

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Comment – strong linkages between climate change, flood management, green infrastructure and minerals planning agendas. Such policy linkages could be further explored through collaborative working between authorities on relevant aspects of the Plan.	11/11685	North Yorkshire County Council
	Support – for Policies GI1-7. Very pleased to see the way Green Infrastructure has been considered in relation to a wide range of issues.	42/11716	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Support – agree with the approach proposed to Green Infrastructure.	59/12665	Dunnington Parish Council
	Comment – how will the Plan meet the requirements of National Guidance with regard to the maintenance of biodiversity and the preservation of wildlife corridors in the area? Currently, the land to the north of Haxby is divided into a number of small fields none of which are farmed intensively. This means that we have the benefit of a rich wildlife. There are long established hedgerows and mature trees. It is expected that developers would respect these existing features.	63/12727	Haxby Town Council
	Comment - the Proposals Map of Strensall shows the following errors in respect of Open Space Areas which have been included in the calculations: The Open Space and Tennis Courts at Strensall Park are part of the MoD Housing are not for public use. The sports area at Queen Elizabeth Barracks is within the MoD property for army use only and there is no public access. The land between the York to Scarborough railway bridge over the River Foss and the small area behind Leyfield Close is owned by the Shepherd Group and is not for public use. The land behind 28 West End is privately owned. The heath alongside Park Gate and Heath Ride is privately owned.	77/12769	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – the wording of the policies are excellent, but there is concern for the implementation.	101/14227	York Natural Environment Panel
	Support – Evidence Base (BAP) – welcome the recent publication (May 2013) of the draft City of York Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). Believe the BAP sets out a positive framework for the conservation of habitats and protection of wildlife which will inform and guide the implementation of the Local Plan (when published). Strongly support stated aims (BAP page 10), of increasing, extending, improving and linking the conservation areas for which it has responsibility (attributed to the Lawton Review, 2010). Comment – major rivers such as the Ouse and Derwent are regularly used by birds as flight paths and navigational aids including migratory birds and birds of very high concern (e.g. Annex 1, Schedule 1, Red Listed, Amber Listed and UK BAP priority species). Strongly recommend consultation with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council	401/16525	York Ornithological Club

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and Selby District Council with a view to creating an integrated management plan for the Rivers Ouse and Derwent to conserve and protect their wildlife while providing appropriate public access.		
General continued	<p>Objection – in the 'Local Context' section reference is made to the Consultation Draft City of York Playing Pitch Strategy (2013) indentifying that the City as a whole has a shortage of playing pitches. This contradicts the statement at page 3 of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2013 which states that in general terms there is sufficient grass pitch provision to meet the current level of demand. In these terms, it cannot be considered that there is a shortage as a whole in the City.</p> <p>Objection – object to statement no. 2 in the 'New Open Space' section of the 'Alternatives' box as the statement is incorrect – the 60/40 ratio is only referred to in respect of urban extensions, new settlements or major village expansions. A 70/30 ratio is referred to for larger sites.</p>	434/16577	Associated British Foods plc
	Objection – Biodiversity Audit Evidence Base – the proposed SINC designation at Severus Hill is unsound and that the sustainable site is suitable to provide housing to meet the future needs of York and should be allocated as such.	536/16725	KeyLand Developments Ltd
	<p>Objection - Evidence Base – inadequate consideration of possible in-combination effects on relevant SAC's/SPA's (principally Lower Derwent Valley's designations). There is very limited consideration of in-combination effects in Appendix 1, but none of any substance. In either the screening or Appropriate Assessment (AA) stages. Also, the lack of any specific consideration is given to the conservation objectives of the relevant SAC's/SPA's/Ramsar sites in the AA. This may have formed some basis for the assessments presented but this is not clear and, if it is the case, should be made more explicit. Welcome the opportunity to work further with the council on these matters.</p>	1399/17365	RSPB
	<p>Objection – the principle of the approach to consider all green infrastructure as a holistic system rather than considering issues individually is supported. However, there is concern that this appears to then be confused by subsequent policies dedicated to biodiversity and trees. In particular, this appears to potentially weaken (in policies GI1 & GI2) the level of protection being afforded to those sites and species within the City which are of national and international biodiversity importance.</p> <p>Concerned that in trying to make a more holistic approach to green infrastructure, the policy protection has effectively been weakened for the more important designated sites, which does not appear to be in accordance with the requirements of NPPF. Consider that the whole section needs reconsidering to clearly define what is meant by the term 'green infrastructure' and the level of protection which will be given to</p>	1491/17452	National Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	designated sites, in order to ensure it complies with NPPF.		
General continued	Support – welcome the general thrust of the section as it provides an appropriate approach to the role and value of Green Infrastructure.	1592/17618	York Civic Trust
	Objection – should adopt the same wording as Selby with regard to highlighting the Lower Derwent Valley Plan: “a) The Lower Derwent Valley affects several local authority areas and the Council recognises the need for co-operation with adjoining local authorities and other organisations in order to safeguard its special landscape of great agricultural, historic, cultural, environmental and landscape value; b) to this end the council will work with its neighbouring authorities and Natural England to produce a joint Plan at the earliest opportunity”	4413/11431	Carstairs Countryside Trust
	Objection – must raise natural environment standards in York and develop a Green Infrastructure Strategy. As green infrastructure underpins most supporting documents and strands in York’s economic strategy and should be built into the local plan plus build into strategic policies and plans to deliver the natural environment quality and make it all happen. There are many GI cross cutting benefits of eco system services to be introduced into almost all of the policies and action plans. Natural Environment should be placed at a higher level. Need to develop a GI strategy as soon as possible.	4819/14288	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Tremendous York
	Support – no objection to the Preferred Approach as it could be applied whichever growth option is adopted.	6516/16338	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – there is no reference in this section to a policy statement on the protection of high quality agricultural land around York to protect this valuable asset as part of York’s future food security. Such a policy should be included.	6518/16421	York Green Party
	Support – agree with the approach to Green Infrastructure.	6519/16484	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	Objection - (Evidence Base) object to the continued inclusion of site 116 (Metcalf Lane Meadows) on page 213 of the BAP. To leave this 13 acre site in the document is thoroughly misleading as it has been dug up and is currently being built on for the Derwenthorpe site. Removal of site 116 would highlight the scarcity of wildlife areas in Osbaldwick Parish. Support – wholeheartedly support the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance . An excellent piece of work with one proviso – the emphasis on quality of materials needs to extend to the residential and village areas of York as much as the City Centre. This document, when approved, will prevent any further loss and detrimental effects on the streetscape of the City.	6521/17238	Cllr Mark Warters

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure	<p>Objection – support the aspirations to enhancing infrastructure, but there is room for improvement as the current draft lacks direction and gives no confidence that the measures outlined in the policy would achieve the objectives for green infrastructure. Neither the policy nor the supporting text defines a green infrastructure assessment or indicates whether applicants would be required to show conservation of existing asset or indeed expansion or enhancement. Currently this policy fails to secure any meaningful improvement or show positive planning. In order to bring the policy in line with NPPF, point vi, for example, could be rewritten as “requiring applicants to submit a green infrastructure assessment showing how the development would contribute to the conservation and expansion of green infrastructure within the city.”</p> <p>It should be made clear in this policy that green infrastructure has a dual use as flood storage areas for river or surface water flows.” The policy should also reference green infrastructure in relation to an intention for green wall, roofs and soft borders.</p>	3/11627	Environment Agency
	<p>Support – strongly support Local Green Corridors where possible incorporating publicly available footpaths to enable pollution-free exercise or point to point travel.</p> <p>Comment – support the representations made by members of the York Natural Environment Panel (ID101) and that of the CPRE (ID47) and York Natural Environment Trust (ID102)</p>	91/12852	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	<p>Objection – Change to option 1 ‘Protect all Green Infrastructure to the same level irrespective of its function’.</p> <p>Supports GI1 and the positive statements of good intentions.</p>	101/14228	York Natural Environment Panel
	<p>Comment – the River Ouse is a key component of York’s Green Infrastructure, providing sustainable transport and leisure opportunities for water based craft and riverside paths for people.</p>	210/14027	Canal & River Trust
	<p>Support – this policy and especially the recognition in the criterion v of the contribution which the city’s heritage assets make to the Green Infrastructure network.</p>	238/14112	English Heritage
	<p>Comment - definition as given for green infrastructure is not particularly strong. States that GI is the term used for overarching framework related to all green assets. Further to paragraph 2.15 (Spatial Portrait) there is no information regarding what could be considered green infrastructure. No specific mention of water or blue infrastructure further to mentioning the rivers as green corridors. There are specific policies regarding issues such as biodiversity, trees, open space and playing pitches, new open space and green corridors. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) represent an important step in managing the effects of climate change and reducing flood risk. SUDS in new developments may include ponds, scapes, drainage channels etc and it is</p>	295/14160	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	likely that these would be designed as part of green infrastructure and its contribution to open spaces, biodiversity etc.		
Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure continued	Support – the multi-functional approach to Green Infrastructure.	434/16578	Associated British Foods plc
	Support – the designation of the land between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway line, Strensall, as a site of importance for Nature Conservation and adjoining land designated for nature conservation.	494/16624	
	Comment – please encourage the maintenance of the strays, green spaces within the City. A park and cafe area could be built up around Clifford’s Tower rather than more shops, incorporating the underused and concrete riverbanks into the life of our City.	995/17032	
	Support – the commitment to produce management plans for Sites of Nature Conservation Interest and Council owned sites is welcomed.	1399/17359	RSPB
	Comment – support the policy, but recommend that all small areas of land, including within the York Business Park, a natural pond and kick about area within Poppleton Park and play area and other natural woodland areas, within Millfield Gardens the play area, all to be included to have them safeguarded and to protect them from development. Also recommend that to further strengthen the purposes of Green Infrastructure, transport corridors and their margins should be considered as green corridors. This should include not only major roads, but also the approach roads to rural areas and within the villages to give special protection as important to wildlife, natural environment and to the setting and character of York and its surrounding villages.	1589/17569	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – Policy GI1(vi): when applicants submit Green Infrastructure assessments, policy should state that they will be assessed by suitably experienced and qualified officers. Objection – Policy GI1(vii): amend to ensure any development complies with Species and Habitat Action Plans / Notes from the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).	1665/12966	York Environment Forum
	Objection – Policy GI1(vi): no justification as to why all non-minor applications have to submit an assessment. This is a matter for the local validation checklist which must be reviewed every 2 years and not the Local Plan which will last for 15 years. The policy therefore is wholly unreasonable and part (vi) should be deleted.	1668/15041	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection –requiring a separate green infrastructure assessment (in part vii) would be unnecessary and onerous. An assessment of impacts on green infrastructure would be picked up through Design and Access Statements and in relation to green transport networks, would also be covered within the Transportation Assessment.	1705/9792	Gladman Developments

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure Continued	Objection – should not seek to allocate SINC’s where they have no detailed evidence base to support such an allocation, particularly where the land is in private ownership and there is no public access on to or through the land.	1736/9831	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – in terms of the level of detail of supporting information, to be required with planning applications, it is considered that a blanket approach across all applications is overly onerous and a statement should be included that, where this information is required, these should be commensurate to the scale and complexity of development proposals and will be requested specifically during pre-application discussions if needed.	1785/9869	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
	Comment – is there an overarching, joined up, integrated environmental, ecological plan for York where the existing and potential green spaces, especially with in the Ring Road are protected and developed?	2358/6541	
	Support – the preferred option to provide local policy to guide new development in relation to all biodiversity/geodiversity/landscape resources.	2846/7562	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	3062/7927	
	Support – support the preferred approach.	3356/8579	
	Support – the preferred option to provide local policy to guide new development in relation to all biodiversity/geodiversity/landscape resources.	2846/7563	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	3062/7928	
	Support – support the preferred approach.	3356/8579	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4054/10735	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4081/10766	
	Support – the proposal of nature conservation status of land behind Southfields Road, Princess Road and Railway Line in Strensall.	4318/11205	
	Objection – the designation of the former bowling green at Connaught Court, Main St, Fulford is no longer appropriate, since the use has ceased and the green will disappear as a result of the emerging development proposals. This designation should be	4350/11752	Royal Masonic Benevolent Institution (RMBI)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	removed in any future versions of the Proposals Map.		
Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure continued	Support – the nature conservation designation proposed for land bounded by Southfields Road, Princess Road and railway line in Strensall.	4394/11386	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4495/11526	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4703/11997	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4769/12062	
	Objection – no green infrastructure strategy. No management, monitoring plan or training plan is currently in place.	4819/14292	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Comment – agree to prioritise ‘functional’ green infrastructure. It is disappointing that little attention is paid to the role of private and public gardens, allotments, and land which is attached to offices, hotels etc as positive contributors to green infrastructure.	5124/12237	
	Comment – the Plan should give greater protection to functional Green Infrastructure. The Plan should provide local level policy to protect existing recreational space and Green Infrastructure and access to it. While new development should clearly make provision for an off site new open space provisions there is sufficient information to form an opinion on the policy as presented.	5178/12362	
	Objection – disagree with the preferred approach, some open spaces are valuable for wildlife and essential sanctuaries for plants and animals even if there is no public access to recreational value, if the preferred approach is taken there is a danger that all York’s green spaces will turn into public parks. Considers that the approach should be to protect all green infrastructure to the same level irrespective of its function.	5609/13176	
	Comment – the production of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) is very much appreciated, but concerned that it will still be draft and incomplete at the time of the examination. In particular, its delay will affect the following sites: Heslington Tillmire, Askham Bog, Hassacarr Nature Reserve.	6277/15862	Friends Of Rawcliffe Meadows
Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature	6312/15958		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)		
Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure continued	Comment – although agree in general terms with the preferred approach to Green Infrastructure there is no evidence of acknowledgement of the strain which the policies promoted elsewhere in the Local Plan documents will put on York’s Green Infrastructure above and beyond the current threats to York’s open spaces.	6508/17682	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Support – the designation of land as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	6514/16308	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Support - agree with the aspirations of this policy. Comment – main concern is whether or not there is the capacity to deliver these objectives, particularly the production of management plans. Objection – concerned about the lack of consistency here with the housing allocations, specifically at Whinthorpe (abuts directly on to Heslington Tillmire SSSI, whilst both the Tillmire and Golf Course are both SINCS and the Sustainability Appraisal identifies negative consequences) and at Woodthorpe ST10 (according to the SA, the quality of this land is 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.	6518/16412	York Green Party

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI2 Biodiversity	<p>Objection – policy GI2 makes no distinction between the levels of protection afforded to international, national or local nature conservation sites. Within a Local Plan, a more detailed policy (or policies) is required in order to determine planning applications. The NPPF and Circular 06/2005 set out the required approaches when determining applications which affect nature conservation sites and species, this should be interpreted locally within the Local Plan. Whilst the Biodiversity Action Plan provides detailed ecological guidance, on what habitats / species should be protected and enhanced, policy GI2 and supporting text should, in accordance with 113, distinguish between international, national and locally designated sites and the level of protection they are afforded.</p> <p>For example, developments which adversely affect the integrity of a Natura 2000 site cannot be permitted (in accordance with the Habitat Regulations).</p> <p>Both the third bullet of policy GI2 and paragraph 17.5 should reflect paragraph 118 of the NPPF (first bullet point) that where significant harm is unavoidable compensation is a last resort. Policy GI2 implies that compensation (loss and replacement) is as acceptable as mitigation (effect reduction). ‘As a last resort’ should be inserted before ‘or compensated for’. Paragraph 17.5 should read: “In exceptional circumstances, where the locational benefits of a development clearly outweigh the adverse effects on a nature conservation site or species and this cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation will be required. Compensation or off-setting will only be accepted as a last resort.” Mitigation and suggested alterations to the Plan are proposed, this entails the following amendment to policy GI2: “No development will be permitted which may have an adverse effect on the integrity of any SAC, SPA or Ramsar site alone, or in combination with other plans and projects.” However, it should not be relied upon where development policies and proposals are likely to adversely affect internationally protected sites. It is acceptable to defer the assessment of a policy to the application stage, where alternatives exist to avoid adverse effects on a site.</p>	2/11589	Natural England
	<p>Objection – elements of this policy, specifically the first two bullet points, are vague and would be difficult to enforce or monitor. The third bullet point, relating to on site impacts does need redrafting to reflect the local objectives and NPPF in furthering the enhancement of biodiversity. Instead of seeking “no net loss” should be seeking a net gain in biodiversity. To achieve this, the policy should be redrafted: “results in a net gain to biodiversity, appropriate with the scale of the development.” The remainder of this bullet point also needs to be updated to better reflect the hierarchy set out in paragraph 118 of NPPF. It could be rewritten as “results in a net gain to biodiversity.</p>	3/11628	Environment Agency

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	In the first instance, developments should be located in areas which do not impact on biodiversity. Where this is not possible, adequate mitigation should be incorporated. If this is unachievable, compensation must be provided. If this cannot be incorporated, development will not be supported."		
Policy GI2 Biodiversity Continued	Support – it is noted that the Lower Derwent Valley is identified as a particularly critical high value area for biodiversity, landscape and cultural value. This is consistent with the draft East Riding Local Plan.	10/11698	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – the 'red-listed' birds and mammals present over 2012 and 2013 were: corn bunting, yellow wagtail, skylark, linnet, yellowhammer, and brown hare. These are precious endangered species and should not be sacrificed for dubious housing statistics.	57/12622	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – impressed with and fascinated by the Biodiversity Action Plan. However, the report is based on existing designation of sites of local interest and importance and it is not clear how the designations were created. Agree with the 3 that are recorded, namely SLI 55, 157, 259 although would argue that the area for SLI 157 (page 211) should be larger in line with the description in Site 25 (Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper – Updated June 2013) and the 'interest' is more than 'semi improved grassland'. Believe that another SLI is the footpath alongside Nova Scotia pond which has many unusual flowers and is a lovely habitat for butterflies. Also wish to have Murton Village Pond and Nova Scotia Pond included (Ponds – pp109-117)	69/13852	Murton Parish Council
	Objection – policies should be amended so that the Plan achieves its objectives of protecting and enhancing biodiversity. For example, any plan to promote the use of biomass should not be at the expense of old growth or biodiverse forests.	90/12842	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Comment – support the representations made by members of the York Natural Environment Panel (ID101) and that of the CPRE (ID47) and York Natural Environment Trust (ID102)	91/12857	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support – agree with option 4 to provide local policy to guide new development in relation to all biodiversity/geodiversity/landscape resources.	101/14229	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – various watercourses within the District are a strategic part of the natural environment and support a wealth of wildlife and flora. The Boards have a wealth of experience working with strategic partners on such issues and should be viewed as partners within this specific policy area. Although broadly supportive of Policy GI2, this may be expanded at point 6 to encompass drainage function in tandem with the other functions discussed. This may be viewed as more balanced and functional. Access to local open space is a worthy aim. However, must be mindful of their specific	190/13971	York Consortium of Drainage Boards

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	functions and associated flood risk management. Consequently, access needs to be strictly regulated and rationalised to ensure it does not impede their function and ability to respond to issues as they arise. Where access is afforded within 9 metres of a bank top, the Board's consent would be required.		
Policy GI2 Biodiversity Continued	Support – the aim of the policy to maintain and enhance the river and banks for their biodiversity, cultural, historic and recreational attributes.	210/14028	Canal & River Trust
	Objection – the policy should be applied flexibly as it may transpire that the reasons for the designation of the SINC are in decline or no longer existing.	434/16579	Associated British Foods plc
	Support – the designation of the land between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway line, Strensall, as a site of importance for Nature Conservation and adjoining land designated for nature conservation.	494/16625	
	Objection – Site of Local Interest affects ST11. Policy GI2 seeks to conserve and enhance areas of biodiversity value. The survey does not reveal any evidence to justify this designation. Recommendation- delete designation from ST11.	659/15058	Persimmon Homes
	Object – the third bullet point of this policy needs rewording as follows: "Results in net gain to biodiversity and contributes to the establishment and improvement of coherent ecological networks." A clear reference to the statutory protected sites for nature conservation (SPA, SAC, Ramsar & SSSI's) and the legal requirement for their protection should be added to the policy. A list of individually named statutory protected sites for nature conservation should also be added to Section 17 (together with corresponding reference numbers on the maps).	1399/17360	RSPB
	Objection – Policy GI2: along with York's Strays, the Council should also maintain and enhance biodiversity on any other area it has within its remit.	1665/12967	York Environment Forum
	Support – support the preferred approach.	3356/8580	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4054/10736	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4081/10767	
	Support – the proposal of nature conservation status of land behind Southfields Road, Princess Road and the Railway Line as shown on plan of Strensall.	4318/11206	
Support – the proposal of nature conservation status of land behind Southfields Road, Princess Road and the Railway Line as shown on plan of Strensall.	4394/11387		
Objection – a severe problem faces hole-nesting birds such as swifts in that upgrading	4413/11748	Carstairs Countryside	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>of roofs is robbing them of nesting places. Yet, this dramatic loss is so easily remedied – a statement should be incorporated that all built development must incorporate ‘swift bricks’. A specific provision should be made in an appropriate place to echo East Riding of Yorkshire’s policy which recognises the River Derwent Landscape as of Great Importance.</p> <p>Objection (GI2 + Proposals Map) – suggest that the Proposals Map should be amended to show the Lower Derwent Valley/River Derwent areas of Habitat protection and additional strategic protection adjacent to the Lower Derwent Valley/River Derwent Corridor (see Annex 4 and Annex 5 of the submission for boundary).</p>		Trust
Policy GI2 Biodiversity Continued	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4495/11527	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2).	4703/11998	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2).	4769/12063	
	Objection – no green infrastructure strategy. No management, monitoring plan or training plan is currently in place.	4819/14293	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Support – agree with the preferred approach.	5609/13177	
	Comment – should keep the countryside to the north of York and the Ouse, green space must be preserved at all costs.	5686/13399	
	Comment – the production of the Biodiversity Action Plan is very much appreciated, but concerned that it will still be draft and incomplete at the time of the examination. In particular, its delay will affect the following sites: Heslington Tillmire, Askham Bog, Hassacarr Nature Reserve.	6277/15863	Friends Of Rawcliffe Meadows
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2).	6312/15959	
	Support – the designation of land as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2).	6514/16309	Cllr Paul Doughty

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI2 Biodiversity Continued	Support – this policy. Comment – believe the maintenance of biodiversity requires a much greater degree of imagination about what constitutes biodiversity than is presently the case.	6518/16414	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI3 Trees	Objection – an extra point is needed within the policy to emphasise the importance of using native trees in new plantings in the city wherever possible.	42/11717	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – should adopt policies to increase the proportion of land under forest cover. Any newly planted forest should be designed to be of high value to wildlife. Policies to manage flooding should look for opportunities to enhance biodiversity as well as reduce flooding. The Plan should increase measures to improve the quality of pollinators in York.	90/12843	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Support – fully support policy GI3 and the positive statements of good intentions.	101/14238	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – various watercourses within the District are a strategic part of the natural environment and support a wealth of wildlife and flora. The Boards have a wealth of experience working with strategic partners on such issues and should be viewed as partners within this specific policy area. Objection - policy GI3 or the following paragraphs should introduce a reference to the planting of trees adjacent to watercourses and drainage culverts suitably guarding against such practices based on their longer term ability to seriously impede watercourses and blocked culverts through root ingress and lack of access for maintenance. Irresponsible planting has resulted in serious and avoidable localised flooding and not insignificant costs.	190/13972	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Comment – support policy but amend third bullet point to read ‘...retains trees that make a significant contribution to the character or setting of a Conservation Area, to the setting of a Listed Building...etc’	238/14113	English Heritage
	Objection – GI3 is an unnecessary policy.	544/16754	
	Comment – should produce a Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Tree Strategy.	1665/12968	York Environment Forum
	Objection – bullet point 3 of this policy should be reworded as follows: “where appropriate retains trees that make a significant contribution to the setting of a conservation area or listed building, the setting of proposed development, are a significant element of a designed landscape or value to the public amenity in terms of visual benefits, shading, screening.” In its current form, the policy lacks clarity. If trees or woodland are worthy of protection then this should be formally done, rather than providing a ‘catch all’ type policy.	1705/9793	Gladman Developments
	Support – the preferred approach.	3356/8581	
	Objection – no tree strategy. Since 1996, promised one and recently a draft tree strategy was started, where Treemendous York was involved to deliver the tree strategy or trees in development sites document, but although promised and recorded,	4819/14294	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) &

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	still no timetable for delivery.		Treemendous York
Policy GI3 Trees Continued	Comment – the production of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) is very much appreciated, but concerned that it will still be draft and incomplete at the time of the examination. In particular, its delay will affect the following sites: Heslington Tillmire, Askham Bog, Hassacarr Nature Reserve. Should produce a 'Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Tree Strategy' reflecting the SINC Audit and BAP.	6277/15864	Friends Of Rawcliffe Meadows
	Support – the policy and particularly the part of the third bullet point referring to the value of trees to the general public amenity. Comment – would also like to add the following bullet point: "Trees in urban and semi-urban spaces need to be managed in a more dynamic manner in order to create and maintain more interesting and stimulating environments that will appeal to a wider range of users. More trees with edible products (fresh or for preservation) need to be integrated with existing tree populations and local people need to be involved more in their management. Some of the principles of Forest Gardens and the Garden Cities need to be applied more widely in York as its structure and history already lends itself to this approach."	6518/16415	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI4 Open Space And Playing Pitches	Objection – evidence base – the definition of ‘surplus’ and deficit of pitches’ is based on a crude measure of provision based on national participation standards and not local health and wellbeing demands. Where the University is seeking grant funding for new facilities, for which it has identified a curriculum need, the definitions could inhibit the success of such applications.	38/12926	York St John University
	Support – support the potential actions regarding the Playing Pitch Strategy. Comment – believe that support should be given to develop further playing pitches.	59/12662	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support – policy GI4 is justified in requiring that developments of 10 or more dwellings should address current deficiencies in open, recreational and play space.	62/12713	Fulford Parish Council
	Support – preferred option 3 to provide local level policy to protect existing recreational open space/green infrastructure and access to it.	101/14230	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – Policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. States that all housing sites will be required to make provision for open space. On sites of 10 units or less it is proposed this will be via payment of commuted sum. Such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL which is meant to be the only tool for collecting cumulative contributions on types of infrastructure; it cannot ‘pool’ more than 5 contributions from section 106 agreements through the payment of a commuted sum.	145/13874	Home Builders Federation
	Comment – support purpose of GI4 but considers the policy’s intent and relationship with the Playing Pitch Strategy could be much more clearly expressed.	349/14194	Sport England
	Comment – pleased to see the proposal for three additional areas of land to be designated for sports fields but feel that the anticipated population growth, more areas of land should be designated for housing. Welcome inclusion of open spaces in the major strategic housing development sites. Would like to see more reference to development being designed to increase physical activity, with appropriate lighting, linked green space, sustainable travel routes, well designed sports facilities etc.	387/14208	Active York
	Objection – the inclusion of public space within a new development is intended to meet the needs of the new residents living within it, as opposed to making up any deficiencies in provision in the local area. The plan cannot therefore look to new developments to make up existing shortfalls. Whilst new provision of open space including play space could be used by existing residents the scale of provision should be proportionate to the size of the new development. The wording of this policy should be reconsidered.	432/16553	Church Commissioners for England

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI4 Open Space And Playing Pitches Continued	<p>Objection – object to Policy GI4 and in particular the following wording (<i>“For sites of 10 or more dwellings, the development will be required to address current deficiencies in open, recreational and play space in line with the current open space study. Development which results in the net loss of open space or gross loss in areas of deficiencies will be refused”</i>) on the grounds that the NPPF (para 73) requires policies to be based on up to date assessment of need. The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study dates from 2008 and is therefore not considered to be an up to date assessment for the purposes of informing policy. It is considered “ultra vires” and unreasonable to require new development to address existing deficiencies, particularly if such deficiencies are not directly related to the development. It is accepted that developments will be required to make provision for the open space needs of future residents, but the quoted wording above on addressing existing deficiencies should be deleted.</p>	434/16580	Associated British Foods plc
	<p>Comment – do not object in principle to addressing current deficiencies in open, recreational and play space. However, to ensure flexibility is provided on a site by site basis, recommend deletion of ‘development will be required to address current open space deficiencies’. This suggests a development may be refused consent because it fails to make up the deficit in open space in an area yet that deficit may be wholly out of scale with the development site. There is no evidence produced to justify this. Recommend that the following sentence be reworded: ‘For sites of 10 or more dwellings, the development will take into account current deficiencies in line with the current Open Space Study’.</p>	659/15085	Persimmon Homes
	<p>Objection – policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. On sites of 10 units or less, it is proposed this will be via payment of a commuted sum. Such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL. It cannot ‘pool’ more than 5 contributions from S106 agreements through the payment of a commuted sum. Given that pooling is back dated, it appears likely that the pooling figure for open space will already have been surpassed.</p>	673/16854	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	<p>Objection – insufficient information to form an opinion on the policy as presented.</p>	1457/17420	
	<p>Objection – policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. On sites of 10 units or less, it is proposed this will be via payment of a commuted sum. Such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL. It cannot ‘pool’ more than 5 contributions from S106 agreements through the payment of a commuted</p>	1514/17485	Monks Cross North Consortium

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sum. Given that pooling is back dated, it appears likely that the pooling figure for open space will already have been surpassed.		
Policy GI4 Open Space And Playing Pitches Continued	Objection – the requirement is excessive. Should not apply to very small projects of just a few dwellings. Should only be demanded on larger sites of ten or more dwellings.	1526/17521	Laverack Associates Architects
	Support – support the policy protecting areas set aside for allotment gardens.	1589/17570	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – the policy does not accord with Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. Also concerned that the requirement for housing development to make provision for open space should be dealt with via CIL.	1668/15042	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Comment – the Plan should include a policy requirement in relation to open space and playing pitch provision rather than referring to the Open Space Study. This would provide additional clarity in relation to likely requirements.	1705/9794	Gladman Developments
	Comment – open spaces originally designated for open space become incrementally filled with development, e.g. the Bowling Green in the Clifton Ward, once land owners realise its development value – but has a detrimental impact on the green environment.	2358/6542	
	Objection – concerned that sport plays no part in the plans.	2713/7195	Dunnington & Grimston Playing Fields Association
	Support – preferred option to provide a local level policy to protect existing recreational open space/green infrastructure and access to it.	2846/7564	
	Objection – to apply open space contributions to a small number of dwellings is madness. It should be on 10 or more dwellings, otherwise it will reduce the number of homes built due to economies of scale.	3066/7937	
	Support – support the preferred approach.	3356/8582	
	Objection – this requirement is excessive, it should only be demanded on larger sites of ten or more dwellings and not applied to very small projects of just a few dwellings.	4362/11308	
Support – the potential actions in regard to the Playing Pitch Strategy. The sports facilities in Dunnington have been developed since 1947 to a very high standard. Due to the number of residents who wish to play sport, there is an urgent need to expand the facilities. Currently, the village is some 6 acres short of required recreational facilities per head of population and any further expansion of the population will create more demand for space. Support should be given to develop further playing pitches. The Sports Club has previously worked with the Council to prepare plans for acquiring	5178/12357		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the land opposite the sports club entrance to develop further. Housing development proposed within the Preferred Options Consultation document both in Dunnington and the surrounding area will increase demand on existing facilities in terms of increased requirement for additional sports pitch capacity and additional requirement for car parking.		
Policy GI4 Open Space And Playing Pitches Continued	Support – agree with the preferred approach to open space.	5609/13178	
	Comment – if recreational open space has to be provided on housing sites, as suggested by policies GI4 & GI5 along with drainage attenuation basins, then achieving a housing density of 40-50dph and an appropriate housing mix, would be very difficult to achieve.	6349/16046	Linden Homes North
	Objection – the policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. The policy states that all housing sites will be required to make provision for the open space needs of existing and future residents. On sites of 10 or less, this will be via commuted sum payment. Such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL which is meant to be the only tool for collecting 5 contributions on types of infrastructure; it cannot 'pool' more than 5 contributions from S106 agreements through the payment of a commuted sum.	6351/17640	Gladedale Estates
	Support - for the policy.	6518/16416	York Green Party
Para 17.10 & 17.11	Comment – strategies and plans need to take account of alternative uses of these spaces for exercise (i.e. Trim Tracks), for alternative sports and for recreational walks for people with mental health problems.	6518/16417	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI5	Comment – while new development should clearly make provision for on or off site new open space provisions, there is insufficient information to form an opinion on the policy as presented.	59/12666	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – policy GI5 should be amended so that any major extensions to existing educational establishments are covered as well as new educational establishments.	62/12714	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – additional open space totalling 61.7ha is required to meet the current population of Haxby and Wigginton. Finding such large amounts of open space in places accessible by residents within a 5 minute walk, spread evenly across the town, is very difficult. Land north of Haxby should be set aside for the future needs of the residents of both Haxby and Wigginton – for multiple uses including sports, allotments, playgrounds, and parkland areas and is located centrally between Wigginton Primary School and Ralph Butterfield Primary School. Parks and play areas create a certain level of noise. The current layout of Haxby has a high use of play areas located very close to housing which invariably leads to the disturbance of residents. The combined Councils of Haxby and Wigginton would like to see a protected strip of land immediately to the north of the existing village of Haxby which will allow for cemetery expansion, increased allotment plots and increased recreational space.	63/12895	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – disappointed that no provision has been made in the Northern quadrant of the City for expansion of existing burial grounds or allocation of land for the development of new burial grounds.	73/12745	Rawcliffe Parish Council
	Objection – any increase in households will require the burial facilities to be expanded. An increase would be desirable adjacent to the existing facility to ensure appropriate care and management.	80/12791	Wigginton Parish Council
	Support – support preferred approach to require only major development (>5ha) to incorporate a 60/40 on site open space provision and require only sites <5ha to contribute off-site open space provision.	101/14231	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – Policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. States that all housing sites will be required to make provision for open space. On sites of 10 units or less it is proposed this will be via payment of commuted sum. Council will be aware that such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL which is meant to be the only tool for collecting cumulative contributions on types of infrastructure, it cannot 'pool' more than 5 contributions from section 106 agreements through the payment of a commuted sum.	145/13875	Home Builders Federation

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI5 continued	Comment – pleased to see the proposal for three additional areas of land to be designated for sports fields but feel that the anticipated population growth, more areas of land should be designated for recreational purposes. Welcome inclusion of open spaces in the major strategic housing development sites. Would like to see more reference to development being designed to increase physical activity, with appropriate lighting, linked green space, sustainable travel routes, well designed sports facilities etc.	387/14204	Active York
	Support – support the inclusion of the wording " <i>whilst not compromising scheme viability</i> ". Objection – object to the reference to meeting deficiency identified in the Council's current open space study, where higher levels may be required through compensatory agreements.	434/16581	Associated British Foods plc
	Comment – do not object to providing new open space as part of any of the strategic sites. However, concerned and object to wording at para 17.12 that suggest a net to gross ratio on larger development sites of 60/40. It is an unusual site where the net area is reduced to 60% of the gross. Recommend that para 17.12 is deleted as it is not justified and not based on any credible evidence.	659/15086	Persimmon Homes
	Objection – policy is unsound as it is unjustified and appears contrary to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. On sites of 10 units or less, it is proposed this will be via payment of a commuted sum. Such a policy requiring contributions towards new sports, open space and recreation should not be separate to CIL. It cannot 'pool' more than 5 contributions from S106 agreements through the payment of a commuted sum. Given that pooling is back dated, it appears likely that the pooling figure for open space will have already been surpassed.	1514/17488	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Comment – When considering the approach to CIL, care will need to be taken to ensure that developers are not charged twice for on-site and off-site provision.	1523/17507	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Comment – a health park would ease depression, cancer and so on thus reducing NHS bills and Council costs.	2544/6832	
	Comment – prefer option 1 which requires all new developments to incorporate a 60/40 on site open space provision.	2846/7565	
	Comment – there is a piece of land at present probably owned by the Health Authority, fronting on to the A19 next to the allotments which is very overgrown and if it to be used for recreational purposes, needs clearing.	3182/8189	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI5 continued	Support – support the preferred approach.	3356/8583	
	Comment – Clifford’s Tower should be improved so people can sit on grass without being told to move. Vast tarmac spaces are a worry. New house roofs should be grassed. Public square should take some grass so should street cafes. Sides of River Foss should be grassed.	4244/11012	
	Comment – the Plan needs to provide for more allotment and recreational areas for which there is a great demand in Haxby and Wigginton.	4253/11068	
	Comment – the south / west of York is lacking a large, high quality park within easy walking distance of the local community even though there are a number of small green spaces.	4305/11180	
	Objection – no green infrastructure policy. No management, monitoring plan or training plan.	4819/14295	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Comment – no plans in place for the improvement in the lifestyle of present and future residents in terms of open spaces.	5238/12568	
	Comment – there is very little amenity land outside the centre of York i.e. parks, woods, and other green areas so those living outside the city centre are once again at a disadvantage. Need a green city and one should accept that big is not always beautiful and the legacy left for the future will become concrete.	5282/14403	
	Comment – Haxby needs more green infrastructure and trees to help promote human health and wellbeing, by improving air quality and the beauty of the environment.	5372/14586	
	Comment - there is a shortage of green space in Haxby and Wigginton. Ideas such as a country park, public tennis courts, additional dog walking, BMX track for children, extra sporting facilities etc should be proposed for existing residents. The provision of more allotments should also be a priority.	5388/14625	
	Comment – developers should set aside fertile and drained land for the relocation of the allotments in Haxby to allow for the station facilities.	5399/14655	
	Support – in favour of all improved/additional green areas and green infrastructure.	5425/14737	
	Support –the protection and enhancement of green corridors and infrastructure and ensuring that new developments maintain the link between open spaces. It is important to use these to promote biodiversity as well as providing recreational space.	5427/14745	
	Comment – no improvements identified for the Woodthorpe/Acomb areas, despite the fact that this large built up area is already poor in terms of quality open space. The Local Plan advocates that the Green Wedges should be extended into the countryside	5431/14758	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>outside the York Ring Roads (which is good in principle). However, the Plan does nothing for those residents who currently have no green wedge (note that this includes Foxwood, one of the three most deprived areas in York). Under the Plan, those who are well off for green space will be given more, while the south west sector which has a paucity of green space will be given nothing. There used to be a green wedge in the south west sector of York. It ran from Hob Moor through Acomb Moor, then out of the top of Moor Lane and into the countryside beyond. Unfortunately, houses were built across the green corridor between Woodthorpe and Acomb and the green wedge was lost. Thereafter, it was still possible to walk out into the countryside on a public right of way between Moor Lane and Askham Bryan. However, this too was effectively lost when the A1237 was built without any provision for walkers wanting to cross it. Bearing in mind that, apart from this now very dangerous footpath, none of the land between Woodthorpe and the A1237 is open to residents. The open land behind the houses on the south side of Moor Lane and up to Eastfield Farm could be acquired and turned into a green open space, with an entrance near the junction of Chaloners Road / Moor Lane and easy access (further up Moor Lane) from the cross-Woodthorpe foot / cycle path and the No.12 bus route. Need to look again at the Plan and find a way of providing the kind of Green Wedge open space in the Woodthorpe / Acomb that residents in other parts of York enjoy.</p>		
<p>Policy GI5 continued</p>	<p>Comment – the land identified at ST7 for 1800 new homes should be used for a large park, woodland and allotments for the use of existing residents in Osbaldwick, especially in light of the Public Open Space report, which identifies Osbaldwick as being one of the worst areas in York, for any type of open space. The natural and semi natural land it states as sparse, the green open space is in deficit – i.e. no tennis courts, bowling green, play areas for children are not sufficient for all the existing residents yet alone a potential 3600 plus, and there are no allotments at all.</p>	<p>5449/14785</p>	
	<p>Comment – there are not enough playing areas today for the size of Haxby and Wigginton. There are no woodland areas in which to walk unless you drive to Moorlands. The large mature trees are gradually disappearing and not being replaced.</p>	<p>5501/14877</p>	
	<p>Support – agree with preferred approach to new open space.</p>	<p>5609/13179</p>	
	<p>Comment – need more recreational facilities, open spaces and allotments in Haxby.</p>	<p>5672/13357</p>	
	<p>Comment – if recreational open space has to be provided on housing sites, as suggested by policies GI4 & GI5 along with drainage attenuation basins, then achieving a housing density of 40-50dph and an appropriate housing mix, would be very difficult to achieve.</p>	<p>6349/16047</p>	<p>Linden Homes North</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI5 continued	<p>Comment – although the 61.70ha shortfall for Haxby & Wigginton cannot be found without affecting other community needs, some of it can be incorporated within the green fields to the north of Oaken Grove to support the local community (map included in rep). This area is close to the centre of Haxby and within walking distance of residents of Wigginton and is used by dog walkers and walkers and has a public right of way through it.</p> <p>Comment – given that Haxby Station is proposed to be re-opened and the existing allotments lost to parking, it is important that they are replaced – by a 2.67ha site for allotments to the north of Haxby.</p>	6512/16298	Cllr Tony Richardson
	<p>Comment – whilst objecting to the majority of strategic housing sites in policy GI5, it is expected that the policy would apply if these objections are overruled.</p>	6516/16339	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	<p>Comment – propose to add the following: “Require all major new developments to incorporate a 60/40 on-site Open Space (preferred option) and for smaller developments to make an off-site contribution where there is suitable open space available within 400m of the site or, if not, to provide a smaller element of open space on site.”</p>	6518/16420	York Green Party
	<p>Comment – there is a critical shortage of open space in Haxby & Wigginton. There is currently a pressing need for more open recreation space in the Haxby area; Wigginton has little open space available for informal recreation purposes. Each community has a dedicated sports and playing fields space, but the Ward needs some 62ha of additional space for recreation, sports and leisure (City of York Council’s Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, 2008). This shortfall includes land needed for parkland, outdoor sport, playspace, amenity space, provision for teenagers and children and it also includes allotments (existing allotment space is fully occupied and there is an extensive waiting list in each community).</p>	6522/16504	Cllrs P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
Para 17.12	<p>Objection – to paragraph 17.12 as it is incorrect. The Local Plan Viability Study sets out at Table 5.2 that on small sites the net developable area is considered to be 80% with this reduced to 70% for larger sites as there is likely to be more onsite provision of items such as open space required. The 60% figure is only applied to strategic urban extensions, new settlements or major village expansions.</p>	434/16582	Associated British Foods plc

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School	Comment – this site is already in the Green Belt, it isn't clear why it is allocated as open space instead. The possible use envisaged for OS1 (trees, nature area, allotment, sports pitches, play area) are appropriate in the Green Belt.	192/14013	
	Support – See Response 9	801/3701	
	Support – See Response 9	895/3611	
	Support – See Response 9	901/3867	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	969/16992	
	Support – See Response 9	977/3842	
	Support – See Response 9	1231/17123	
	Support – See Response 9	1579/17524	
	Support – See Response 9	1580/17534	
	Support – See Response 9	1585/3649	
	Support – See Response 9	1588/4114	
	Support – welcome the provision of new open space at site OS1. Earmarked for community use.	1589/17571	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – See Response 9	1590/17579	
	Support – See Response 9	1597/3898	
	Comment – the triangular area of land to the north of Manor School is depicted as new open space, when in fact it is already open space. The designation of the small space of land as a nature conservation area is welcomed, however, in practice this is used by children as a makeshift cycle stunt park and it might struggle to be effective as a conservation area and may be more appropriate to be formalised as a play area and introduce a nature conservation area on the land bordering the sports ground to Manor School.	1599/9928	
	Support – See Response 9	1604/4122	
	Support – See Response 9	1891/7804	
	Support – See Response 9	2009/6490	
	Support – See Response 9	2550/6858	
	Support – See Response 9	2575/3516	
Support – See Response 9	2580/6908		
Support – See Response 9	2600/3523		
Support – See Response 9	2601/3532		
Support – See Response 9	2603/3538		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	2604/3543	
	Support – See Response 9	2605/3548	
	Support – See Response 9	2606/3555	
	Support – See Response 9	2607/3564	
	Support – See Response 9	2681/4128	
	Support – See Response 9	2855/3593	
	Support – See Response 9	2856/3602	
	Support – See Response 9	2857/3620	
	Support – See Response 9	2859/3633	
	Support – See Response 9	2860/3640	
	Support – See Response 9	2861/3658	
	Support – See Response 9	2862/3667	
	Support – See Response 9	2863/3676	
	Support – See Response 9	2864/3683	
	Support – See Response 9	2865/3692	
	Support – See Response 9	2866/3710	
	Support – See Response 9	2867/3716	
	Support – See Response 9	2868/3723	
	Support – See Response 9	2869/3730	
	Support – See Response 9	2870/3736	
	Support – See Response 9	2871/3742	
	Support – See Response 9	2872/3746	
	Support – See Response 9	2873/3749	
	Support – See Response 9	2874/3758	
	Support – See Response 9	2875/3767	
	Support – See Response 9	2876/3776	
	Support – See Response 9	2877/3785	
	Support – See Response 9	2878/3794	
	Support – See Response 9	2879/3803	
	Support – See Response 9	2880/3812	
Support – See Response 9	2881/3821		
Support – See Response 9	2882/3824		
Support – See Response 9	2883/3833		
Support – See Response 9	2884/3849		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	2885/3858	
	Support – See Response 9	2886/3872	
	Support – See Response 9	2887/3880	
	Support – See Response 9	2888/3889	
	Support – See Response 9	2890/3911	
	Support – See Response 9	2891/3920	
	Support – See Response 9	2892/3926	
	Support – See Response 9	2893/3935	
	Support – See Response 9	2894/3944	
	Support – See Response 9	2895/3953	
	Support – See Response 9	2896/3962	
	Support – See Response 9	2897/3971	
	Support – See Response 9	2911/4132	
	Support – See Response 9	2912/4142	
	Support – See Response 9	2962/4151	
	Support – See Response 9	3004/7834	
	Support – See Response 9	3022/7854	
	Support – See Response 9	3029/4156	
	Support – See Response 9	3030/4164	
	Support – See Response 9	3037/4180	
	Support – See Response 9	3039/4195	
	Support – See Response 9	3040/4201	
	Support – See Response 9	3041/4210	
	Support – See Response 9	3042/4216	
	Support – See Response 9	3043/7888	
	Support – See Response 9	3044/4225	
	Support – See Response 9	3045/4231	
	Support – the new open space and preservation of Green Belt at land north west of Manor School.	3099/7986	
	Support – See Response 9	3209/8263	
	Support – See Response 9	3249/4242	
	Support – See Response 9	3271/4249	
	Support – See Response 9	3278/8417	
Support – See Response 9	3284/4259		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	3285/4268	
	Support – See Response 9	3287/4277	
	Support – the Poppleton Village Design Statement (PVDS) would support the new proposed open space (OS1) but would suggest that all the Green Spaces in the PVDS should be included in the ‘existing open spaces’ on the Local Plan. One omission is that of Model Farm, Upper Poppleton, within the settlement limit, adjacent to the Field House site.	3378/8672	
	Support – See Response 9	3384/8682	
	Support – See Response 9	3419/4283	
	Support – See Response 9	3423/4292	
	Support – See Response 9	3443/8810	
	Support – See Response 9	3458/8921	
	Support – See Response 9	3468/8925	
	Support – See Response 9	3473/8942	
	Support – See Response 9	3474/8951	
	Support – See Response 9	3475/8961	
	Support – See Response 9	3479/8969	
	Support – See Response 9	3481/8977	
	Support – See Response 9	3482/8987	
	Support – See Response 9	3483/8996	
	Support – See Response 9	3484/9007	
	Support – See Response 9	3485/9016	
	Support – See Response 9	3486/9026	
	Support – See Response 9	3487/9036	
	Support – See Response 9	3488/9045	
	Support – See Response 9	3490/9055	
	Support – See Response 9	3491/9064	
	Support – See Response 9	3492/9073	
	Support – See Response 9	3493/9082	
	Support – See Response 9	3494/9092	
	Support – See Response 9	3495/9100	
Support – See Response 9	3502/9109		
Support – See Response 9	3503/9119		
Support – See Response 9	3504/9129		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	3505/9138	
	Support – See Response 9	3506/9147	
	Support – See Response 9	3507/9156	
	Support – See Response 9	3550/9160	
	Support – See Response 9	3551/9168	
	Support – See Response 9	3554/9171	
	Support – See Response 9	3555/9180	
	Support – See Response 9	3556/9189	
	Support – See Response 9	3557/9198	
	Support – See Response 9	3558/9207	
	Support – See Response 9	3559/9212	
	Support – See Response 9	3560/9221	
	Support – See Response 9	3561/9229	
	Support – See Response 9	3562/9238	
	Support – See Response 9	3563/9245	
	Support – See Response 9	3564/9254	
	Support – See Response 9	3565/9262	
	Support – See Response 9	3566/9271	
	Support – See Response 9	3567/9280	
	Support – See Response 9	3568/9290	
	Support – See Response 9	3622/9299	
	Support – See Response 9	3623/9303	
	Support – See Response 9	3628/9323	
	Support – See Response 9	3629/9331	
	Support – See Response 9	3630/9337	
	Support – See Response 9	3631/9344	
	Support – See Response 9	3633/9349	
	Support – See Response 9	3634/9355	
	Support – See Response 9	3637/9365	
	Support – See Response 9	3638/9374	
Support – See Response 9	3639/9381		
Support – See Response 9	3640/9390		
Support – See Response 9	3641/9397		
Support – See Response 9	3642/9406		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	3677/9415	
	Support – See Response 9	3728/10032	
	Support – See Response 9	3730/10047	
	Support – See Response 9	3731/10057	
	Support – See Response 9	3735/10069	
	Support – See Response 9	3740/10094	
	Support – See Response 9	3741/10098	
	Support – See Response 9	3742/10108	
	Support – See Response 9	3743/10118	
	Support – See Response 9	3745/5795	
	Support – See Response 9	3746/10128	
	Support – See Response 9	3797/10223	
	Support – See Response 9	3815/7816	
	Support – See Response 9	3911/4595	
	Support – See Response 9	3942/4622	
	Support – See Response 9	3947/4640	
	Support – See Response 9	3966/10542	
	Support – See Response 9	4055/4675	
	Support – See Response 9	4072/4702	
	Support – See Response 9	4077/4708	
	Support – See Response 9	4078/4717	
	Support – See Response 9	4079/4726	
	Support – See Response 9	4080/4735	
	Support – See Response 9	4082/4744	
	Support – See Response 9	4084/4754	
	Support – See Response 9	4085/5810	
	Support – See Response 9	4087/4764	
	Support – See Response 9	4088/4772	
	Support – See Response 9	4097/4786	
	Support – See Response 9	4103/4794	
Support – See Response 9	4111/4814		
Support – See Response 9	4127/4837		
Support – See Response 9	4145/4854		
Support – See Response 9	4191/4887		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – See Response 9	4198/10922	
	Support – See Response 9	4386/11355	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	4416/5050	
	Support – See Response 9	4425/5063	
	Support – See Response 9	4431/5073	
	Support – See Response 9	4435/5082	
	Support – See Response 9	4437/5091	
	Support – See Response 9	4438/5101	
	Support – See Response 9	4439/5109	
	Support – See Response 9	4440/5115	
	Support – See Response 9	4441/5124	
	Support – See Response 9	4442/5132	
	Support – See Response 9	4443/5141	
	Support – See Response 9	4444/5149	
	Support – See Response 9	4445/5156	
	Support – See Response 9	4446/5163	
	Support – See Response 9	4447/5171	
	Support – See Response 9	4462/5179	
	Support – See Response 9	4463/5187	
	Support – See Response 9	4650/5236	
	Support – See Response 9	4755/5285	
	Support – See Response 9	4756/5295	
	Support – See Response 9	4759/5304	
	Support – See Response 9	4767/5313	
	Support – See Response 9	4768/5322	
	Support – strongly support the proposal for new open space at OS1.	4829/12143	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	5282/14394	
	Comment – the triangular area of land to the north of Manor School is depicted as new open space, when in fact it already is open space. The designation as a nature conservation area is welcomed, although in practice, this site is constantly used by children as a makeshift cycle stunt park and it may struggle to be effective as a conservation area. It may be more appropriate to formalise this site by designating it as open space. In order to meet the conservation objectives of this proposal it may be more appropriate to introduce a nature conservation area on the land bordering the	5332/14992	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sport ground at Manor School.		
Site OS1 Land North West Of Manor School Continued	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	5408/14672	
	Support – proposals for OS1.	5620/13212	
	Support – proposals for OS1.	5662/13322	
	Support – proposals for OS1.	5729/13498	
	Support – proposals for OS1.	5817/13762	
	Support – proposals for OS1.	5829/13797	
	Support – See Response 9	5948/6241	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	6038/15451	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	6131/15555	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS1.	6133/15571	
	Support – See Response 9	6190/6096	
	Support – See Response 9	6191/6104	
	Support – See Response 9	6203/6121	
	Support – See Response 9	6206/6133	
	Support – strongly support the new open space allocation OS1	6360/16069	
	Support – See Response 9	6413/6273	
	Support – See Response 9	6414/6282	
	Support – See Response 9	6418/6293	
	Support – See Response 9	6421/6299	
	Support – See Response 9	6425/6309	
	Support – See Response 9	6438/6353	
	Support – See Response 9	6469/6395	
Support – See Response 9	6478/6410		
Support – See Response 9	6481/6416		
Support – See Response 9	6483/6424		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton	Comment – this site is already in the Green Belt, it isn't clear why it is allocated as open space instead. The possible use envisaged for OS3 (extension to the adjacent Junior Football ground) is appropriate in the Green Belt.	192/14014	
	Support – See Response 9	801/3702	
	Support – See Response 9	895/3612	
	Support – See Response 9	901/3868	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	969/16993	
	Support – See Response 9	977/3843	
	Support – See Response 9	1231/17124	
	Support – See Response 9	1579/17525	
	Support – See Response 9	1580/17535	
	Support – See Response 9	1585/3650	
	Support – See Response 9	1588/4115	
	Support – welcome the provision of new open space at site OS3. Earmarked for community use.	1589/17572	
	Support – See Response 9	1590/17580	
	Support – See Response 9	1597/3899	
	Support – it is essential to preserve the separation with the main conurbation on Millfield Lane towards the roundabout. The existing sports field is extensively used for children's football and there is a desire to create a new cricket club in the village, and the area designated would enable the use of existing pavilion facilities to support this proposal.	1599/9929	
	Support – See Response 9	1604/4123	
	Support – See Response 9	1891/7805	
	Support – See Response 9	2009/6491	
	Support – See Response 9	2550/6859	
	Support – See Response 9	2575/3517	
Support – See Response 9	2580/6909		
Support – See Response 9	2600/3524		
Support – See Response 9	2601/3533		
Support – See Response 9	2603/3539		
Support – See Response 9	2604/3544		
Support – See Response 9	2605/3549		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	2606/3556	
	Support – See Response 9	2607/3565	
	Support – See Response 9	2681/4129	
	Support – See Response 9	2855/3594	
	Support – See Response 9	2856/3603	
	Support – See Response 9	2857/3621	
	Support – See Response 9	2858/3625	
	Support – See Response 9	2859/3634	
	Support – See Response 9	2860/3641	
	Support – See Response 9	2861/3659	
	Support – See Response 9	2862/3668	
	Support – See Response 9	2863/3677	
	Support – See Response 9	2864/3684	
	Support – See Response 9	2865/3693	
	Support – See Response 9	2866/3711	
	Support – See Response 9	2867/3717	
	Support – See Response 9	2868/3724	
	Support – See Response 9	2869/3731	
	Support – See Response 9	2870/3737	
	Support – See Response 9	2871/3743	
	Support – See Response 9	2872/3747	
	Support – See Response 9	2873/3750	
	Support – See Response 9	2874/3759	
	Support – See Response 9	2875/3768	
	Support – See Response 9	2876/3777	
	Support – See Response 9	2877/3786	
	Support – See Response 9	2878/3795	
	Support – See Response 9	2879/3804	
	Support – See Response 9	2880/3813	
	Support – See Response 9	2881/3822	
Support – See Response 9	2882/3825		
Support – See Response 9	2883/3834		
Support – See Response 9	2884/3850		
Support – See Response 9	2885/3859		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	2886/3873	
	Support – See Response 9	2887/3881	
	Support – See Response 9	2888/3890	
	Support – See Response 9	2889/3906	
	Support – See Response 9	2890/3912	
	Support – See Response 9	2891/3921	
	Support – See Response 9	2892/3927	
	Support – See Response 9	2893/3936	
	Support – See Response 9	2894/3945	
	Support – See Response 9	2895/3954	
	Support – See Response 9	2896/3963	
	Support – See Response 9	2897/3972	
	Support – See Response 9	2911/4133	
	Support – See Response 9	2912/4143	
	Support – See Response 9	2962/4152	
	Support – See Response 9	3004/7835	
	Support – See Response 9	3022/7855	
	Support – See Response 9	3029/4157	
	Support – See Response 9	3030/4165	
	Support – See Response 9	3032/4173	
	Support – See Response 9	3037/4181	
	Support – See Response 9	3039/4196	
	Support – See Response 9	3040/4202	
	Support – See Response 9	3041/4211	
	Support – See Response 9	3042/4217	
	Support – See Response 9	3043/7889	
	Support – See Response 9	3044/4226	
	Support – See Response 9	3045/4232	
	Support – the new open space and preservation of Green Belt at land to north of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton.	3099/7987	
	Support – See Response 9	3209/8264	
	Support – See Response 9	3249/4243	
	Support – See Response 9	3271/4250	
Support – See Response 9	3278/8418		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	3284/4260	
	Support – See Response 9	3285/4269	
	Support – See Response 9	3287/4278	
	Support – the Poppleton Village Design Statement (PVDS) would support the new proposed open space (OS3) but would suggest that all the Green Spaces in the PVDS should be included in the 'existing open spaces' on the Local Plan. One omission is that of Model Farm, Upper Poppleton, within the settlement limit, adjacent to the Field House site.	3378/8673	
	Support – See Response 9	3384/8683	
	Support – See Response 9	3419/4284	
	Support – See Response 9	3423/4293	
	Support – See Response 9	3443/8811	
	Support – See Response 9	3458/8922	
	Support – See Response 9	3468/8926	
	Support – See Response 9	3473/8943	
	Support – See Response 9	3474/8952	
	Support – See Response 9	3475/8962	
	Support – See Response 9	3479/8970	
	Support – See Response 9	3481/8978	
	Support – See Response 9	3482/8988	
	Support – See Response 9	3483/8997	
	Support – See Response 9	3484/9008	
	Support – See Response 9	3485/9017	
	Support – See Response 9	3486/9027	
	Support – See Response 9	3487/9037	
	Support – See Response 9	3488/9046	
	Support – See Response 9	3490/9056	
	Support – See Response 9	3491/9065	
	Support – See Response 9	3492/9074	
	Support – See Response 9	3493/9083	
Support – See Response 9	3494/9093		
Support – See Response 9	3495/9101		
Support – See Response 9	3502/9110		
Support – See Response 9	3503/9120		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	3504/9130	
	Support – See Response 9	3505/9139	
	Support – See Response 9	3506/9148	
	Support – See Response 9	3507/9157	
	Support – See Response 9	3550/9161	
	Support – See Response 9	3551/9169	
	Support – See Response 9	3554/9172	
	Support – See Response 9	3555/9181	
	Support – See Response 9	3556/9190	
	Support – See Response 9	3557/9199	
	Support – See Response 9	3558/9208	
	Support – See Response 9	3559/9213	
	Support – See Response 9	3560/9222	
	Support – See Response 9	3561/9230	
	Support – See Response 9	3562/9239	
	Support – See Response 9	3563/9246	
	Support – See Response 9	3564/9255	
	Support – See Response 9	3565/9263	
	Support – See Response 9	3566/9272	
	Support – See Response 9	3567/9281	
	Support – See Response 9	3568/9291	
	Support – See Response 9	3622/9300	
	Support – See Response 9	3623/9304	
	Support – See Response 9	3627/9320	
	Support – See Response 9	3628/9324	
	Support – See Response 9	3629/9332	
	Support – See Response 9	3630/9338	
	Support – See Response 9	3631/9345	
	Support – See Response 9	3633/9350	
	Support – See Response 9	3634/9356	
	Support – See Response 9	3637/9366	
Support – See Response 9	3638/9375		
Support – See Response 9	3639/9382		
Support – See Response 9	3640/9391		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	3641/9398	
	Support – See Response 9	3642/9407	
	Support – See Response 9	3677/9416	
	Support – See Response 9	3728/10033	
	Support – See Response 9	3730/10048	
	Support – See Response 9	3731/10058	
	Support – See Response 9	3735/10070	
	Support – See Response 9	3740/10095	
	Support – See Response 9	3741/10099	
	Support – See Response 9	3742/10109	
	Support – See Response 9	3743/10119	
	Support – See Response 9	3745/5796	
	Support – See Response 9	3746/10129	
	Support – See Response 9	3797/10224	
	Support – See Response 9	3815/7817	
	Support – See Response 9	3911/4596	
	Support – See Response 9	3942/4623	
	Support – See Response 9	3947/4641	
	Support – See Response 9	3966/10543	
	Support – See Response 9	4055/4676	
	Support – See Response 9	4072/4703	
	Support – See Response 9	4077/4709	
	Support – See Response 9	4078/4718	
	Support – See Response 9	4079/4727	
	Support – See Response 9	4080/4736	
	Support – See Response 9	4082/4745	
	Support – See Response 9	4084/4755	
	Support – See Response 9	4085/5811	
	Support – See Response 9	4087/4765	
	Support – See Response 9	4088/4773	
Support – See Response 9	4097/4787		
Support – See Response 9	4103/4795		
Support – See Response 9	4111/4815		
Support – See Response 9	4127/4838		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – See Response 9	4145/4855	
	Support – See Response 9	4191/4888	
	Support – See Response 9	4198/10923	
	Support – See Response 9	4386/11356	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	4416/5051	
	Support – See Response 9	4425/5064	
	Support – See Response 9	4431/5074	
	Support – See Response 9	4435/5083	
	Support – See Response 9	4437/5092	
	Support – See Response 9	4438/5102	
	Support – See Response 9	4439/5110	
	Support – See Response 9	4440/5116	
	Support – See Response 9	4441/5125	
	Support – See Response 9	4442/5133	
	Support – See Response 9	4443/5142	
	Support – See Response 9	4444/5150	
	Support – See Response 9	4445/5157	
	Support – See Response 9	4446/5164	
	Support – See Response 9	4447/5172	
	Support – See Response 9	4462/5180	
	Support – See Response 9	4463/5188	
	Support – See Response 9	4650/5237	
	Support – See Response 9	4755/5286	
	Support – See Response 9	4756/5296	
	Support – See Response 9	4759/5305	
	Support – See Response 9	4767/5314	
	Support – See Response 9	4768/5323	
	Support – strongly support the proposal for new open space at OS3.	4829/12144	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	5282/14395	
	Comment – the land identified as new open space and the designation of the short length of land from Millfield Lane to the roundabout is 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.	5332/14994	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site OS3 Land To North Of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton Continued	Support – proposals for OS3	5620/13213	
	Support – proposals for OS3	5662/13323	
	Support – proposals for OS3	5729/13499	
	Support – proposals for OS3	5817/13763	
	Support – proposals for OS3	5829/13798	
	Support – See Response 9	5948/6242	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	6038/15452	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	6131/15556	
	Support – the proposal for new open space at OS3.	6133/15572	
	Support – See Response 9	6158/15653	
	Support – See Response 9	6190/6097	
	Support – See Response 9	6191/6105	
	Support – See Response 9	6203/6122	
	Support – See Response 9	6206/6134	
	Support – strongly support the new open space allocation OS3	6360/16070	
	Support – See Response 9	6413/6274	
	Support – See Response 9	6414/6283	
	Support – See Response 9	6421/6300	
	Support – See Response 9	6425/6310	
	Support – See Response 9	6438/6354	
	Support – See Response 9	6469/6396	
	Support – See Response 9	6478/6411	
	Support – See Response 9	6481/6417	
	Support – See Response 9	6483/6425	
	Objection – Land at Millfield Lane, Poppleton – should be reallocated from open space to residential on the basis that it 'squares off' the boundary of the built development area to the east of Millfield Lane and the south of Long Ridge Lane.	6507/16274	City Of York Council Property Services

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI6 Green Corridor	Support - the policy.	2/11592	Natural England
	Comment – the A166 and A1079 are attractive rural aspects into the City and these and other green approaches should be protected. Support –strongly support the policy of ‘green corridors’ as far as possible along the major access routes to the City.	69/13847	Murton Parish Council
	Support – strongly support Local Green Corridors where possible incorporating publicly available footpaths to enable pollution-free exercise or point to point travel.	91/12853	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support – fully support the policy and any overriding of the policy must be specifically justified in the planning decision.	101/14239	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – submit that various watercourses within the District are a strategic part of the natural environment and support a wealth of wildlife and flora. The Drainage Boards have a wealth of experience working with strategic partners on such issues and should be viewed as partners within this specific policy area. Objection – policy GI6 mitigates the problems of irresponsible planting to some extent, but the policy is subject to interpretation an amendment to read “creates and/or enhances appropriate stepping stones” may open up a more balanced basis on which to discuss resulting issues and make representations.	190/13973	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Comment – Green Corridors should include main arterial roads into York. Some run through strays, others through the Green Belt (e.g. A59) and this Green Belt should be retained.	192/14012	
	Support/comment – support the policy and consider it should add all the green areas of verges not only alongside major roads, but also the verges in villages and rural areas.	1589/17573	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Comment – the identification of Green Corridors should not prejudice the delivery of housing sites that lie within the corridors that are required to deliver housing of the Plan. There is no formal definition of what constitutes a green corridor and it appears that both private and public land has been included. Where private land is included, such sites cannot necessarily foster connections.	1748/9850	Diocese of Middlesbrough
	Support – the preferred approach.	3356/8584	
	Support – pleased that Green Corridors are to be retained as part of the Local Plan.	4244/11011	
Objection – whilst the Green Corridors Technical Paper 2011 is worthwhile, it does not compensate for a Green Infrastructure Strategy.	4819/14297	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Tremendous York	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI6 Green Corridor Continued	Comment – agree with keeping and improving the existing Green Corridors into York. The Green Corridor from Askham Lane to the A59, along the York Outer Ring Road (A1237) which at present has nominal housing and employment along its route, should be kept in its entirety and in its natural environment, conserving good quality agricultural land.	5238/12896	
	Support – the protection and enhancement of green corridors and infrastructure and ensuring that new developments maintain links between open spaces. It is important to use these to promote biodiversity as well as providing recreation space.	5427/14746	
	Comment – no improvements identified for the Woodthorpe/Acomb areas, despite the fact that this large built up area is already poor in terms of quality open space. The Local Plan advocates that the Green Wedges should be extended into the countryside outside the York Ring Roads (which is good in principle). However, the Plan does nothing for those residents who currently have no green wedge (note that this includes Foxwood, one of the three most deprived areas in York). Under the Plan, those who are well off for green space will be given more, while the south west sector which has a paucity of green space will be given nothing. There used to be a green wedge in the south west sector of York. It ran from Hob Moor through Acomb Moor, then out of the top of Moor Lane and into the countryside beyond. Unfortunately, houses were built across the green corridor between Woodthorpe and Acomb and the green wedge was lost. Thereafter, it was still possible to walk out into the countryside on a public right of way between Moor Lane and Askham Bryan. However, this too was effectively lost when the A1237 was built without any provision for walkers wanting to cross it. Bearing in mind that, apart from this now very dangerous footpath, none of the land between Woodthorpe and the A1237 is open to residents. The open land behind the houses on the south side of Moor Lane and up to Eastfield Farm could be acquired and turned into a green open space, with an entrance near the junction of Chaloners Road/Moor Lane and easy access (further up Moor Lane) from the cross-Woodthorpe foot/cycle path and the No.12 bus route. Need to look again at the Plan and find a way of providing the kind of Green Wedge open space in the Woodthorpe/Acomb that residents in other parts of York enjoy.	5431/14759	
	Support – welcome the intention to strengthen network of green infrastructure.	5786/13699	
	Support + comment – support the approach with the proviso that green corridors are not the only valuable and valued open space in the City and that the stepping stones concept is also considered where appropriate. The Green Corridor principle is an excellent one and it needs to be retained in the future. These could be enhanced if	6518/16418	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	there were more engagement of local stakeholders and residents in their management.		
Policy GI6 Green Corridor Continued	Support – agree with York retaining its green corridors into the city.	Petition 20	
Figure 17.1 Green Corridors	Objection – The former British Sugar site is highlighted as a district corridor on Figure 17.1 Green Corridors. This is considered to be an inaccurate representation of the site. The former British Sugar site is a brownfield development site and therefore be demarked as 'Urban Area' on Figure 17.1.	434/16583	Associated British Foods plc
	Objection – the western side of the City outskirts seem to be expected to benefit little from Green Corridors.	2416/6679	
	Comment – the proposed ST2 site is located in a 'Green Corridor' as shown in Fig 17.1. By definition, this suggests that the subject site should remain 'green' and not to be developed. Support the policy of a Green Corridor along part of the A59 provided the site is maintained as open space.	4634/11764	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI7 Access To Nature	Comment – support policy GI7 part (a) as this delivers multiple benefits. However, sites recognised for their bird interest (e.g. Heslington Tillmire) are especially sensitive to recreational disturbance and this should be recognised. In addition, increased access has the potential to increase trampling of flora, litter, dog fouling and risk of fire. Increased levels of access should be managed according to the nature conservation protection status and sensitivity. Where ecologically acceptable, improved access will be reliant on landowner agreement and funding. To assist delivery, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan must identify improvement to Green Infrastructure as a priority.	2/11593	Natural England
	Support – fully support the policy and any overriding of the policy must be specifically justified in the planning decision.	101/14240	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – submit that various watercourses within the District are a strategic part of the natural environment and support a wealth of wildlife and flora. The Drainage Boards have a wealth of experience working with strategic partners on such issues and should be viewed as partners within this specific policy area. Objection – point two and three may be more appropriate to read “and drainage infrastructure” following conservation ecological and conservation value respectively.	190/13974	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Support – the designation of the land between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway line, Strensall, as a site of importance for Nature Conservation and adjoining land designated for nature conservation.	494/16626	
	Comment – leaving parks open is foolhardy and a false economy and makes them vulnerable to damage. Charging bowlers to use their public green is mean. The impending charges are very unpopular and need to be dropped to regain the respect of park users.	679/16862	
	Support – welcome the intention in this policy to balance the benefits of improved access with potential nature conservation issues.	1399/17361	RSPB
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	3062/7929	
	Support –the preferred approach.	3356/8585	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4054/10737	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature	4081/10768	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)		
Policy GI7 Access To Nature Continued	<p>Comment – Clifford’s Tower should be improved so people can sit outside on the grass without being told to move. The vast tarmac spaces are a concern. 3 bedroom houses or apartments should be built on stilts over Marygate Car Park, still keeping the car park under the houses – the roofs should be sedum (green growing roofs). Exhibition Square, Kings Square and St Sampson’s Square could take some grass. Street cafes should be considered for grass. The sides of the River Foss near Piccadilly Car Park should have grass, flower beds and park benches for people to relax on after they have finished shopping.</p> <p>If people want to walk to their car from their gate without walking on grass, narrow paths can be made in the grass. Grass is better for people who are jogging with less impact on joints than on tarmac or concrete. It is easier to dig up and replace by people providing underground services.</p>	4244/11013	
	Support – the proposal for nature conservation status of land behind Southfield Road, Princess Road and the Railway Line at Strensall.	4318/11207	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4394/11388	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4495/11528	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4703/11999	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	4769/12064	
	Objection – missing Tree Strategy as part of the evidence base.	4819/14296	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Support – would like to see wildlife corridors maintained and enhanced.	5754/13597	
	Support – the designation of the land shown in the Local Plan between Princess Road, Southfields Road and the Railway Line (Strensall) as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	6312/15960	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GI7 Access To Nature Continued	Support – the designation of land as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2) Support – the designation of land as a site of importance to nature conservation (GI1 & GI7) and adjoining land designated for Nature Conservation (GI2)	6514/16310	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Comment – the management of green spaces, from roadside verges to more open spaces, needs to be reassessed with greater emphasis on creating greater biodiversity including the development of more wildlife meadows and spaces. The management of grassed verges needs to be relaxed with less emphasis on rapid cutting at 1mm height at fixed intervals and greater understanding of growing seasons and an appreciation of native wildflowers.	6518/16419	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 17: Green Infrastructure Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 17.01	Support – the proposed approach and guidance which the policies in the section provide for Green Infrastructure and welcome the recognition of the contribution which the City’s heritage assets make to the Green Infrastructure network.	238/14114	English Heritage
	Objection - green infrastructure should all be protected to the same level (option 1).	529/16689	
	Objection - green infrastructure should all be protected to the same level (option 1).	835/16913	
	Support - the preferred approach to green infrastructure should be taken.	943/16963	
	Support – the chosen alternatives are correct and must be adhered to.	1109/17206	
	Support – the preferred approach to biodiversity (provide local policy to guide new development in relation to all biodiversity/geodiversity/landscape resources) is supported.	1399/17362	RSPB
	Support - the proposed approach.	1457/17419	