

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| <b>General</b>                                | Comment – this section relates to the Built Sports Facilities Strategy April 2013. The University’s facilities are not community facilities; they are funded by students and provided for students. Request that it be made clear that the University’s facilities are not community facilities. Highlight the absence of objectives and a strategy in this section, e.g. increase average participation on sport and fitness activity by city residents for health and wellbeing objectives. | 38/12919    | York St John University                      |
|   | Comment – support the preferred approach to community facilities as long as more local considerations are taken into account. Do not believe this should be done on a York wide basis. Will develop this approach in their Neighbourhood Plan.  | 59/12660    | Dunnington Parish Council                    |
|   | Comment – it is believed that even at current population levels that patients attending the Strensall My Health medical practice are required to attend other surgeries in the group and these are located at Huntington, Dunnington and Stamford Bridge.   | 77/12769    | Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council      |
|   | Support – agree with the preferred approach to community facilities as long as more local considerations are taken into account. Do not believe this should be done on a York wide basis.   | 1457/17414  |  |
|   | Support – support this Policy of required contribution so that all new developments contribute to community facilities/health provision, on or off site (preferably local).   | 1589/17567  | Nether Poppleton Parish Council              |
|   | Comment – this section of the plan needs to consider the social determinants of health, so that issues of exercise, access to food etc are promoted rather than hindered by developments and planning decisions. Role of Green Infrastructure is important to this.   | 1665/12958  | York Environment Forum                       |
|   | Comment – little vision for a growing aged population. Where are the facilities for such an aging population?   | 1947/214    |  |
|   | Comment – as a local veterinary practice who have been in York for over 100 year. would be very interested in having discussions with you about setting up small clinics in a couple of the planned areas to service clients and their pets in those new areas.   | 5455/14799  | The Minster Veterinary Practice              |
|   | Support –agree with the preferred approach to provision and accessibility of facilities and the protection of existing community facilities.<br>Objection – do not agree with preferred approach to required contributions, consider that only major developments should be required to contribute to community facilities/health provision on or off site  | 6508/17678  | City Of York Council Conservative Group      |
|   | Comment – should include reference to a wider range of community facilities e.g. specifically dental services, adult education, library services, youth provision (not just childcare and children’s centres) fitness clubs. In addition there should also be a more specific presumption against loss of traditional public houses, post offices, schools and  | 6518/16403  | York Green Party                             |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|--|-------------|--|
|   | places of worship to residential development where these provide an important focal point and public building in a community. It should be stated that change of use will not be considered until the conclusion of 9 months active marketing for new owners or a compatible new use that remains community access. The same should apply (whether stated here or under 'retail') where the premises are the only local shop in a community. |             |  |
| <b>General Continued</b>                      | Support – agree with the preferred approach to community facilities.   | 6519/16480  | Cllr Jenny Brooks                            |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities</b>        | Objection – text says new facilities should only be supported where need is identified. This cannot be justified; it is up to provider to determine what they will provide in an education or commercial sector. This restrictive policy arises from, the ‘crude’ measure of community provision and location of new facilities in relation to sport, based on national participation standards not local health and wellbeing objectives. This is considered unsuitable for specialist dedicated provision. Suggest that the policy is too restrictive and is inappropriate. Suggested wording: ‘All proposals for new and improved sports facilities will be supported providing that they meet normal planning criteria such as adequate access and availability of non-car modes of travel.’  | 38/12920    | York St John University                      |
|   | Objection –consider criteria (i) of this policy, requiring new or improved community facilities accessible to all to be provided to accompany new residential development, to be unsound. The policy has not been subject to any cumulative viability assessment and therefore its impact upon the viability of development cannot be properly assessed. The policy does not identify the mechanism for achieving such facilities.  | 145/13872   | Home Builders Federation                     |
|   | Support - welcome policy on community facilities.<br>Comment – feel the policy could be strengthened by stating facilities and services, in the title and every usage in this section. Without this addition, concerned that facilities could be included within long term plan as to how they can be maintained and made best use of through people delivering services from them. Context statement ending: ‘...buildings for community groups such as clubs for senior citizens and scout and guide groups.’ Gives an incomplete and hence potentially misleading picture of the community, voluntary and social enterprise sector in the city. We would prefer a more encompassing statement as follows: ‘...buildings for community, voluntary and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations. We recognize the VCSE sector in York is large and diverse including an estimated more than 500 registered charities, plus an even larger number of non-registered voluntary organizations and an undermined number of businesses with clear social purposes and values. The diversity of community provision extends to include services for children, young people and families, older people, those with health conditions, cultural and heritage services, sports and leisure, faith and religion, environmental, neighbourhood and many more services. The diversity of service is reflected in the diversity in both size and type of buildings and other spatial requirements such as open spaces and associated transport demands. Although the community facilities provided and operated by VCSE groups is inherently diverse and ever changing, a level of co-ordination is provided by infrastructure or local support and development agencies; York CVS being the main provider of such a service in | 178/13905   | York Council for Voluntary Service           |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>    | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|--|---|-------------|--|
|  | <p>York, in which City of York Council invests funds for this express purpose.’ Would encourage a consistent approach with SS4 by stating in the policy that: ‘Community facilities and services should be developed following appropriate independent research of both local and citywide need and then met through community-led provision in a coordinated, planned and appropriately phased manner which compliments, integrates and wherever possible enhances existing community facilities and services. This research, coordination and planning should be resourced by the developer and managed by a suitable and trusted local organization as chosen by the community. If the organization chosen is the developer, then appropriate safeguards between the commercial development and community aspects should be put in place to ensure no conflict of interest.’ Would encourage a more explicit consideration of the community facility and service requirements of minority communities/service users which are unlikely to be co-located in a specific geographical community. For example, there is a need to develop an autism hub somewhere in the city and such a facility could be developed in conjunction with a commercial development, but would be unlikely to show up as a significant need in the community around any one development. One approach to such matters would be an option to bank ‘community credits’ for smaller developments which are unable to fully meet their community needs locally. Such credits could then be pooled on a citywide basis and used to fund citywide community facilities that are identified. Are unclear why community facilities are only associated with residential developments. In many cases the appropriate place for a community facility is nearer to a work place than a home; for example daily leisure or childcare facilities or facilities being accessed at lunchtime, before or after work. Would like to see the requirement for consideration of community facilities extended to include retail, office and other industrial developments in order to support employers’ workforces. Would propose that a further principle should be to support the development of neighbourhood based community hubs in order to reduce duplication and increase coordination of services locally. These might be in existing or new facilities including community centers, libraries, village or parish halls, local schools, children’s centers or prominent buildings of locally based VCSE organizations.</p> |             |  |
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities Continued</b> | <p>Comment – paragraph 13.3 does not provide a clear explanation for the term ‘community facilities’. Strongly suggest that an entry is made for this term in the Glossary.</p>   | 299/14145   | The Theatres Trust                           |
|  | <p>Support – for policy CF1.</p>  | 349/14191   | Sport England                                |
|  | <p>Comment – welcome the inclusion of the recommendations from the Built Sports</p>   | 387/14200   | Active York                                  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>    | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>                      |
|--|---|-------------|---|
|  | Facility Strategy in this section. Would like more description to make it clear that this could include indoor or outdoor provision and provision for any age group.  |             |   |
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities Continued</b> | Objection – only on leisure site is market on the proposals map, the Designer Outlet, this is devoted to shopping where does the leisure come in? York is badly in need of leisure facilities other than eating and drinking and watching football. There are many more healthy leisure activities to be enjoyed by all age group that are missing and could well be developed in York. Particularly by people in older age groups who are currently being lambasted for increasing cost dependence on social services care, much of which could be avoided by encouraging them to keep themselves fit. | 419/16527   |   |
|  | Support – fully support Policy CF1. Stress the importance of CF1 para iii “not permitting proposals which fail to protect existing community facilities”. Endorse preferred approach.   | 648/16797   | York Railway Institute  |
|  | Comment – consider criteria (i) of this policy, to lack clarity. The policy does not identify the mechanism for achieving such facilities.  | 673/16852   | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  |
|  | Comment – plan should include developments of existing community centres.   | 703/16875   |   |
|  | Support – the approach adopted in the Policy.   | 1346/17311  | Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust                                     |
|  | Support – agree to this approach. The Plan should require all new development to contribute to community facilities/health provision, on or off site. The plan should provide generic local criteria to guide community facilities/health provision in relation to general community facilities. The Plan should provide generic local criteria to guide community facilities/health provision and accessibility in relation to new development. The Plan should provide local level policy to protect existing community facilities and access to them.  | 1457/17413  |   |
|  | Comment – consider criteria (i) of this policy, to lack clarity. The policy does not identify the mechanism for achieving such facilities.  | 1514/17483  | Monks Cross North Consortium                                      |
|  | Comment – when considering the approach to Community Infrastructure Levy, care will need to be taken to ensure that developers are not changed twice for on-site and off-site provision.  | 1523/17504  | Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd |
|  | Objection – it is not clear how the appropriate, proportionate requirement will be arrived at and this does not assist developers and land owners to assess the overall additional cost on development which may be imposed through this requirement. Council need to undertake a more detailed viability appraisal of the development plan and allow examination of this to ensure that the plan is sound in this regard.  | 1661/9953   | Linden Homes  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>    | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Ref.</b>  | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>                        |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | Comment – wishes to see space for community growing and allotments included in all new residential development.  | 1665/12954   | York Environment Forum  |
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities Continued</b> | <p>Support – supportive of the essence of ensuring that there is an adequate provision of community facilities in York, concerns regarding the first bullet point of the policy. Objection – to the policy given that such provision should be based on evidence of need and should only be necessary where there is an identified deficiency in the relevant area. Furthermore such a requirement for all new residential development has not been tested via any cumulative viability assessment. The Community Levy Infrastructure should be the only mechanism for collecting cumulative impact on types of infrastructure.</p> <p>Alternatives – not only object to the proposed approach to Policy CF1 but also object to the only other alternative put forward on page 144 of the Local Plan. This alternative approach requires only major developments to contribute to community facilities/health provision on or off-site. Again, this should be based on need and any identified deficiency and should not be applied on a blanket approach. Recommended that the council adopt the same approach as they have for Policy EST1 regarding education, in that the policy specifically stipulates that education provision will be based on meeting an identified need and to address deficiencies in existing facilities.</p> <p>Objection – concerns with the use of the term “Proportionate” in relation Part i). The lack of detail within the policy wording leaves a degree of uncertainty for the development industry. In relation to Part ii) concerns with the lack of clarity and query how this will be applied on a consistent basis.</p> <p>Support – Policy CF1 is sensible and appropriate. A range of community facilities should be provided in accessible “limits” which they are easy of access, on foot, from the neighbourhood they serve.</p> <p>Support – agree with the preferred approach to required contributions, provision and accessibility and protection of existing community facilities.</p> <p>Comment – think that an investigation should happen to find out whether shops and services like the hospital or fire department can manage with the proposed new residents.</p> <p>Comment – there should be specific reference to the need to provide church buildings.</p> <p>Objection – absolutely no mention of how the city’s hospital or libraries will cope with such a high influx of new home owners.</p> <p>Comment – the non-delivery of essential infrastructure is particularly relevant to the proposed housing and commercial development on and around the A1237 Outer Ring</p> | <p>1668/15040</p> <p>1705/9788</p> <p>2416/6658</p> <p>2846/7552</p> <p>2849/7587</p> <p>2994/7781</p> <p>3246/8332</p> <p>3428/8776</p> | <p>Barratt &amp; David Wilson Homes</p> <p>Gladman Developments</p> |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.           | Comments   | Ref.       | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | Road.  |            |                                       |
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities Continued</b> | <p>Comment – all of the options concentrate on physical facilities which have a specific community function. Flourishing geographical communities are made up of more than specific buildings. There are other physical assets that can encourage flourishing communities which are not considered in this section. For instance pockets of trees and grass, roadside seats, bus stops etc. Furthermore the layout of buildings on their plots, siting of roads, design of buildings themselves will either encourage or hinder strong communities. Lastly, communities have a social dimension, and the physical nature of the environment is not the sole determinant of how effective or strong a geographical community is. Needs to consider the social determinants of health, so that issues of exercise, access to food etc are promoted rather than hindered by developments and planning decisions. Exercise takes places in many settings, and is mostly not dependant on being in a sports hall or on a pitch. Children’s play, which is crucial to good health short term and long term, is helped or hindered by where they live and go to school. A specific policy to achieve children’s need for play would be helpful. The section does not really address equality issues. This section could address guaranteeing residents’ access to land for food growing in ways which are additional to allotments, such as community gardens. The history of allotments in York show that privately owned land was used as well as corporation land, so there is historical precedent for urban agriculture to be part of the private sector as landlords.</p> | 5124/12234 |                                       |
|  | <p>Support – agree with the preferred approach. The Plan should require all new development to contribute to community facilities/health provision, on or off site. The Plan should provide generic local criteria to guide community facilities/health provision in relation to general community facilities. The Plan should provide generic local criteria to guide community facilities/health provision and accessibility in relation to new development. The Plan should provide local level policy to protect existing community facilities and access to them. Support the preferred approach to community facilities as long as more local considerations are taken into account. Does not believe this should be done on a York wide basis.</p>  | 5178/12355 |                                       |
|  | <p>Comment – regrets that there are no plans in place for the improvement to the life style of residents present and future in terms of schooling, community facilities and open space.</p>  | 5238/12567 |                                       |
|  | <p>Comment – the approach sounds good, it is not in place currently for many the major urban areas and this plan will not help.</p>  | 5740/13533 |                                       |
|  | <p>Comment – caring agencies, including the church, who are supporting people in</p>   | 5865/15136 | St Mary's Parochial                   |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>    | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>   |
|--|--|-------------|--|
|  | particular need in the parish is clearly overstretched. Haxby is an area with an older population, and a high number of people who live alone, and this means that there are significant implications for the caring and social professions as well as voluntary organisations including the church and its pastoral work. The Parochial Church Council also understand the proposed new development will not be big enough to attract a new GP practice, again something that should be taken into account. |             | Church Council                                 |
| <b>Policy CF1 Community Facilities Continued</b> | Comment – be much clearer and more pro-active on its current infrastructure requirements through an informed evidenced based study. Policy does not identify the mechanism for achieving such facilities. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is meant to be the only tool for collecting cumulative impact on types of infrastructure. Any CIL charge should be based upon a detailed viability assessment of all policy requirements and obligations.  | 6351/17638  | Gladedale Estates                              |
|  | Objection – disagree with the preferred approach to required contributions, support option 2, to require only major developments to contribute to community facilities/health provision on or off site.<br>Support – agree with the preferred approach to provision and accessibility to community facilities/health facilities and to the protection of existing community facilities.  | 6508/17677  | City Of York Council<br>Conservative Group     |
|  | Comment - no objection to the Preferred Approach as it could be applied whichever growth option is adopted. However, do need to ensure that there is sufficient usable open space in some of the villages and rural areas. Just because there are fields around, it doesn't necessarily mean that they are available for children to play on them.   | 6516/16333  | City Of York Council<br>Liberal Democrat Group |
|  | Comment – should specify not just accessible by walking and cycling but with appropriate and sufficient provision (e.g. cycle parking, lobby for coats, child buggies, scooters etc).  | 6518/16404  | York Green Party                               |



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| <b>Policy CF2 Built Sports Facilities</b>     | Support – supportive of the aim to ensure that anybody who wishes to play sport in the York area can do.  | 59/12661    | Dunnington Parish Council                    |
|   | Objection – CF2 should contain a statement regarding the environmental impact of sports sites development in the context of climate change.   | 90/12831    | Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)      |
|   | Comment – suggest that Policy CF2 is unnecessary as its essence is included in Policy CF1 which deals with all types of community infrastructure.   | 299/14146   | The Theatres Trust                           |
|   | Comment – policy’s intent and relationship with the Built Facilities Strategy could be much more clearly expressed. As an example of clarity would point towards Darlington’s Core Strategy (policy CS 18).   | 349/14192   | Sport England                                |
|   | Support – supportive of the aim to ensure that anybody who wishes to play sport in the York area can do.  | 1457/17415  |  |
|   | Support – policy CF2 is sensible. They rely on the cooperation of providers (e.g. NHS) and thus of a cross party willingness to ensure the best provision at local level.   | 2416/6659   |  |
|   | Comment – all of the options concentrate on physical facilities which have a specific community function. Flourishing geographical communities are made up of more than specific buildings. There are other physical assets that can encourage flourishing communities which are not considered in this section. For instance pockets of trees and grass, roadside seats, bus stops etc. Furthermore the layout of buildings on their plots, siting of roads, design of buildings themselves will either encourage or hinder strong communities. Lastly, communities have a social dimension, and the physical nature of the environment is not the sole determinant of how effective or strong a geographical community is. Needs to consider the social determinants of health, so that issues of exercise, access to food etc are promoted rather than hindered by developments and planning decisions. Exercise takes places in many settings, and is mostly not dependant on being in a sports hall or on a pitch. Children’s play, which is crucial to good health short term and long term, is helped or hindered by where they live and go to school. A specific policy to achieve children’s need for play would be helpful. The section does not really address equality issues. This section could address guaranteeing residents’ access to land for food growing in ways which are additional to allotments, such as community gardens. The history of allotments in York show that privately owned land was used as well as corporation land, so there is historical precedent for urban agriculture to be part of the private sector as landlords. | 5124/12235  |  |
|   | Support – Policy CF2. Supportive of the aim to ensure that anybody who wishes to play sport in the York area can do.  | 5178/12356  |  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>                             |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| <b>Para 13.02 &amp; 13.04</b>                 | Comment – it is important that community facilities in a new development do not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring community facilities. It is (ironically) then illustrated in par 13.4, which refers to the proposed new Community Hub at the York Community Stadium.   | 1665/12955  | York Environment Forum   |
| <b>Para 13.03 &amp; 13.05</b>                 | Comments – there is an unidentified gap in provision for minority sport, in particular up-to-date skatepark facilities. There is an opportunity to identify a site for a free-to-use skatepark of regional significance. This would support the programmes of health, social inclusion and equalities. Paras. 13.3 and 13.5 do not include this. The Built Sports Facilities Strategy para. 9.9 indicates that there is confusion over terminology – a BMX track is not a skatepark. | 103/12863   | York Tomorrow  |
| <b>Para 13.05</b>                             | Comment – should be a reference to the importance of the beautiful natural environment on how to deliver and maintain quality of open space to help encourage people into active leisure sports.   | 4819/14313  | York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Tremendous York |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>   | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b>                 | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Policy CF3 Child Care Provision</b>  | Comment – Para 13.6 Does this need to refer to “Managing Environmental Nuisance”?   | 387/14201                   | Active York                                  |
|   | Support – Policy CF3 is sensible. It relies on the cooperation of providers (e.g. NHS) and thus of a cross party willingness to ensure the best provision at local level.   | 2416/6660                   |  |
|   | Comment – future investment of cities begins with childcare provision.  | 2662/7050                   |  |
|   | Comment – all of the options concentrate on physical facilities which have a specific community function. Flourishing geographical communities are made up of more than specific buildings. There are other physical assets that can encourage flourishing communities which are not considered in this section. For instance pockets of trees and grass, roadside seats, bus stops etc. Furthermore the layout of buildings on their plots, siting of roads, design of buildings themselves will either encourage or hinder strong communities. Lastly, communities have a social dimension, and the physical nature of the environment is not the sole determinant of how effective or strong a geographical community is. Needs to consider the social determinants of health, so that issues of exercise, access to food etc are promoted rather than hindered by developments and planning decisions. Exercise takes places in many settings, and is mostly not dependant on being in a sports hall or on a pitch. Children’s play, which is crucial to good health short term and long term, is helped or hindered by where they live and go to school. A specific policy to achieve children’s need for play would be helpful. The section does not really address equality issues. This section could address guaranteeing residents’ access to land for food growing in ways which are additional to allotments, such as community gardens. The history of allotments in York show that privately owned land was used as well as corporation land, so there is historical precedent for urban agriculture to be part of the private sector as landlords. | 5124/12236                  |  |
|   | Support – strongly recommend that this policy be kept in the final version of the Local Plan as it helps to protect the sustainability of existing quality childcare provision within a locality.   | 5275/14383                  | Polly Anna's Nursery                         |
|   | Support –strongly recommend that this policy be kept in the final version of the Local Plan as it helps to protect the sustainability of existing quality childcare provision within a locality.  | 5301/14453                  | Sunshine Day Nursery (York) Ltd              |
| Comment – would like more control over the say in expanding Children’s Day Nurseries in York. The market in some areas is saturated, then in need of Nurseries in others. This sounds incredibly silly to add to somewhere that doesn’t need more and thus closing existing Nurseries down. | 5306/14464  | Little Acorns, New Earswick |  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>    | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| <b>Policy CF3 Child Care Provision Continued</b> | Support – strongly recommend that this policy be kept in the final version of the Local Plan as it helps to protect the sustainability of existing quality childcare.   | 5317/14484  | Walmgate Day Nursery Ltd                     |
|  | Support – strongly recommend that this policy be kept in the final version of the Local Plan as it helps to protect the sustainability of existing quality childcare.   | 5354/14543  | The Wendy House Children's Day Nursery       |
|  | Support – strongly recommend that this policy be kept in the final version of the Local Plan as it helps to protect the sustainability of existing childcare provision. | 6256/15829  | Childcare Sufficiency Group                  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>       | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>                      |
|---|---|-------------|---|
| <b>Policy CF4 Healthcare And Emergency Services</b> | Objection – considered that there should be policies which: require all new developments (other than house extensions) to contribute to community facilities/health provision. Provide detailed local criteria to guide community facilities/health provision and accessibility in relation to new development. | 62/12707    | Fulford Parish Council  |
|   | Comment – should there be mention of Archways Intermediate Care Unit?   | 258/14151   |   |
|   | Comment – when considering the approach to Community Infrastructure Levy, care will need to be taken to ensure that developers are not changed twice for on-site and off-site provision.  | 1523/17505  | Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd |
|   | Comment – issue of the major redevelopment of the Hospital over the next few years.   | 1895/56     | York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust                       |
|   | Support – Policy CF4 is sensible. It relies on the cooperation of providers (e.g. NHS) and thus of a cross party willingness to ensure the best provision at local level.   | 2416/6661   |   |
|   | Comment – what about medical services? York Hospital will surely need enlarging. Police and fire services? New stations will be needed regardless of the current government’s aim to cut both.  | 4681/11958  |   |
|   | Comment – York District Hospital would also be hard pressed to meet the additional demands on its services and with an aging population it is difficult to visualise how the service could meet the inevitable increase in patient care.  | 5800/13731  |   |
|   | Objection – St. Leonard’s propose that this site should instead be allocated to meet the future needs for health care facilities in York.   | 6142/15612  | St Leonard's Hospice  |

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 13: Community Facilities Continued**

**April 2014**

| <b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Ref.</b> | <b>Name (where business or organisation)</b> |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| <b>Question 13.01</b>                         | Support – approach agreed.  | 103/12865   | York Tomorrow                                |
|   | Support – the approach recommended within this consultation and especially the development of local level policy.   | 190/13967   | York Consortium of Drainage Boards           |
|   | Comment – the preferred approach to community facilities should be appropriate.   | 943/16959   |  |
|   | Support – agree with preferred options.   | 1109/17202  |  |
|   | Comment – while no general comments upon this section, needs to be much clearer and more pro-active on its current infrastructure requirements through an informed evidenced based study.   | 1514/17482  | Monks Cross North Consortium                 |
|   | Objection – the options concentrate on physical facilities with a specific community function and miss the point that flourishing geographical communities are made up of more than buildings such as libraries, churches, schools, pitches etc. Other physical assets that can encourage communities which are not considered in this section, notably public spaces, pockets of trees and grass (even roadside seats). The nature of 'community' - the definition of which it is becoming increasingly important to determine (for example, for applications for community energy or other projects) - is flexible and communities overlap in terms of interests (as well as geographically). | 1665/12957  | York Environment Forum                       |
|   | Support – agree in principal with the preferred approach. Need to work in conjunction with service providers and the community in relation to the enhancement of existing services and provision of new services.<br>Comment – where the delivery of community facilities would not be undertaken in conjunction with public sector service providers, such as childcare facilities, the provision of a need assessment has the potential to prevent competition and hinder choice for the local community. For uses such as private crèches, surely it should be the market that dictates their success.   | 1736/9827   | Oakgate Group PLC                            |