter the nature of the village increasing size inorganically by circa 40%. The proposed housing density is inappropriate for a village and will further negatively affect the ambience of the village. What is the justification for requiring greater housing density on green field sites than on Brownfield ones? There is no indication that there will be adequate vehicle parking arrangements for residents of the new housing. There is no indication in the plan as to why prime agricultural land surrounding Companthorpe should be developed for housing when there is a national requirement to ensure that the UK maximises its own food production. There is no indication in the plan as to how the council wants to be built will first ensure that the infrastructure improvements will be completed before any housing is commenced. There are already infrastructure pressures in Companthorpe. One area suffers from poor rainwater drainage due to low water pressure. Both junctions on the A64 and the Northern relief road are under intense pressure at peak times already. The reality is that Companthorpe is an attractive location for people who currently live and work in the West Yorkshire and parts of South Yorkshire and who wish to relocate to a pleasant low crime area whilst continuing to work in their current locations. Consequently the council plans for Copmanthorpe will be entirely self defeating. Will the council try to ensure that future private resale's are restricted to workers in York or is this a little too Stalinist to</p>	5186/12392	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	stomach.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection- do not agree with the Local Plan in the Copmanthorpe area. The numbers of proposed houses are too high and wind farms should not be included in the plans.	5202/12427	
	Objection- objection to the city of York Local Plan. Specifically the strategic housing sites outside of the York ring roads. As a minimum all the land outside of the A64 and the A1237 should be considered as York's Green Belt. Don't believe that building a large housing estate separate from York will in any way safeguard York heritage, rather than meeting local housing needs it will draw an influx of new people to York which is already struggling with problems of congestion.	5223/12511	
	Comment- the Councils Local Plan is based upon strongly-disputed figures on the growth of the economy of the city of York of the number of jobs that will be created as a result and on the number of houses that might be required; in the draft local plan the figure of nearly 1200 houses being needed each year is clearly out of line with experts forecasts which place that number nearly 25% lower. Objection- Objection secondly to the scale of the development proposed for Copmanthorpe. The addition of 600 houses to the village would increase its size by around 35% which is simply unsustainable. To add development of this scale to the west of the village would overwhelm the existing infrastructure. The development of the additional 'safeguarded' land would turn it from a village into the size of a small town. Many of the village amenities are already overstretched: the village school is full and the centre of the village struggling to cope with the car parking, the drains and sewers are already stretched to capacity and regularly flood with heavy rain, the water pressure is sub-standard at times of heavy demand, the electricity supply is regularly subject to faults, and the access points into the village by car are already incredibly congested. These would have to be significant investment in such infrastructure to enable and large-scale development to take place. To develop the western side of the village would also skew its population significantly away from the current centre; the suggestion that additional retail facilities or an additional school should be built ignores the fact that having a clear centre, a single school, and clearly defined boundaries are important elements of its character.	5239/12576	
	Objection- the proposed developments in Copmanthorpe are thoroughly inappropriate given the size and the atmosphere of the village will have a catatonic impact on life and a significant impact on enjoyment and property values.	5508/14897	
	Objection- the proposal for so many houses would turn Copmanthorpe into a small town and erode the green belt. Why not build on a brown field site rather than on	5514/14910	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	prime agricultural land. Astonished that the wind farm proposal is back on the agenda after being firmly rejected by planning committee last year in the face of massive local opposition. No one would want to live in any of the proposed new house if there were huge wind turbines built so close to their homes, concerned on the local wildlife and in particular bats by building on the green belt land.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection- concerned that the village cannot cope with so many extra houses. The school is already at full capacity and so many cars would add to more traffic. Not convinced that there is any real need either to build so many extra houses given the state of the housing market and the numerous houses in the village that already can't sell. Worried about building on to green land this would harm a small village. Strongly oppose building a wind farm near Copmanthorpe. Wind power only exists at all as an industry because of government subsidies and will not meet the future power needs for the country. This is not an appropriate use of green belt land.	5515/14916	
	Objection- doesn't think that the village in Cmpanthorpe can support the proposed housing.	5516/14922	
	Objection- infrastructure cannot cope. There are plenty of empty homes and offices in the York area that need to be used up first. Adding on extra 600 homes to cop is not sustainable with 30% affordable homes/local authority homes will bring its own unique set of problems.	5518/14930	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed for the village is far too large. Do not see the evidence for why so many are needed and believe this would have a detrimental effect on the local community. The character of the houses proposed is not in keeping with the village. There is not sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with these houses. The main road through the village is heavily congested. Do not believe the local primary school has capacity to consider this plan in full. May impact on ability of children in current homes to attend Tadcaster Grammar.	5553/13017	
	Objection – too many houses to be built in Copmanthorpe. There is little or no infrastructure to support it with school places, few doctors, adequate access and egress roads and other vital facilities. Residents in the new homes will all need to get in their several cars per household to get to where the facilities are.	5556/13030	
	Objection – the scale of development proposed for Copmanthorpe is completely out of proportion to its current size. Areas of concern are: infrastructure – drains, roads, junction of Manor Heath and A64 slip road; primary school capacity and the feed to appropriate secondary schools; shopping and car parking facilities; adequate health car provision.	5747/13557	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – what about the increase in school capacity, doctors surgeries and dentists? How does Copmanthorpe school cope with the influx of families who will be occupying the hundreds of houses expected to be built there?	5750/13569	
	Comment – the infrastructure in Copmanthorpe cannot cope with so many additional residents and improvements must be completed before any additional development. Key infrastructure problems are drainage and roads.	5760/13622	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure of the village cannot support the addition of the proposed housing. The roads are too narrow to allow vehicle flow where vehicles are parked on the road. Parking at the shop is at capacity. The drainage system seems at or beyond capacity. Water pressure is often poor, surely the addition of further households will exacerbate this?	5787/13705	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6229	
		5807/6237	
	Objection – the school is already overcrowded. Hundreds of new families would put a strain on what few community facilities exist in Copmanthorpe.	5844/13832	
	Comment- have worries about the houses to be built in companthorpe in particular roads and infrastructure. The roads in the village are at present disgusting and a danger to cyclists how will they cope with an extra minimum 500 cars. In addition how will the cars leave he village to access the A64 it is bad enough with the numbers we have.	5856/15115	
	Comment- where will 600 more children go to school plus 600 vehicles or more is trying to get out of Manor Health onto the A64.	5909/15234	
	Comment- some more housing will help sustain local services (shops, medical, library, post office) and hopefully improve public transport. Manor health would need improvement and the merge on to the A64. The local school could do with more children from school traffic associated.	6232/15797	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Additional 600 houses not sustainable.	6297/15924	
	Objection- will change the whole character and the village life of Copmanthorpe. It seems fitting for such a historical and widely admired city of York to be bordered by villages, and for those villages to be bordered with green belt areas. Building on prime agricultural land to accommodate the amount of extra traffic, people and drainage. Yet to be convinced of the justification for the number of houses. The primary school is already full parents are concerned about the class sizes.	6320/15977	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6432/6326	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Developments will cause significant traffic	6433/6333		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and public service issues. Will destroy beautiful green surrounding landscape that makes Copmanthorpe such an attractive place to live.		
Site H43 Manor Farm Yard, Copmanthorpe continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6341	
		6435/6349	
		6457/6370	
		6467/6391	
	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.	6486/6437	
	Objection- at present the local amenities and infrastructure are sufficient but feel that the considerable increase in housing proposed would be unsuitable and have a detrimental affect on the physical and emotional environment of the village. Companthorpe has motorway and rail on two of its borders our green areas are very limited. It would be a travesty to build on green field sites and appeal to the council to re-assess their strategy	6525/16519	Brian Bell Carpets Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington	Comment – the parish survey revealed that of those returning the survey 27.5% were in favour, 36.5% were against and 30.6% expressed no opinion.	59/12649	Dunnington Parish Council
	Comment – this site lies within Dunnington Conservation Area. It is considered that the loss of this open area may result in harm to that part of the Conservation Area. There will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot would make to the character of the Conservation Area.	238/14088	English Heritage
	Comment – could possibly be suitable for retirement properties, with footpaths to the doctors and the village centre. The land drains at the corner of Garden Flats Lane and Petercroft Lane is very poor and blocks regularly.	945/16980	
	Objection – too much additional housing does nothing for the environment or countryside.	961/16991	
	Objection – adding bulk to our population by way of the proposed new housing would reduce the quality of facilities currently on offer throughout the village.	981/17007	
	Comment – the developer could be required to make improvements to the road infrastructure which will improve the safety of vehicle users and pedestrians. Being contained within a confined area is less imposing.	995/17026	
	Objection – the site lies in the Dunnington Conservation Area. The Dunnington Village Design Statement Guideline 9 states that the preservation of open spaces within the village should be encouraged, including the retention of large garden plots. It is a wildlife haven, with mature trees.	1109/17196	
	Objection – Petercroft is situated within the village Conservation Area and thought should be given to retain a link to its agricultural past.	1898/6044	
	Objection – the proposals will lead to urban sprawl to the village, with the village ending up like other villages in the York area.	1913/97	
	Objection – it is important to preserve the existing green spaces in the village centre. The development will increase traffic at the Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction by the surgery.	2349/6538	
	Objection – the volume of traffic and overloading at school, the doctors and dentist would have a disastrous effect.	2407/6567	
	Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6652	
	Objection – against extra housing, want to keep the village a village. The school and sewerage cannot cope with the influx of people with all the proposed housing allocations.	2467/6746	
Objection – if further housing has to be proposed in the village, it should be made a priority that the drainage system and tap water be made completely up to standard to	2533/6817		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cope with the influx. It is a health hazard.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – Dunnington is a gem of a village and such developments should not be allowed to happen.	2552/6867	
	Comment – affordable housing would seem appropriate.	2556/6877	
	Objection – much concern about extra houses, when the primary school is full and there is traffic everywhere, particularly much congestion on York Street. Residents would prefer not to have any extra housing as it would spoil the village completely and the infrastructure would not cope. Drainage is already a problem.	2558/6883	
	Objection – disagree with the area to be allocated for housing. The village drainage system is unable to cope with the existing demands of the housing.	2561/6896	
	Objection – the proposed housing would put extra pressure on local services, such as schools and health care.	2583/6926	
	Objection – the proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own Design Statement. Dunnington has serious surface water drainage problems causing flooding – any additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Additional development will put a further strain on the sewerage system. Development in the proposed area will change the character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features and ancient native hedgerows. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to existing congestion and its inherent road risks, particularly at junctions. Development will increase the demand for parking and increase congestion. Further expansion will destroy the unique historic character of Dunnington.	2594/6948	
	Objection – all sense of community will be crushed and amenities will be overwhelmed by the force of numbers.	2623/6967	
	Support – there is a need for smaller and low cost housing so that senior citizens can downsize and remain in the village.	2642/7004	
	Objection – it would be dangerous in terms of access, especially for pedestrians and school children. Respondents to the Village questionnaire (2004) had a unanimous feeling that the village was already ‘fully built’ and that no further development was either wanted or needed. Are the feelings of residents to be ignored? Also, Dunnington Primary School cannot adequately cope with any additional pupils as a result of such allocations.	2646/7016	
	Objection – it would be dangerous in terms of access, especially for pedestrians and school children. Respondents to the Village questionnaire (2004) had a unanimous	2647/7020	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	feeling that the village was already 'fully built' and that no further development was either wanted or needed. Are the feelings of residents to be ignored? Also, Dunnington Primary School cannot adequately cope with any additional pupils as a result of such allocations.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Support – Dunnington is capable of absorbing such development. This land would be ideally suited towards providing sheltered or more easily managed properties for older people because of the proximity to shops, buses, and other main village amenities.	2661/7046	
	Objection – the development of any housing site in Dunnington would create concerns for the infrastructure of the village. The roads are already inadequate and poorly maintained. The same applies to drainage and sewerage. Basic facilities in the village, including the school, would be stretched.	2666/7062	
	Objection – the village is big enough, don't want to become another sprawling town. Want to keep Dunnington as a village.	2677/7099	
	Objection – the proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington's own Design Statement. Dunnington has serious surface water drainage problems causing flooding – any additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Additional development will put a further strain on the sewerage system. Development in the proposed area will change the character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features and ancient native hedgerows. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to existing congestion and its inherent road risks, particularly at junctions. Development will increase the demand for parking and increase congestion. Further expansion will destroy the unique historic character of Dunnington.	2679/7113	
	Objection – the proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington's own Design Statement. Dunnington has serious surface water drainage problems causing flooding – any additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Additional development will put a further strain on the sewerage system. Development in the proposed area will change the character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features and ancient native hedgerows. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to existing congestion and its inherent road risks, particularly at junctions. Development will increase the demand for parking and increase congestion. Further expansion will destroy the unique historic character of Dunnington.	2682/7123	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the development of this site would be detrimental to the landscape and put pressure on the facilities in the village.	2697/7154	
	Objection – the roads within the village are narrow and parking difficult – to generate more cars from new housing will have a negative impact on the village especially at Church Balk, Petercroft Lane, Four Lane Ends and Common Lane.	2707/7169	
	Objection – this development would adversely affect the character of the village.	2708/7177	
	Objection – the cumulative effect of developing the 4 sites in Dunnington will have an impact on the character of the village – more built up area, less open space, existing services under strain. Will the school be able to cope? More congestion too.	2709/7183	
	Support – this site may be sustainable, although an upgrade to the drainage and sewerage system would be required.	2711/7189	
	Objection – any more housing in Dunnington would require additional sporting land and a lot of money spending on basic infrastructure (sewerage and schooling)	2713/7199	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Objection - the effect of all the proposed housing sites in the village would be too large for Dunnington. Brownfield sites should be developed before green field ones. More development would lead to more congestion, amenities could not cope and there would be more car parking problems.	2714/7206	
	Objection – the narrow roads are already congested, and couldn't sustain more traffic, parking is also a concern, main junctions in and out of the village are a concern and more traffic would increase the problems, there are concerns for pedestrian safety of increased traffic, brownfield sites should be developed first, the sewerage / drainage system is already working to maximum capacity, the new housing would be too close to existing residences impacting on natural light ("plunging some into a state of perpetual darkness"), destroy the unique character of the village and stretch the local amenities beyond their limit.	2726/7226	
	Objection – the development will increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft / Church Street junction. The development is on one of the few green spaces in the centre of the village.	2736/7250	
	Objection – there is no evidence for the need for this level of housing. The local health, education, transport and sanitary infrastructure will struggle to cope with such a dramatic increase	2743/7266	
Objection – would lead to significant increase in the amount of traffic in the village, they would put further strain on the drainage system increasing flooding, and the proposal would eradicate one of the few remaining green areas within the village	2778/7352		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	impacting on the character and overall attractiveness of the village.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the site is in the Conservation Area and is an important part of the village’s agricultural past. It will increase the problems of the surface water drainage in the village, and exacerbate road junction problems.	2779/7359	
	Objection – the infrastructure will not support the number of houses proposed for this and the other sites proposed in Dunnington. There is a drainage problem which could lead to flash flooding.	2781/7371	
	Support – do not object as there is some need to grow.	2793/7409	
	Objection – the proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own Design Statement. Dunnington has serious surface water drainage problems causing flooding – any additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Additional development will put a further strain on the sewerage system. Development in the proposed area will change the character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features and ancient native hedgerows. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to existing congestion and its inherent road risks, particularly at junctions. Development will increase the demand for parking and increase congestion. Further expansion will destroy the unique historic character of Dunnington.	2836/7510	
	Comment – the need for housing in York is well known, but the enlargement of Dunnington should be restricted so as not to destroy the village life which the residents value so much.	2840/7526	
	Objection – it will remove one of the few green spaces in the village, traffic movements in and out of the village will be increased, significant expenditure will be needed to resolve surface drainage and sewerage problems.	2842/7532	
	Comment – what safeguards will be put in place to control extra flooding due to the new housing? The sewerage system is at full capacity. There would be extra traffic & congestion in the village.	2914/7631	
	Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic caused by the extra building will add to the chaos on local roads and the proposed building will cause flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields.	2915/7638	
	Comment – provided the drainage / sewage and highways issues surrounding development of this land can be overcome, then no objection would be raised.	2916/7644	
	Objection – loss of green space and an increase in traffic.	2941/7691	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – further housing is not justifiable, impact on traffic, will threaten serious water drainage issues, greater strain on parking and high ways issues. Dunnington is a village and long may it remain so.	2942/7698	
	Comment – whilst it is understood that some more homes are needed, the main problem will be that a better sewage / and flood protection work would need doing, and roads would need to be wider.	2947/7706	
	Support – this is probably the best out of the plans proposed as there would be less cars, if any. Homes suitable for people wishing to downsize and stay in this lovely village would be good.	2957/7717	
	Objection – object to the proposed housing site.	2967/7745	
	Objection – object to the proposed housing site.	2968/7749	
	Objection – the proposed developments in Dunnington would add considerable strain on the already oversize village. The infrastructure would need to be improved, the sewage and tap water would need to be updated / renewed, and the school would need to be expanded.	2984/7768	
	Objection – the proposed developments in Dunnington would add considerable strain on the already oversize village. The infrastructure would need to be improved, the sewage and tap water would need to be updated / renewed, and the school would need to be expanded.	2985/6204	
	Objection – no to any housing development. Lovely village would be spoilt with any housing.	3027/7876	
	Support – do not object to this proposal.	3056/7913	
	Objection – the current drainage and utilities are already over stretched, many of the footpaths and roads around the village are in much need of repair and any building would increase the risk of flooding.	3089/7975	
	Objection – where will cars park when using the doctor’s surgery, or is that also being turned into housing? The volume of traffic on Eastfield Lane will have a detrimental effect on an already busy junction with Church Balk.	3122/8040	
	Support – no objection to the infill at Petercroft Lane.	3136/8078	
	Objection – more building, of any type, would be of great detriment to the traditional way of life in Dunnington. The village has reached its maximum and the local amenities are stretched to their absolute limit. The site is within the Conservation Area and is a beautiful little copse, rich in wildlife. It is one of the few green spaces left in the village and should be treasured. There will be an adverse effect on wildlife. It will create extra traffic through the village, especially along Petercroft Lane and Garden	3146/8102	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Flats Lane.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the development would increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The development is on one of the few green spaces in the centre of the village.	3176/8171	
	Comment – this development, although closer to the village amenities will add to the traffic at the already hazardous junction of Petercroft Lane / Church Street. This site would make an ideal site for sheltered housing, or housing for the elderly. Although not many people see this site, it is one of the only green areas within the centre of the village, situated next to the Scout and Guide headquarters.	3247/8340	
	Support/comment – the proposed development is supported provided that the developer improves the drainage and sewage systems to eliminate the risk of flooding and the backing up of sewage and the developer improves the road infrastructure for the safety of all users.	3265/8381	
	Objection – should be retained to preserve the village’s identity and reference to its past.	3290/8438	
	Objection – should be retained to preserve the village’s identity and reference to its past.	3291/8446	
	Objection – object to the cumulative effects of all the Dunnington residential allocations (and Whinthorpe & Derwenthorpe), especially in terms of the infrastructure and road network, loss of green space and congestion.	3293/8455	
	Objection – Dunnington has managed to retain its village feel despite its closeness to York. However, there is concern that the developments in and around Dunnington will result in a loss in identity and community involvement. The proposed developments will be too big and out of scale with the village. Concerned about the impact of the extra housing on schools, extra space would be required for the increased number of classes. Secondary school pupils from Dunnington normally attend Fulford School, however, this is already large and any increase in pupil numbers will create problems. Traffic will also be a concern, especially in the village centre. The drainage in the village is chancy at best, and the eastern end of the village is where all the water ends up.	3310/8489	
	Comment – the development would have an impact on this quiet area. No strong objections to this site.	3368/8642	
	Comment – like the other proposed sites in Dunnington, there are problems with drainage and sewage. However, because the site is small, these problems could be overcome. The Council is missing an opportunity though, as this is a prime site for	3383/6056	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sheltered accommodation, as it's in the village centre, near shops, bus routes and the only feasible NHS practice for elderly residents.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Support – do not oppose the development of this site.	3402/8715	
	Objection – the developments in Dunnington would have an adverse impact on traffic in the village. Despite the volume and acknowledged speed of the traffic, there are no designated crossings within the village and no plans to introduce any. Not against future housing development in the village in principle, however they must be accompanied by clear proposals to address the traffic issue which the Council is aware of. In the absence of such information, it must be assumed that no proposals exist, giving no choice but to strongly object to the housing developments.	3408/8727	
	Objection – this is inappropriate development within the existing Conservation Area, and raised highway safety problems.	3431/8760	
	Support - this site would be classed as infill development, so would not be regarded as a major issue.	3434/8763	
	Objection – Dunnington has an on-going concern with drainage, flooding and sewage and the proposed developments would only exacerbate the problem and put further stress on an already over stretched drainage system.	3446/8827	
	Support - this site would be classed as infill development, so would not be regarded as a major issue.	3464/8896	
	Comment – no objection, providing the correct infrastructure is put in place – e.g. more roads, drainage etc. Over development will destroy its unique character.	3471/8910	
	Objection – the developments in Dunnington would increase congestion and destroy the unique character of the village.	3509/9431	
	Comment – a very small development could be accommodated on this site.	3523/9465	
	Objection – proposed developments in Dunnington would destroy character of the village, put pressure on local amenities, impact on flooding / drainage, increased traffic etc	3589/9560	
	Support – if houses do need to be built in Dunnington, this site may be acceptable.	3590/9568	
	Objection – all the proposed sites in Dunnington suffer from floods and require major investment for roads, water and sewage.	3610/9604	
	Objection – development here would increase traffic along Petercroft Lane, passing the surgery and through the awkward Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. However, of the 4 sites proposed in Dunnington, this one has the fewest negative points as it is in a confined area and near to shops and amenities in the centre of the village.	3614/9616	
	Comment - the housing proposals for Dunnington are a little ambitious, would affect	3636/9653	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	its attractiveness and rural character and would need to improve the village infrastructure. No provision is made for drainage / sewage disposal, road improvements, mains services, as well as extra pressure on the village school, health centre, and the only comprehensive food shop in the village, parking and traffic would also be an issue.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – the proposals have been formulated without reference to the impact on the existing village, characterised in Dunnington’s own Design Statement. Dunnington has serious surface water drainage problems causing flooding – any additional development will make the problems worse and increase the risk of flooding. Additional development will put a further strain on the sewerage system. Development in the proposed area will change the character and aspect of the village and impact on important geological features and ancient native hedgerows. Development will increase the number of road users which will add to existing congestion and its inherent road risks, particularly at junctions. Development will increase the demand for parking and increase congestion. Further expansion will destroy the unique historic character of Dunnington.	3679/9698	
	Objection – any further building in Dunnington would create issues as the mains services would not be able to cope with the extra residents. Flash flooding is a frequent occurrence as the drains cannot cope. Power cuts were also all too frequent following previous building of new housing developments.	3681/9707	
	Comment – suggest a small complex of privately owned flats and / or bungalows for the elderly, a level site next to a doctor’s surgery and shops.	3689/9729	
	Objection – all the proposed developments in Dunnington would result in highway safety issues for road users, children and pedestrians crossing the roads by increasing the amount of traffic and parking issues along small narrow roads and hazardous junctions that currently exist in the village. Additional traffic will cause traffic and safety issues. Surface water drainage and sewage is also a concern.	3690/9735	
	Comment – the extra cars and extra people need to be considered – getting in and out of the village rush hour times is already difficult. The school is already bursting at the seams.	3699/9750	
	Objection – green space for agriculture, nature reserves, or just to make the country a pleasanter place to live in, is becoming very scarce. Dunnington has a strong sense of community if the village population increases, this will be lost.	3748/10143	
	Objection – the development will increase the traffic on Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The development is one of the few green spaces in the centre of the	3756/10160	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village. The village is unable to absorb any further development of any size, without major alterations to the infrastructure, which would seriously affect the charm and character of the village. We wish as far as possible to retain the current culture and charm of the village. If development of any nature is to take place the single most important thing that must receive attention is the drainage, sewerage and surplus water, as there are already problems in all these areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. At some point in the village surface water passes through the same system as sewerage which makes the situation much worse.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – provided the drainage / sewerage and highways issues surrounding the development of this land can be overcome, no objection would be raised.	3765/10174	
	Objection – the development will increase the traffic on Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The development is one of the few green spaces in the centre of the village. The village is unable to absorb any further development of any size, without major alterations to the infrastructure, which would seriously affect the charm and character of the village. We wish as far as possible to retain the current culture and charm of the village. If development of any nature is to take place the single most important thing that must receive attention is the drainage, sewerage and surplus water, as there are already problems in all these areas. Additional properties elsewhere in the village would aggravate the situation with rain entering the surface water drains more quickly. At some point in the village surface water passes through the same system as sewerage which makes the situation much worse.	3798/10237	
	Comment – would like the Council to consider a complex of privately owned flats for older people with communal rooms and a garden (similar to McCarthy & Stone Developments). There is nowhere in the village for people to downsize to when the house is too big or the garden gets too much. A new development will mean more housing becoming available in the village and people would be able to stay locally with their friends. It has a level walk to the amenities and right next to the doctors.	3823/10292	
	Objection – the site is a conservation area. The infrastructure is already at capacity. The school is full. Traffic is dangerous and accidents will certainly happen.	3853/10350	
	Comment – new houses are required but not the numbers envisaged in Dunnington.	3858/10369	
	Comment – no opposition to additional housing around Dunnington, but if this goes ahead, it will itself create a greater need for additional retail, education and leisure facilities.	3870/10397	
	Support – building on the small parcel of land behind the doctors surgery will have the	3871/10402	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	least visual impact on the village as it is completely surrounded by trees.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – if more houses must be built, then build them on Common Road on the land proposed for the travellers site, not on the precious hilltops and slopes and not surrounding the cemetery.	3876/10412	
	Objection – the proposed increase in the number of dwellings in the village would have a huge detrimental impact to the village’s resource and add further traffic and pollution to the village. The village spirit will be lost with the new development. The roads are already busy, and an increase in the number of cars and buses will create extra danger.	3887/10433	
	Comment – happy to support a small area of house building in Dunnington village to provide a share of the need for more housing stock. However, the following should be considered before any developments are approved: deal with inadequate sewerage / drainage system, acknowledge the potential traffic problems, possibly include some bungalows for the elderly.	3918/10457	
	Objection – the site is one of the few green spaces in the centre of the village. The development will increase the traffic on what is the worst road in Dunnington. Totally inappropriate and unnecessary as well as being in a conservation area.	3932/10472	
	Objection – site is within a Conservation Area and should be retained as an important reminder of the villages agricultural past.	3934/10479	
	Objection – the site is in a Conservation Area, development here would change the visual appearance and amenity of this central part of the village with its reference to the village’s agricultural past. The loss would outweigh the gain in housing stock and is therefore inappropriate.	3941/10490	
	Comment – one of the few remaining green spaces in the centre of the village. The group of mature trees on the site makes a major contribution to the attractiveness of the village. If open to the public, would make a welcome sheltered quiet spot in the centre of the village.	3944/10496	
	Objection – it will increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. One of the few green spaces in the village centre. The site is within a Conservation Area and should be retained as an important reminder of the village’s agricultural past.	3945/10503	
	Objection – the infrastructure to support it does not exist. The present drainage system cannot cope with storms and localised flooding takes place. The incidence of power cuts increases when new development occurs in the village (the Council should insist that all utilities are upgraded by the developer BEFORE any development takes	3952/10516	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	place). The road network is inadequate to cope with the extra traffic in the village. The junction of Petercroft Lane / Church Street and York Street is dangerous, as is the junction from Eastfield Lane and Church Street. There is already parking blight in the village. There should be no further housing development in Dunnington until the road network is upgraded to cope with additional traffic. Outside Dunnington, Grimston Bar cannot cope with the traffic at peak times.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – whilst this is the smallest area proposed for housing, it would provide some much needed housing, although 6 homes hardly helps to alleviate the problems. A nice green space, but in private hands affords nothing to the village. Perhaps the owner could be persuaded to let the adjoining Brownies / Scouts and Guides use it for recreational and practice camps.	4029/10663	
	Objection – this would increase traffic which would increase the danger at the centre of the village. The site is located within a Conservation Area.	4045/10704	
	Comment – provided the drainage / sewerage and highways issues surrounding the development of this land can be overcome, no objection to this site would be raised.	4092/10780	
	Comment – no particular objection to this site, although the loss of trees and shrubs would significantly reduce the natural habitat for birds, small animals and insects at the heart of the village.	4142/10855	
	Objection – the site is in the Green Belt and should be retained in its current use.	4252/11029	
	Comment – if any development is to take place in Dunnington, then the preference should be for the site H44 (but within the Conservation Area), with consideration for specialist accommodation for over 70's. However, Dunnington should not have to take such a large number of developments overall. The historic character of the village should be retained and no development should take place before the surface water drainage and sewerage problems are resolved. Additionally, there would be an increase in traffic and consideration needs to be given to improving a number of junctions in the village.	4257/11041	
	Comment – prefer no further development in Dunnington, but accept that housing is required. If development were to take place on this site, account should be taken of wildlife, access and drainage problems. More needs to be spend on drainage before there is any more housing.	4270/11084	
	Objection – oppose all further housing development in the village until or unless the serious state of the surface water drainage and foul sewer system is addressed by City of York Council or developers. This must be before any development takes place. Comment – any infill development on this green space garden fronting on to Church	4401/4906	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Street would have to fit in with the conservation area. Vehicular ingress via Garden Flats Lane to Petercroft Lane will increase the traffic at the hazardous Petercroft / Church Street junction.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – disagree with any new houses because the sewerage system is already overloaded, lots of roads are very narrow and cannot cope with the extra traffic.	4503/11536	
	Would agree to any infill.	4549/11554	
	Objection – the roads are too narrow and crowded with traffic already, and the school can't take more pupils.	4591/11573	
	Objection – will increase traffic movements in the village and will further threaten the serious drainage and surface water issues. Will put extra pressure on the oversubscribed doctors and school.	4640/11771	
	Objection – the site is in a Conservation Area and should be retained as an appropriate reminder of the village's agricultural past.	4782/12079	
	Objection – the development will result in increased traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The development is on one of the few green spaces left in the centre of the village.	4798/12101	
	Objection – the development will increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing junction of Petercroft Lane with Church Street. Development of any sites singled out in the village will seriously harm the character of the village and impact on the problems already experiencing with surface water and sewage in the village. These problems should be resolved before any discussion of proposed housing developments is considered.	4804/12107	
	Objection – there is a lack of infrastructure and unsuitable roads in the area and traffic is a major concern.	4806/12113	
	Objection – the development will increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing junction of Petercroft Lane with Church Street. Development of any sites singled out in the village will seriously harm the character of the village and impact on the problems already experiencing with surface water and sewage in the village. These problems should be resolved before any discussion of proposed housing developments is considered. Objection – the development will increase traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing junction of Petercroft Lane with Church Street. Development of any sites singled out in the village will seriously harm the character of the village and impact on the problems already experiencing with surface water and sewage in the village. These problems should be resolved before any discussion of proposed housing developments is considered.	4821/12139	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – object to most of the housing sites to be built around the village, the valid reasons for this I’m sure have been quoted to you many times and I will not repeat them again, suffice to say it does not make a lot of sense.	5106/12209	
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Objection – its location is close to the village hub and therefore lies within the Dunnington Conservation Area which is of great significance if we want to retain and appreciate the villages past. Even the 6 No. properties would have a major affect on this location, not least the fact that the site access would have to be very close to the already busy and far from ideal visibility wise junction of Garden Flats Lane and Petercroft Lane. The present garden site is a place of peace and tranquillity close to the village centre and should not be developed, as endorsed by the draft Dunnington Village Plan.	5107/12213	
	Comment – of the sites proposed in Dunnington, this would be the preferred one. It is a small development in a confined space and is the least imposing of all the proposals. The developer could be required to contribute to local amenities and improvements to infrastructure, should their proposals go ahead.	5149/12279	
	Objection – all the proposed buildings would have a negative visual impact on existing homes. There are serious concerns regarding the drainage of surface water, which is already an issue in the village. The introduction of more homes will mean more traffic in the village. The roadside parking is already hazardous, at the amenities, the public houses, the school and Doctors and this would be further exacerbated. There are many lanes which are too narrow to cope with increased vehicular use.	5185/12387	
	Comment – whilst recognising a need to provide additional homes, any development of the proposed sites should be looked at with serious consideration to existing drainage problems and should not change the nature of approach roads. Whilst there is some evidence to support overall housing needs in the York area, the number of homes required in Dunnington is questionable and would require further justification taking into account other proposals.	5208/12440	
	Objection – to squeeze more houses onto Petercroft, although not subtracting from agricultural land, would represent infill development, changing the character of the oldest part of the village. The Petercroft site is within a Conservation Area. Planning permission has often been refused at nearby properties on the grounds that this would reduce the charm of this historical part of the village. The same applies to the Petercroft site.	5219/12487	
	Comment – any housing development in Dunnington should take account of both the character and setting of the village, and also any new development must address	5230/12531	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	serious shortcomings in the current village infrastructure. The drainage system is insufficient for peak rainfall and results in surface water flooding within the village, this must be fully adequately addressed as a formal requirement of any planning approval for additional housing. The road infrastructure also requires upgrading if any planning approval for additional housing. School capacity would need addressing and the protection of natural habitats, the character and setting of the village and the protection of wildlife would also need consideration.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Comment – as this is only for 6 houses the impact on the whole village infrastructure would be much less and this area is much more enclosed than any other areas identified so less impact on the village as a whole. However, this small site will not make much difference to the total amount of housing for York.	5294/14426	
	Objection – cannot see how permission could be granted for 6 houses within a Conservation Area when permission was refused for one property in a garden in Church Street, to allow a daughter to move closer to her ailing mother, on the grounds that it was within the Conservation Area.	5241/14322	
	Comment – hope it will be possible for the proposed housing to be planned as well as the past new builds which haven't detracted from the village scene.	5687/13404	
	Objection – the volume of new housing would damage the village. The centre already has traffic difficulties with cars and buses negotiating parked vehicles due to a lack of off street parking on York Road and Church Lane. This will only be exacerbated by increasing the village population.	5827/13794	
	Comment – additional housing proposed in the village presents further traffic issues. York Street is already very congested and Intake Lane is unsuitable for further traffic. There also is an existing drainage problem which has necessitated call outs this year.	6125/15552	
	Objection – the development is within the Conservation Area and the plot should be retained as part of the villages past – a green breathing space among the already present houses.	6146/15622	
	Comment – concerned about any development in the village that is likely to increase traffic in the centre of the village. The impact on Dunnington Primary School should also be considered.	6148/15629	
	Objection – this is one of the few green spaces left in the village.	6151/15638	
	Objection – Dunnington Surgery has been proposed to be changed into a plot for housing – this is not the right choice for the land as a growing village GP surgery is most suitably located in the centre of the village.	6157/15650	
	Objection – object to replacing the doctors surgery with houses unless another surgery	6178/6085	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	is provided in the centre of Dunnington.		
Site H44 R/O Surgery And 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington continued	Support – support this proposal as it will widen the choice of housing within the village. Any development should address the infrastructure and drainage issues in the village.	6184/15723	
	Comment – favour the provision of additional affordable housing in the village, but there would need to be improvements to the road infrastructure, improving safety and the local primary school has reached capacity - has the Council got contingency plans?	6187/15727	
	Objection – this is one of the few green spaces left in the village.	6210/6147	
	Comment – there seems to be no reason why this site would impact badly on the village.	6220/15763	
	Objection – the prizes won for Britain in Bloom say what a lovely village this is why spoil it with more housing?	6237/15810	
	Objection – the development will increase the traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The development is on one of the few green spaces in the centre of the village. Where has the Council found its evidence for this population growth?	6242/6169	
	Support – this site is acceptable as infilling is better than extending outwards and the traffic implications are less serious.	6257/6185	
	Objection – the site is only small but does lie within the Conservation Area. It is also a little gem of a site with an abundance of wildlife inc Greater Spotted Woodpeckers, Sparrow Hawks, squirrels, hedgehogs etc.	6259/15833	
	Objection – the site is within a Conservation Area and should be retained as an important reminder of the Villages agricultural past.	6463/6382	
	Objection – the infrastructure could not cope – roads, and flooding would be an issue, and the school is at capacity.	6270/15850	
	Objection – the village infrastructure and amenities would not cope with the extra number of people.	6272/15859	
	Objection – the site is unsuitable as it is a green space and would place extra demands on the infrastructure, schools, medical practice and road network.	6366/16084	
	Objection – the development will increase the traffic on Petercroft Lane and exacerbate the existing hazardous Petercroft Lane / Church Street junction. The site is one of only a few green spaces in the centre of the village.	6473/6405	
Comment – site should be developed as privately owned older people flats and/or bungalows with communal rooms and gardens. Level access to amenities and next to	Petition 20		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surgery. There is nowhere in the village for people to downsize to. This development would mean more housing becoming available in the village.		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection – site is adjacent to the conservation area and the houses in this area are already ribbon development. The proposals to build five houses on this site does not fit the street scene and should not be considered.	78/12781	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection - see Response 9. It is incredible that given the 'windfall' of the Sugar Beet site, other developments in the area are being considered. The Green Belt and environment should be preserved.	801/3706	
	Objection - see Response 9.	895/3616	
	Objection – see Response 9.No more than 2 houses should be developed. There is enough traffic on Long Ridge Lane.	901/3871	
	Objection- to the proposal to build site at the suggested volume. rural development should be less than 30 dwellings per hectare.	969/16996	
	Objection – five houses is far too many. Do we have enough school places and doctors available?	1217/17119	
	Objection - see Response 9. Concerned about the semi-rural community being lost in urban sprawl. Not convinced by the arguments for such a large amount of housing (and industrial) development in the area and very worried about increased traffic, pressure on Ousebank and Manor Schools and the threats to wildlife and other environmental impacts.	1231/17128	
	Objection - see Response 9.	1579/17529	
	Objection - see Response 9.	1580/17539	
	Objection - see Response 9. The area is already over populated, considering air pollution from the tip at Rufforth and sewage plant at Rawcliffe. These problems need rectifying before contemplating causing more. Narrow roads throughout areas concerned are also a major factor.	1585/3654	
	Objection – consider this is over development and should only have 2 houses allocated to continue the longitudinal streetscape.	1589/17563	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection - see Response 9.	1604/4126	
	Comment -loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given.	1742/2125	NFU
	Objection - see Response 9. The continued urbanisation of the Green Belt will be a disaster.	2009/6495	
Support – allocation seems of reasonable scale.	2416/6653		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. Site would be far too crowded.	2550/6854	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2575/3521	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2580/6913	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2600/3528	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2601/3537	
	Objection - see Response 9. Too much development will upset the balance of community life, and create traffic and pollution problems.	2605/3552	
	Objection - see Response 9. Even with the new park and ride, the increased traffic will make Boroughbridge Road a nightmare to use.	2606/3560	
	Objection - see Response 9. More cars will create more serious congestion.	2607/3568	
	Objection - see Response 9. The proposals would create unacceptable levels of congestion on the present road infrastructure and local services.	2681/4131	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2855/3598	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2856/3607	
	Objection - see Response 9. Do not ruin the area with more and more houses.	2858/3629	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2860/3645	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2861/3663	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2862/3672	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2863/3681	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2864/3688	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to any Green Belt development in any village around York.	2865/3697	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2866/3714	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2869/3734	
	Support - see Response 9. Do not oppose the development of this site.	2870/7604	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2871/4531	
	Objection - see Response 9. This would be the beginning of the end for the Poppletons as a village and must be stopped at all costs. Poppleton School is already full to capacity.	2872/4534	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2873/3754	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2874/3763	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2875/3772	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. All local amenities are already at breaking point, parking is a nightmare and the Junior School is unable to take any more pupils. There are enough people in the village.	2876/3781	
	Objection - see Response 9. The village feel is being lost with every new house being approved and all its local services cannot handle the increase ie. the Doctors Surgery, road networks, parking, schools etc.	2877/3790	
	Objection - see Response 9. Don't build more houses just to generate income for the Council to tax, don't turn York in to an overpopulated sprawl.	2878/3799	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2879/3808	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2880/3817	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2881/4540	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2882/3829	
	Objection - see Response 9. No more than 2 houses should be developed on this site.	2883/3838	
	Objection - see Response 9. Strongly object to the use of green fields for development.	2884/3854	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2885/3863	
	Objection - see Response 9. Overdevelopment, there is room for 2 houses to stay in keeping with the rest of the Lane.	2887/3885	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2888/3894	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2890/3916	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2892/3931	
	Objection - see Response 9. Insufficient infrastructure to support the development.	2893/3940	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2894/3949	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2895/3958	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2896/3967	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2897/3976	
	Objection - see Response 9.	2911/4137	
	Objection - see Response 9. If the development was to go ahead, would need more schools, larger doctors surgery, improved public transport etc.	2912/4147	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3004/7839	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3022/7859	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3030/4169	
Objection - see Response 9. Should provide no more than 2 houses.	3037/4185		
Objection - see Response 9.	3038/4192		
Objection - see Response 9.	3039/4199		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. Over development in and around Poppleton, will lead to local congestion on the roads.	3040/4206	
	Objection - see Response 9. In particular, object to the proposal for a 'mini estate' on the plot, which was originally intended for 2 houses fronting onto the street.	3041/4214	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3042/4221	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3043/7893	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3044/4230	
	Objection - see Response 9. This site forms an important buffer between Poppleton and suburban York and should remain in the Green Belt.	3045/4235	
	Objection - object to the development of this site.	3099/7990	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3248/4238	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3249/4247	
	Objection - see Response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved throughout the area.	3271/4254	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3278/8422	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the number of houses proposed - too many.	3284/4264	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the number of houses proposed - too many.	3285/4273	
	Objection - this site would be overdeveloped with 5 houses and would not be supported by the Poppleton Village Design Statement.	3378/8674	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3384/8687	
	Objection - see Response 9. This site would be overdevelopment and increase congestion.	3419/4288	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3423/4297	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3441/8804	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3443/8815	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3468/8930	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3472/8938	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3473/8947	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3474/8956	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3475/8966	
Objection - see Response 9.	3481/8982		
Objection - see Response 9.	3482/8992		
Objection - see Response 9.	3483/9001		
Objection - see Response 9.	3484/9012		
Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure of the village will not support the influx	3485/9021		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of the proposed number of houses.		
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9.	3486/9031	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3487/9041	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure of Poppleton can not adequately support the proposals of the Local Plan.	3488/9050	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3490/9060	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3491/9069	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3492/9078	
	Objection - see Response 9. Keep the Green Belt green and don't let development take place which would damage the charm of the village.	3493/9087	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3494/9096	
	Objection - see Response 9. Don't build any more houses in Poppleton and turn it into another suburb of the City. Protect the Green Belt.	3495/9105	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3502/9114	
	Objection - see Response 9. What is the point of the area being designated as a Conservation Area, then sites are developed for housing. The Green Belt should be preserved.	3503/9124	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3504/9134	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3505/9143	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3506/9152	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3554/9175	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3555/9185	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3557/9203	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3558/6063	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3559/9217	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3560/9226	
Objection - see Response 9. Please leave Poppleton as a village, rather than a City suburb.	3561/9234		
Objection - see Response 9. Until the Outer Ring Road is dualled, no more development should be contemplated.	3563/9250		
Objection - see Response 9.	3564/9259		
Objection - see Response 9.	3565/9267		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. Another application has also been submitted for 36 houses on land opposite Chantry Green. This would equate for approx 100 extra cars – these developments are for too many houses and are not wanted.	3566/9276	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3567/9285	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3568/9295	
	Objection - see Response 9. Concerned about over development of the site and the impact on roads and schools.	3623/9311	
	Support - see Response 9.	3628/9330	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3631/9348	
	Objection - see Response 9. Must preserve village life and maintain rural culture.	3633/9354	
	Objection - see Response 9. Concerned about turning the Poppletons into an urban sprawl and degrading the village status and increased traffic in and around the village.	3634/9360	
	Objection - see Response 9. Over development, should be 2 affordable houses max.	3637/9370	
	Objection - see Response 9. It is vital to preserve green spaces in the village to avoid it becoming a built up suburb of York. This site should be identified as a site for a few houses with large gardens to preserve the large trees and green corridors.	3639/9386	
	Objection - see Response 9. Very concerned about the urban spread whether in Poppleton or elsewhere. Surely there are sufficient areas of brownfield within the existing city boundaries.	3641/9402	
	Objection - see Response 9. More houses will mean more cars, leading to more parking problems. Also, more people will lead to more pressure on the doctors surgery.	3642/9411	
	Objection - see Response 9. To put 5 houses there would spoil the road as houses there are either detached or semis with gardens – it will look like a Council House block if 5 houses are put there (with no gardens).	3677/9420	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to any further development in Poppleton – any further development will create more congestion.	3728/10037	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3730/10052	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3731/10062	
	Objection - see Response 9. Must preserve the Green Belt as much as possible and use empty upper floors of City centre shops before considering building new houses.	3735/10074	
	Objection - see Response 9. If migrants were reduced, then not so many houses would need to be built and the Green Belt would be preserved.	3738/10087	
Objection - see Response 9. Any additional housing would result in overcrowding and	3739/10093		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	stretched facilities.		
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see Response 9. Additional housing would put extra strain on local facilities and roads.	3741/10103	
	Objection - see Response 9. It is important to preserve the identity of Poppleton and any development will place more strain on infrastructure – roads, schools etc.	3742/10113	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3743/10123	
	Objection - see Response 9. Housing plans are oversubscribed and would result in overdevelopment. There are not enough school places to support the number of houses proposed.	3745/5800	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3746/10133	
	Objection - see Response 9.	3747/10138	
	Objection - see Response 9. Only 2 houses should be built on this site – any more would be an eyesore.	3797/10227	
	Objection - see Response 9. In particular, object to the proposal for a 'mini estate' on the plot, which was originally intended for 2 houses fronting onto the street.	3815/7820	
	Objection - see Response 9. Overall, the additional housing proposals in this document will destroy Poppleton as a community, with increased traffic and schools unable to cope with the influx of pupils.	3911/4600	
	Objection - see Response 9. Making Poppleton an overgrown town.	3942/4627	
	Objection - see Response 9. Poppleton cannot cope with more housing, the school and Health Centre would not be able to cope.	3946/4636	
	Objection - see Response 9. Object to the level of housing proposed and loss of Green Belt for development.	3966/10547	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposal to build 5 new houses on this site. This would be extreme over development of an area which would not fit the "street scene" of this road and is in direct contravention of the Poppleton Village Design Statement. Any development in this area should respect the character of the other houses along this road.	3976/10575	
	Objection - see Response 9. 5 houses on this site is too many.	4055/4680	
	Objection - see Response 9. Original planning permission was for 2 houses on the site. This proposal breaks faith with the original proposals and is too dense, causing extra traffic congestion on a major public road through the village.	4072/4705	
Comment - see Response 9. Any housing in the area should take account of transport needs and schools.	4077/4713		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton Continued	Objection - see Response 9. Lack of transport infrastructure to support the current housing stock in the area surrounding Poppleton, the proposed development will attract further traffic without any form of amelioration, which will significantly reduce safety and amenity in the local area.	4078/4722	
	Objection - see Response 9. 5 houses on this site will put strain on local roads and add to congestion.	4079/4731	
	Objection - see Response 9. The proposals cannot be accommodated with the current road network and will reduce road safety and amenity.	4080/4740	
	Objection - see Response 9.	4082/4749	
	Objection - see Response 9. The infrastructure cannot cope with such developments, roads would not cope with the number of vehicles, schools would not cope with the increase in the number of children, and the Green Belt should be retained so that villages remain villages.	4084/4759	
	Objection - see Response 9.	4085/5815	
	Objection - see Response 9. The village will lose any distinction if piecemeal development continues. There is sufficient brownfield land to cater for this development.	4087/4768	
	Objection - see Response 9. Development of this site forms creeping urbanisation in the Green Belt.	4088/4777	
	Objection – see Response 9. Should development be allowed in a Conservation Area? Expansion of the village would create traffic problems.	4103/4799	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4111/4819	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4127/4841	
	Objection – see Response 9. Such a development would have a significant impact on the infrastructure, parking, school and health centre.	4145/4859	
	Objection – see response 9. New housing would be a blot on the landscape.	4191/4892	
	Comment – see response 9. If building is allowed in Poppleton, builders should have to redevelop childrens play areas and improve the area.	4198/10927	
	Objection – strongly object to a ‘mini’ housing estate being erected on this site. This land runs directly adjacent to my property. Two houses would be acceptable to ‘co-exist’ with the immediate surroundings.	4324/11222	
Objection – consider the proposed development of 5 dwellings on land adjacent to 131 Long Ridge Lane, Upper Poppleton is an over development of the site and will create problems, not only for the village community, but also for residents of Long Ridge Lane. It is already difficult to access the road from our houses, especially in rush hour.	4325/11223		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Five dwellings means another five to ten vehicles. Always expected two dwellings on this plot, this is what should have been done.		
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection – the proposed development of 5 dwellings is an over-development of this site and will generate problems for the community. Road access on to Long Ridge Lane is a problem already. Also, a development of this density is not in sympathy with its surrounding settlement and represents a decline in environmental standards for all. The land is currently divided into two plots – these should remain for two dwellings, not five!	4326/11224	
	Objection – see Response 9. Poppleton is already a small town rather than a village and any further expansion apart from minor infilling will result in it just becoming a suburb of York. The infrastructure is already struggling to cope without adding additional burden. The proposed plan for 5 houses is over development – 2 would be acceptable.	4386/11360	
	Objection – this is over development of the site.	4416/5055	
	Objection – the density of housing is out of keeping with the area.	4419/5062	
	Objection – such developments in Poppleton will significantly affect the nature of the village, loss of green space and traffic issues. Also, there will be an impact on schools and infrastructure / services.	4422/11448	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4425/5068	
	Objection – see Response 9. If all the proposed building goes ahead in Poppleton, it will lose its rural charm and become a suburb of York. More houses means more cars and there are only two main roads. Consider more children for Poppleton School. Facilities and shops, surgeries etc will also have to cope with more demands.	4431/5078	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4435/5087	
	Objection – see Response 9. Strongly object to loss of green fields for any reason. Surely there are enough brownfield sites to satisfy housing requirements.	4437/5096	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4440/5120	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4442/5137	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4443/5146	
	Objection – see Response 9. There are other areas of the City where such developments would not harm rural life or the environment.	4444/5153	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4445/5160	
Objection – see Response 9. Poppleton is starting to become over developed and has lost its village feel. It has a wonderful community spirit, which would be spoilt by such developments. In particular, Long Ridge Lane cannot support 5 houses in such a small	4446/5167		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	space and its development would eat into the Green Belt, reducing the gap with York.		
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection – see Response 9.	4447/5175	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4462/5183	
	Objection – see Response 9. Development will destroy a very attractive area.	4463/5192	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4650/5241	
	Objection – the village does not need to be enlarged, it is already almost too large. The road system is overcrowded, with terrible congestion. The village integrity is being destroyed.	4723/14259	
	Objection – see Response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved and not eaten into.	4755/5290	
	Comment – see Response 9. No objection provided confined to infill development.	4756/5300	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4759/5309	
	Objection – see Response 9.	4767/5318	
	Objection – represents over development.	4829/12147	
	Objection – all land outside the Ring Road should be Green Belt.	5223/12513	
	Objection – strongly object to the use if the site for housing	5282/14399	
	Objection – strongly object to this proposal. Poppleton has expanded incrementally and by and large seems to have coped well. However, more houses will have an adverse effect.	5408/14676	
	Objection – concerned about the amount of housing concentrated in a small area like Poppleton having a detrimental impact on the character, schools and doctors surgeries.	5499/14873	
	Objection – will directly impact on the village environment.	5817/13766	
	Objection – increased traffic through the village. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on schools that the higher numbers will bring.	5829/13801	
	Objection – strongly object to building in the Green Belt. H45 will further reduce the notional green corridor between York and Poppleton.	5879/15169	
	Objection - see Response 9.	5948/6246	
	Objection – the number of houses being built in Poppleton would put a huge strain on local services and traffic in the village.	6038/15456	
	Objection – this is over development.	6133/15576	
Objection - see Response 9.	6158/15655		
Objection -see response 9. The development appears too large for the area considered. Potential problems arise from access and traffic.	6190/6101		
Objection - see Response 9.	6191/6109		
Objection - see Response 9.	6203/6126		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site H45 Land Adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton continued	Objection - see response 9. For Poppleton to retain its village status, it is important it doesn't get swallowed up into the outskirts of York.	6206/6138	
	Objection - represents over development.	6360/16072	
	Objection - see response 9.	6413/6278	
	Support - see response 9. Believe housing need of the City is great enough to warrant this development. Would also support the maximum possible quota of affordable housing on this development.	6414/6287	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6421/6303	
	Objection - see Response 9. The Green Belt should be retained intact.	6425/6314	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6438/6358	
	Objection - see Response 9.	6469/6400	
Objection - see Response 9.	6483/6429		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development	Support- support the restriction on densities in village/rural areas. We support densities not greater than 30 dwellings per hectare.	59/12650	Dunnington Parish Council
	Comment- housing Density is of course taken over the whole site, such that a higher density over the development part of a site can be used to offset providing a larger amount of green open space or corridor to include paths for use of the public.	91/12854	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support –broadly agree with the densities proposed.	144/12885	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment- Policy H4 conflicts with the plan requirements for 70% of all new dwellings built to be houses. Given the requirement for a density of 80-100 dwellings per hectare within the city centre extension zone this cannot be achieved in such areas as houses simply cannot be built at such densities. Concerned that the council are using high densities to minimise the amount of land released. This will impede the delivery of the plan. High densities should not be used to minimise the release of housing land.	145/13866	Home Builders Federation
	Objection- note the council’s intention in Policy ACHM2 that the overall provision of housing over a period of the plan should be 70% houses and 30% flats. Given that requirement and considering that most housing developments will be met outside the existing build up area, the requirement in policy H4 to achieve 50 dwellings per hectare in the suburban area seems particularly onerous and unlikely to be achieved. These figures should be reconsidered and the land required to meet the housing requirement adjusted accordingly.	187/13918	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Support – welcome the requirement that the density of new development should be informed by the character of the local area. This will help to ensure that new residential schemes respond sensitively to the distinctive character of the various parts of the city.	238/14071	English Heritage
	Objection – the housing density figures are too high and lead to an incorrect high assumption of housing yield for allocated sites.	304/14176	Shirethorn Ltd
	Objection – the housing density figures are too high and lead to an incorrect high assumption of housing yield for allocated sites.	431/16537	Shepherd Homes Ltd
	Objection – policy H4 suggests an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare. For rural and village locations. Whilst this is a useful guide, it would be in excess of the existing density of developments in this location. A slightly lower average or target density of say 20-25 dwellings per hectare would be more appropriate.	432/16550	Church Commissioners for England
	Comment – the policy should make clear that these density figures are thresholds that can be expected where appropriate and should not be seen as ceiling or maximum figures.	434/16573	Associated British Foods plc

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Objection – the densities set out in policy H4 do not reflect local circumstances and indeed are ambitious at best. Whilst the flexibility of the policy is supported it is apparent that the densities have been used to underpin the numbers of new homes on the suggested allocations. As there are no master plans for the new settlements proposed it is impossible to assess what the likely impact of higher density housing will be. Whilst high housing densities help to meet the housing requirements there is likely to be a shortage of homes as these high densities are regarded to be overly ambitious and unlikely to be achieved. Indeed the implications of such an approach in any event would be an inconsistency with the existing spatial character of York. It is inevitable that further housing land will be required to make up the shortfall.	451/16602	Linden Homes North & Miller Homes
	Comment and support – the general aims of the policy are supported including the principles expressed about residential development density. The policy does not however need to specify development densities for specific parts of the site. This is overly prescriptive and it should be for each development to be brought forward with a clear and firm understanding of its context, against the principles expressed in the policy, but also with the aim to make efficient use of land.	452/16612	Miller Homes Ltd
	Objection – although it is acknowledged that city centre development should have higher density to the urban edge, each site should be assessed on its own merits to ensure the scheme takes into consideration any site constraints and that the end scheme is deliverable and viable.	528/16668	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Support- in principle we support the density policy which varies the density required depending on the location. Concerned that the dwellings per hectare suggested, are overly ambitious and therefore undeliverable. The target density of 80-100 dwellings per hectare for the City Centre and City Centre Extension Zone is unrealistic and therefore unlikely to be delivered. Objection- in relation to the other areas where the density proposed is 40 or 50 dwellings per hectare we have concerns that house builders will be unable to deliver these densities. Our view the suggested figures should be revised downwards, while we agree a spectrum of densities based on location is appropriate we would suggest the following is more appropriate. City Centre And Extension Zone 50-60 dwellings per hectare, York Urban Area 40 dwellings per hectare, Major Expansion Areas And New Settlements 30-35 dwellings per hectare, Suburban Area (including Haxby and Wigginton) 30 dwellings per hectare. If revised figures are accepted it is clear that additional housing land will be required, obviously the most appropriate sites would be those currently identified as Safeguarded Land.	534/16708	DPP One Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	<p>Objection – believe the proposed densities at each level (ranging from city centre to Rural and Villages are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. We think it is appropriate as a matter of principle to “band” locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural and Villages since within each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or even above the identified densities but, equally, in many cases it will be impossible to achieve the densities stated without significantly compromising local character. They suggest however, that reference to the location is unhelpful as, within any given location, there may be opportunities for widely differing densities of development. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site-specific characteristics, not location.</p>	540/16732	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	<p>Objection - objects to the formula adopted by the Council to calculate dwelling capacity of draft allocated sites. Consider the minimum new development area of sites is up to about 1,000 dwellings is 85% of the gross area and an average density of 30 dwellings per acre be applied to the gross area, or 35 dwellings per hectare to the net area. In practice the capacity of each site will depend on individual factors and it is anticipated the site will accommodate up to 250 houses.</p>	659/15056	Persimmon Homes
	<p>Comment - slightly concerned that the Council may be using high densities to minimise the amount of land released. Densities should be realistic and set using credible evidence. A flexible approach to implementation should also employed taking account of the characteristics of individual sites. High densities should not be used to minimise the release of housing land.</p>	673/16846	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	<p>Comment - can not see how developers can be expected to provide all services, roads, community buildings, and education and health establishments and still fulfil the outlines of the Local Plan.</p>	969/16997	
	<p>Support- agree with the preferred approach to vary the density of dwellings accordingly to the character of the location. Objection - concerned at the density level proposed across the different types of location as we feel that they are generally too high and are based on now extinct Planning Policy Statement 3 advice rather than the latest National Planning Policy Framework advice. Density requirements need to be more realistic and need to be reduced. Our concerns are illustrated by the density proposed for the City Centre And City Centre Extension Zone category. The density seems to presume all properties will be flats. Feel that greater flexibility should be allowed in order to provide for a mix of</p>	1346/17306	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	dwelling types according to the location.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Support- supports the restriction on densities in villages/rural areas. I accept densities should take into account the limitations of the individual sites which may result in smaller numbers of dwellings but does not support the 'average' approach. Support densities not greater than 30 dwellings per hectare.	1457/17405	
	Objection – the densities appear overly high – local evidence should be provided to substantiate the figures suggested. Slightly concerned that the Council may be using high densities to minimise the amount of land released. A flexible approach to implementation should also be employed taking amount of the characteristics of individual sites.	1514/17477	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Comment- seek clarification as to whether Clifton Gate should be a 'major expansion area but with a density of 30 dwellings per hectare, consider that an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare is broadly appropriate for Clifton Gate.	1523/17500	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Objection- densities to be less than 50 dwellings per hectare urban , less than 40 dwellings per hectare suburban and less than 30 dwellings per hectare for villages and rural areas.	1589/17564	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support- agrees with the preferred approach to vary the density of dwellings according to the character of the location. This requires a detailed, sensitive, site by site assessment at the Development Management stage. Blanket densities across the city centre, inner, outer, areas, villages etc. Will not achieve the quality environment required by National Planning Policy Framework and necessary to safe guard the character of the sites' surroundings. Concerned at the density level proposed across the different types of location, as we feel that they are generally too high and are based on now extinct Planning Policy Statement 3 advice rather than the latest National Planning Policy Framework advice. Objection - as well as reducing the density requirements , would ask for a definition of 'dwelling' and 'dwellings' per hectare' to be introduced into the policy of the glossary in order to explain the implications of the various proposed density levels.	1592/17601	York Civic Trust
	Objection- no indication regarding space allowed for community food growing in urban and semi urban areas. This should be included in all new developments. (Are gardens sufficiently large to grow vegetables)	1665/12952	York Environment Forum
	Objection- sets out very ambitious and unrealistic housing densities that appear too high. Considers that suburban areas should be given an average density of 25 to 30 dwellings per hectare instead of 40 dwellings per hectare. Major expansion areas/ New	1668/15037	Barratt & David Wilson Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	settlements should be given an average density range of 30-35 dwellings per hectare rather than 50 dwellings per hectare.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	<p>Comment – agree with the need for flexibility in density levels and submit that site density should be considered on a site by site basis to take account of the character and form of the site and existing settlement.</p> <p>Objection – the proposed density requirements are significantly higher than expect to see delivered on developments. They do not reflect the types of development that is currently being delivered in the market. Unrealistic density assumptions will have a significant impact on the numbers of units that can be expected to be delivered on the housing allocations.</p>	1705/9785	Gladman Developments
	Comment- support the recognition in the assessment that small scale retail uses could be included onto the site frontage onto Lawrence Street. The development area boundary of the site needs to be corrected to remove the area of the burial grounds which is not included in the site development area and its to be retained by our clients.	1748/9843	Diocese of Middlesbrough
	Objection – the densities as currently set are overly prescriptive and do not provide sufficient flexibility for an appropriate site specific design response and should not be included. If a density range is to be included these should be much broader allowing for both lower and higher densities.	1785/9866	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
	<p>Support – support in principle the density policy that varies the density required depending on the location.</p> <p>Objection – concerned that the dwellings per hectare suggested are overly ambitious and therefore undeliverable. The target density of 80-100 dwellings per hectare for the city centre and City Centre Extension Zone is unrealistic and therefore unlikely to be delivered – only achievable through inclusion of a significant number of apartments. The market for apartments remains weak (from ARUP Topic paper – Population (2011). In relation to other areas where density proposed is 40 or 50 dwellings per hectare concerned that house builders will be unable to deliver these densities and would suggest the following densities as being more appropriate; City Centre and City Centre Extension Zone: 50-60 dwellings per hectare. York Urban Area: 40 dwellings per hectare Major Expansion Areas and New Settlements: 30-35 dwellings per hectare. Suburban Area (inc Haxby & Wigginton): 30 dwellings per hectare. If these revised figures are accepted it is clear that additional housing land will be required, obviously the most appropriate sites would be those currently identified as Safeguarded land.</p>	1801/9895	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)
	Objection – the Local Plan uses housing density of 30 houses per hectare which is dramatically more dense than the existing village and would result in a complete	2012/6502	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unbalance in the structure of the village form.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Objection- in order to achieve the high density proposed much of the housing for instance in the extended Wilstrop Farm Estate, would be necessity inevitably by the now typical three storey terraced units. Such houses would of course by totally alien and inappropriate.	2469/2629	
	Comment – acknowledge that city centre development should have higher density to the urban edge, each site should be assessed on its own merits to ensure the scheme takes into consideration any site constraints and that the end scheme is deliverable and viable.	2769/7329	
	Objection- the average density figure for rural and village locations should be reduced. The villages in York will lose their distinctive character.	3041/7815	
	Support- support housing density to vary by location and to be 30 dwellings per hectare for village/rural areas.	4257/11042	
	Objection – the housing densities are too high.	4411/11421	
	Comment- support the restriction on densities in villages/rural areas. Accept densities should take into account the limitations on the individual sites which may result in smaller numbers of dwellings but does not support the 'average' approach. Support the densities not greater than 30 dwellings per hectare.	5178/12347	
	Comment- density must take into account the location of the land. Village and Rural Objection - Density should be much less than 30 dwellings per hectare.	5228/12535	
	Support – broadly agree with the densities proposed (in Policy H4)	5245/14337	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – less dense developments would be more preferable especially when there is room e.g. Whinthorpe.	5740/13528	
	Objection – the chosen density levels appear to be very high with only minimal green space and gardens around houses. This is not what people want.	5783/13691	
	Objection –concerned at the density level proposed across the different types of location – they are generally too high and based on the now extinct Planning Policy Statement 3 advice rather than the National Planning Policy Framework. The density requirements need to be reduced in order to become more realistic. Concern illustrated by the density proposed for the City Centre and City Centre Extension Zone – density presumes all properties will be flats. Greater flexibility should be allowed in order to provide for a mix of dwelling types according to the location. Blocks of flats are not necessarily appropriate across the whole of the city centre. National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that a wide choice of homes should be made available to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Allowing flats will not achieve	6046/17458	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	this objective, particularly in relation to accommodating families within the city centre.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Support- support the wording of this policy which allows a flexible approach to be taken in the event the density guideline for a site does not fit with the density of development surrounding a site.	6062/15516	ID Planning
	Comment- in principle they support the density policy which varies the density required depending on the location. However they are concerned that the dwelling per hectare suggested are overly ambitious and therefore undeliverable. The target density of 80-100 dwellings per hectare for the City Centre and City Centre Extension Zone is unrealistic and therefore unlikely to be delivered. In relation to the other areas where the density proposed is 40 or 50 dwellings per hectare we have concerns that house builders will be unable to deliver these densities. Our view the suggested figures should be revised downwards, while agree a spectrum of densities based on location is appropriate. They would suggest the following is more appropriate.	6160/15672	
	Comment- flats/houses: the overall mix needs to be the opposite way round ie 30% houses and 70% flats.	6279/15870	Yorkstories.co.uk
	Objection – concerned about the draft Plan’s proposals for the density of residential development; Densities proposed at each level are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. This would be counter to National Planning Policy Framework which requires high standards of design and the creation of inclusive, mixed and environmentally friendly residential environments. It is inappropriate to ‘band’ locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural, and Villages since, within each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or even above the identified densities, but equally in many cases it will be impossible to achieve densities stated without significantly compromising local character. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site specific characteristics not location.	6339/16009	The Merchant Taylors Of York & R & M Gorwood
	Objection – concerned about the draft Plan’s proposals for the density of residential development; Densities proposed at each level are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. This would be counter to National Planning Policy Framework which requires high standards of design and the creation of inclusive, mixed and environmentally friendly residential environments. It is inappropriate to ‘band’ locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural, and Villages since, within each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or	6341/16015	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	even above the identified densities, but equally in many cases it will be impossible to achieve densities stated without significantly compromising local character. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site specific characteristics not location.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Objection – Concerned about the draft Plan’s proposals for the density of residential development; Densities proposed at each level are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. This would be counter to National Planning Policy Framework which requires high standards of design and the creation of inclusive, mixed and environmentally friendly residential environments. It is inappropriate to ‘band’ locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural, and Villages since, within each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or even above the identified densities, but equally in many cases it will be impossible to achieve densities stated without significantly compromising local character. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site specific characteristics not location.	6344/16025	Escrick Park Estate
	Comment- the dwellings per hectare suggested, are overly ambitious and therefore undeliverable.	6349/16045	Linden Homes North
	Objection – the densities identified in Policy H4 appear overly high – local evidence should be provided to substantiate the figures suggested. Concerned that the Council may be using high densities to minimise the amount of land released. Densities should be realistic and set using credible evidence. A flexible approach to implementation should also be employed taking account of characteristics of individual sites.	6351/17633	Gladedale Estates
	Comment- allows a flexible approach to be taken in the event the density guideline for a site does not fix with the density of development surrounding a site. It is essential the plan remains flexible over the plan period allowing density to respond to market considerations and site characteristics, whilst ensuring the housing requirement can still be met.	6357/16060	Ainscough Strategic Land
	Objection – concerned about the draft Plan’s proposals for the density of residential development; Densities proposed at each level are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. This would be counter to National Planning Policy Framework which requires high standards of design and the creation of inclusive, mixed and environmentally friendly residential environments. It is inappropriate to ‘band’ locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural, and Villages since, within	6383/16116	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or even above the identified densities, but equally in many cases it will be impossible to achieve densities stated without significantly compromising local character. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site specific characteristics not location.		
Policy H4 Density Of Residential Development continued	Objection – concerned about the draft Plan’s proposals for the density of residential development; Densities proposed at each level are too high and will impact on the quality of developments proposed in each zone as open, recreational and amenity space in particular is compromised. This would be counter to National Planning Policy Framework which requires high standards of design and the creation of inclusive, mixed and environmentally friendly residential environments. It is inappropriate to ‘band’ locations together e.g. City Centre, Suburban, Rural, and Villages since, within each category, there will inevitably be sites which are capable of being developed at or even above the identified densities, but equally in many cases it will be impossible to achieve densities stated without significantly compromising local character. The density bands should be lower and qualified by reference to detailed site specific characteristics not location.	6384/16122	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Linden Homes
	Comment- option 2 (a housing density target that varies by location) is the preferred approach, but we reserve the right to disagree with Council conclusions on appropriate density.	6508/17670	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Comment- no problem with the density of new development. Have a problem with the reduction in the amount of developable land on each site 90% to 80%. Increasing from 10% to 20% the amount needed for infrastructure means that another 64 hectares of land has had to be identified to build the same number of dwellings. Reduction in proposed housing numbers on particular sites, the numbers in the Local Plan have reduced without explanation.	6516/16330	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Support and comment- generally in agreement with these guideline densities, although would like to see a clearer statement in this policy that i) these are guidelines and each application will be assessed on its merits. ii) high quality innovative sustainable design can facilitate higher densities whilst supporting open space and high quality environment (e.g. Green roofs, roof gardens, green walls, shared open space and gardens) and will be encouraged.	6518/16393	York Green Party
	Support – agree with the density of housing for village areas at no more than 30 dwellings per hectare.	Petition 20	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 10.1	<p>Comment- it would be inappropriate for the Boards to comment in regard to the specific housing allocation in terms of overall numbers proposed during the lifetime of the plan. Our comments should be confined to distribution in terms of geographical locations and the specifics of each site. Support the use of brownfield sites should be prioritised. Support the approach whereby the densities of specific sites varied according to the local context with the higher densities. The specific nature of the site should be dictate sustainability, sustainability and appropriate density. The need to deliver housing should not compromise the specific nature, complexity or uniqueness of an individual site and its merits should be the determining factor to ensure living is within environmental limits. Paragraph 10.14 regardless a number of sites brought forward will present issues through location or density or a combination of both. In terms of these proposed sites the respective boards would have concerns in respect of a number of locations where flood risk and/or drainage infrastructure was perceived to be the issue. Of note would be the proposals at Winthorpe, Elvington, Strensall, Haxby, Huntington and Monks Cross each of which has issues with either flooding and/or infrastructure capacity.</p>	190/13964	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	<p>Comment- housing supply buffer (option 1) of buffer is preferable.</p>	529/16688	
	<p>Comment- housing growth – support option 1 (850 dwellings per annum); Housing supply buffer – support option 2 (10% buffer). The local plan preferred options of 1090 dwellings per annum (Alt 2) with 15% buffer (Alt 3) seem to be rather high; Housing Density - option 1 (<30 dwellings per hectare for villages and rural areas) in order to maintain management of protecting and enhancing York’s villages, especially as regards traffic congestion, pollution, and overcrowding of the local villages and provision of adequate public transport.</p>	657/16799	
	<p>Comment- housing supply buffer (option 1) of a 5% buffer is preferable. Phasing and delivery- option 4 would provide more control over the protection of sites and better deliberation over the sustainability of sites.</p>	835/16912	
	<p>Comment- the preferred approach should be appropriate in regard to housing policy.</p>	943/16954	
	<p>Comment- housing growth and distribution - reading all background information evidence option 1 (850 dwellings per annum) is sufficient; housing supply buffer- 10% buffer sufficient; phasing and delivery- need emphasis on brown field sites first. Therefore cannot rely on market forces; density alternatives- option 2, where density varies by location; City centre option1 (<80-100 dwellings per hectare), Urban option 1 (<50 dwellings per hectare), Extensions option 1 (<50 dwellings per hectare), Suburban option 1 (<40 dwellings per hectare), Village/ rural option 1 (<30 dwellings</p>	1109/17187	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 10: Housing Growth & Distribution Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	per hectare).		
Question 10.1 Continued	Support- agrees with preferred approach to housing growth and development.	1331/17256	
	Comment – the general approach to housing densities is considered appropriate, however, City of York Council should ensure that higher densities such as 75 dwellings per hectare are not identified as a specific requirement where by lower densities have to be justified. It is recognised that there will be a need to deliver higher densities in relation to student accommodation and similar but these higher densities should not be enforced on other schemes for open market family and mixed community housing.	1736/9820	Oakgate Group PLC
	Comment- why not allow premises above shops etc. to be used for residential purposes. Could not empty flats/houses be offered as temp accommodation	1944/926	
	Objection- given that the Arup report identifies a lower level of growth than previously forecast and specifically, that international migration had been overestimated (by up to 34%) we find great difficulty in supporting any of the options.	6516/16326	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group