

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Support – section 18 and polices GB1 -GB5.	42/11720	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Comment – where the Green Belt is less sensitive, a neighbourhood plan should identify it as such and it is here that development could take place.	59/12672	Dunnington Parish Council
	Comment – welcome right use of words in the policies but have concern for the implementation.	101/14232	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – in defining the inner boundary of the Green Belt it is important that the Conservation Area boundaries and other built or natural environment designations are respected so that the Green Belt boundary does not cut through an existing designated site.	188/13948	
	Comment – in recent years a trend both for developers and individuals to purchase areas of Green Belt land adjoining their property in order to extend garden areas. Make it clear in the section on this policy what these Green Belt extended garden areas can and cannot be used for.	192/14015	
	Comment – page 190 Bullet Point “facilities for outdoor sport, recreation and cemeteries” could this be changed to “facilities for outdoor sport, recreation, and cemeteries”.	387/14205	Active York
	Support - accept the preferred approach. Where the Green Belt is less sensitive, a neighbourhood plan should identify it as such and it is here that development could take place if the development itself is appropriate for example like Dunnington cemetery.	1457/17427	
	Comment – might be helpful to have some cross referencing to the study mentioned in paragraph 6.6 which might help to alleviate some of the pressure on housing land, and therefore lead to fewer safeguarded areas having to be identified.	1491/17453	National Trust
	Objection – important that York is restraining the sprawl which has engulfed other historic cities. Don` t want York to become a suburban ring dwarfing the historic core.	2416/6680	
	Support – agree in general terms with the preferred approach, i.e. that local criteria be developed for any development in the Green Belt.	6508/17683	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Support – the Green Belt is especially valuable for villages to stop them coalescing with other communities. Villages should have their own green corridors as they are as important to them as York`s are to it.	6519/16485	Cllr Jenny Brooks

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB1 Development In The Green Belt	Objection – suggest Green Belt boundary should exclude the Northfields sports pitches since this policy is incompatible with Policy GB1.	38/12924	York St John University
	Comment – in GB1 permitted development could also include developments specifically to enhance biodiversity such as wildlife ponds or hides within a nature reserve.	42/11718	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – whilst roads and infrastructure may be deemed acceptable in principle where they do not affect the general openness of the Green Belt, the cumulative effect of the development needs to be considered including mitigation and landscape works necessary to reduce the impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.	46/12590	Heslington Village Trust
	Objection – whilst roads and infrastructure may be deemed acceptable in principle where they do not affect the general openness of the Green Belt, the cumulative effect of the development needs to be considered including mitigation and landscape works necessary to reduce the impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.	48/12599	Heslington Parish Council
	Support – agree with this policy and welcome the resolution of the Green Belt and its protection until 2040.	59/12667	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – in line with the NPPF (para 54), Policy GB4 should be clarified, as currently drafted; it is contrary to national policy which only permits exception sites in rural areas.	62/12715	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – although not identified as such in the plan Strensall and Towthorpe are washed over by the Green Belt. It is surrounded by identified Green Belt and there are also areas within the settlement which are also classed as Green Belt. Sites H30 and SF1 have been excluded from the Green Belt by this draft plan in order to meet housing targets which are unacceptable.	77/12772	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Support – preferred approach to development in the Green Belt.	101/14233	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – outdoor sport and recreation. Only small scale ancillary facilities should be allowed even in exceptional circumstances.	192/14016	
	Comment – criterion C includes a seemingly random selection of the elements which contribute to York`s special character. Amend Criterion C to read; `it would not harm those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York`.	238/14116	English Heritage
Objection – the Plan fails; to define development limits of villages; provide a policy which defines inset boundaries; and provide a policy which specifically sets the inner and outer boundary of the Green Belt, so far these are within the District. Additionally there is evidence base to support any proposal for inset boundaries or washed over villages.	544/16740		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB1 Development In The Green Belt Continued	Objection – paragraph 18.6 recognises that the provision of opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation is one of the key aims of green belt policy, this should be specifically acknowledged within the provisions of policy GB1.	550/16787	
	Support – agree with this policy and welcome the resolution of the Green Belt and its protection until 2040.	1457/17422	
	Support – welcome the clarification provided by Policy GB1 on types of development which might be appropriate within the Green Belt.	1491/17455	National Trust
	Objection – whilst can support the main policies cannot agree that Green Belt should be available for limited affordable housing for proven local needs, cannot be for development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order, nor can it be used for renewable energy schemes unless these are buried beneath the ground. Recommend that where a redevelopment in Green Belt land is allowed the new build should not exceed the footprint of the demolished / existing building, has no greater impact than the original build, does not exceed single-storey and does not lead to a major increase in the development portion of any site.	1589/17574	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – whilst the general thrust of the policy is appropriate (given it simply repeats the NPPF) concerned about criterion C, which specifically refers to the setting and special character of City of York. Criterion suggests that particular attention will be given to transport corridors and elevated locations. Why are these two elements prioritised, especially elevated locations? Consideration should be given to whether a proposal will prejudice the setting and special character within the Green Belt.	1592/17619	York Civic Trust
	Comment – should the list of appropriate development not include the development of allocated sites?	1736/9832	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – support alternative approach, should rely on the NPPF to guide development in Green Belt.	3208/8257	
	Objection – seems to raise uncertainties. The key test surely is to determine whether a proposal is in conformity with the green belt as spelled out in the NPPF. This policy should be reviewed to make it clear that any development proposal falling within the green belt will be tested 'to destruction' against the NPPF to create a sustainable green belt for York for at least the planned 30 years.	3356/8586	
	Support – for Policy GB1 which allows for development within the Green Belt where the scale, location and design would not detract from the open character of the Green Belt; it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt; it would not prejudice the setting and special character of York and is for limited infilling or redevelopment of existing developed sites.	4382/11350	Peel Environmental & North Selby Mine Waste Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB1 Development In The Green Belt Continued	Support - agree with this policy and welcome the resolution of the Green Belt and its protection until 2040.	5178/12363	
	Support – preferred approach to development in the Green Belt.	5609/13180	
	Support – support GB1 including most of the list of purposes appropriate to the Green Belt. Comment – would amend bullet point 2 as follows: facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation where floodlighting provision is not required, or would amend bullet point 8 as follows: mineral extraction, provided high environmental standards are attainable and can be proven that the extraction is safe and necessary to support this development plan for York. The ‘fracking’ of shale gas will not be an acceptable use for York`s Green Belt. Would amend the final bullet point as follows: renewable energy schemes, where it can be proved that the location is technically appropriate, the proposal respects local amenity including the historic setting of York, and that wider environmental and/or community benefits can be demonstrated (Positive weight will be given to applications which directly benefit the immediate local community through a share in profits generated) or would suggest adding two more bullet points in keeping with points made elsewhere in relation to food and waste strategy: appropriate small scale facilities for processing York`s waste, subject to the usual consideration of transport impact and local amenity (in the event that Allerton Park proposal does not go ahead, alternative facilities to support a zero/low waste strategy will be needed, or, appropriate small scale facilities to support local food production for York residents, or, sympathetically sited telecommunication masts to meet the needs of the local community.	6518/16422	York Green Party
	Support – agree with policy GB1.	Petition 20	
Para 18.01	Objection – disagree that the Green Belt boundaries identified on the proposals map follow recognisable physical features.	528/16671	York Diocesan Board of Finance
Para 18.02	Support – See Response 9	801/3703	
		895/3613	
		901/3869	
		977/3844	
		1231/17125	
		1579/17526	
		1580/17536	
		1585/3651	
1588/4116			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		1590/17581	
		1597/3900	
		1604/4124	
		1891/7806	
		2009/6492	
		2550/6860	
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – See Response 9	2575/3518	
		2580/6910	
		2600/3525	
		2601/3534	
		2604/3545	
		2605/3550	
		2606/3557	
		2607/3566	
		2681/4130	
		2855/3595	
		2856/3604	
		2857/3622	
		2858/3626	
		2859/3635	
		2860/3642	
		2861/3660	
		2862/3669	
		2863/3678	
		2864/3685	
		2865/3694	
		2866/3712	
		2867/3718	
		2868/3725	
		2869/3732	
		2870/3738	
		2871/3744	
		2872/3748	
		2873/3751	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		2874/3760	
		2875/3769	
		2876/3778	
		2877/3787	
		2878/3796	
		2879/3805	
		2880/3814	
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – See Response 9	2881/3823	
		2882/3826	
		2883/3835	
		2884/3851	
		2885/3860	
		2886/3874	
		2887/3882	
		2888/3891	
		2889/3907	
		2890/3913	
		2891/3922	
		2892/3928	
		2893/3937	
		2894/3946	
		2895/3955	
		2896/3964	
		2897/3973	
		2911/4134	
		2912/4144	
		3004/7836	
		3022/7856	
		3029/4158	
		3030/4166	
		3032/4174	
		3037/4182	
		3038/4189	
		3039/4197	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		3040/4203	
		3041/4212	
		3042/4218	
		3043/7890	
		3044/4227	
		3045/4233	
		3209/8265	
		3249/4244	
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – See Response 9	3271/4251	
		3278/8419	
		3284/4261	
		3285/4270	
		3287/4279	
		3384/8684	
		3419/4285	
		3423/4294	
		3443/8812	
		3458/8923	
		3468/8927	
		3473/8944	
		3474/8953	
		3475/8963	
		3479/8971	
		3481/8979	
		3482/8989	
		3483/8998	
		3484/9009	
		3485/9018	
		3486/9028	
		3487/9038	
		3488/9047	
		3490/9057	
		3491/9066	
		3492/9075	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		3493/9084	
		3494/9094	
		3495/9102	
		3502/9111	
		3503/9121	
		3504/9131	
		3505/9140	
		3506/9149	
		3507/9158	
		Para 18.02 Continued	Support – See Response 9
3551/9170			
3554/9173			
3555/9182			
3556/9191			
3557/9200			
3558/9209			
3559/9214			
3560/9223			
3561/9231			
3562/9240			
3563/9247			
3564/9256			
3565/9264			
3566/9273			
3567/9282			
3568/9292			
3622/9301			
3623/9305			
3627/9321			
3628/9325			
3629/9333			
3630/9339			
3631/9346			
3633/9351			

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		3634/9357	
		3637/9367	
		3638/9376	
		3639/9383	
		3640/9392	
		3641/9399	
		3642/9408	
		3677/9417	
		3728/10034	
		3730/10049	
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – See Response 9	3731/10059	
		3735/10071	
		3740/10096	
		3741/10100	
		3742/10110	
		3743/10120	
		3745/5797	
		3746/10130	
		3797/10225	
		3815/7818	
		3911/4597	
		3942/4624	
		3946/4633	
		3947/4642	
		3966/10544	
		4055/4677	
		4072/4704	
		4077/4710	
		4078/4719	
		4079/4728	
		4080/4737	
		4082/4746	
		4084/4756	
		4085/5812	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
		4087/4766	
		4088/4774	
		4097/4788	
		4103/4796	
		4111/4816	
		4127/4839	
		4145/4856	
		4191/4889	
		4198/10924	
		4386/11357	
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – agree with paragraph 18.2 and the preservation of Green Belt.	4416/5052	
	Support – See Response 9	4425/5065	
		4431/5075	
		4435/5084	
		4437/5093	
		4438/5103	
		4439/5111	
		4440/5117	
		4441/5126	
		4442/5134	
		4443/5143	
		4444/5151	
		4445/5158	
		4446/5165	
		4447/5173	
		4462/5181	
		4463/5189	
		4650/5238	
		4755/5287	
		4756/5297	
		4759/5306	
		4767/5315	
		4768/5324	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Para 18.02 Continued	Support – for proposals for new open spaces and preservation of Green Belt.	4829/12145	
	Support – paragraph 18.2.	5282/14396	
	Support – relatively content with paragraph 18.2; preservation of the Green Belt.	5408/14673	
	Support – the preservation of ‘open spaces’ for, and in connection with, the Green Belt. Support paragraph 18.2.	5620/13214	
	Support – the keeping of Green Belt within the Poppleton area. Fully support paragraph 18.2.	5662/13324	
	Support – proposals for creating/preserving open spaces and the Green Belt and paragraph 18.2.	5729/13500	
	Support – paragraph 18.2.	5817/13764	
	Support - paragraph 18.2.	5829/13799	
	Support – See Response 9	5948/6243	
	Support - paragraph 18.2.	6038/15453	
	Support – paragraph 18.2.	6131/15557	
	Support – paragraph 18.2 and the preservation of Green Belt.	6133/15573	
	Support – See Response 9	6158/15654	
		6190/6098	
		6191/6106	
		6203/6123	
		6206/6135	
6413/6275			
6414/6284			
6418/6294			
6421/6301			
6425/6311			
6438/6355			
6469/6397			
6478/6412			
6481/6418			
6483/6426			
Para 18.03	Comment – the wording of this section may need to reflect these on-going changes to the planning system.	1491/17454	National Trust
Para 18.06	Objection – suggest that paragraph 18 be specifically cross referenced to paragraph 2.11 so that the benefits of the exceptions provided for in paragraph 18 can	550/16786	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>specifically support the aims and aspirations of paragraph 2.11. The principle should be extended to include cross reference to a new policy which would fully reflect and give weight to the sustainable tourism objections set out in paragraph 2.11. Additionally, since paragraph 18.6 recognises that the provision of opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation is one of the key aims of green belt policy this should be specifically acknowledged within the provisions of policy GB1. This approach would fully meet the requirements of the NPPF to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the green belt.</p>		
Para 18.14	<p>Comment – community right to build order needs to be very carefully monitored and follow NPPF guidelines. Local people need to be consulted every step of the way, otherwise, open to abuse.</p>	1109/17207	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB2 Development In Settlements "Washed Over" By The Green Belt	Support – agree with this Policy.	59/12668	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – opposed to this policy.	60/12682	Earswick Parish Council
	Support – the villages of Rufforth and Knapton both enjoy 'washed over' status.	74/12752	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Support – support GB2.	101/14241	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection – object to the wording of Policy and the status of Rufforth as a washed over settlement. Rufforth is the sole example of the 12 policy GB2 washed over settlements where a housing allocation is proposed; it appears to be inconsistent with the status of Rufforth as a Policy GB2 settlement. Suggest either inset Rufforth within the Green Belt or retain it as a Policy GB2 settlement but revise the definition of limited infilling to allow other forms of development not necessarily on a built up (road) frontage.	152/13882	Raymond Barnes Town Planning Consultant
	Objection – question the proposed development limits around some of the settlements washed over by the Green Belt. These settlements need to be able to support some small scale development to ensure that they remain sustainable as a settlement. Although acknowledged that Askham Bryan and Askham Richard are villages washed over by green belt (and are also conservation areas) new development, with careful design will help support the suture vitality of the communities. Reassess the development limits of Askham Bryan to include sites for future development (see response for detail).	528/16672	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – policy is not justified, together with the consequential elements of allocation policies related thereto.	544/16747	
	Objection – to paragraph 18.16 that a village, for example Heslington, be included in the Green Belt, in order to prevent development primarily because of the important contribution the village's open character makes to the openness of the Green Belt. There should be recognition that there are some covered by policy GB2 that can be brought forward and developed in a way that would be appropriate to the location, scale and design of the village and any neighbouring property. Recommend that this policy is flexible to allow development proposals to come forward, if in keeping with neighbouring properties.	659/15087	Persimmon Homes
	Comment – appropriate to consider a review of whether the washing over Naburn settlement with Green Belt is necessary in the context of York's Green Belt principle purpose of preserving the setting and the special character of the city of York.	1140/17079	
Support – agree with this policy.	1457/17423		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB2 Development In Settlements "Washed Over" By The Green Belt Continued	Objection – consider that the definition of the village as one washed over by Green Belt is unjustified and would unduly restrict a sustainable form of development within the village.	1672/15052	Mitchells & Butlers PLC
	Objection – “Washover” is for an area where housing is spread out over an area, this area is also considered “unsustainable”, i.e. no shop, school, pub, church, village hall. Rufforth does not fit these criteria. Rufforth is deemed “unsustainable” as it has “washover” status, but then for the Local Plan it is deemed sufficiently “sustainable” to propose 24 new houses in H38. If H38 is allocated then need to change the status of Rufforth from “washover” to “inset”.	2536/6819	
	Objection – has the Elvington settlement boundary moved?	3063/12893	
	Objection – seems to raise uncertainties. The key test surely is to determine whether a proposal is in conformity with the Green Belt as spelled out in the NPPF. This policy should be reviewed to make it clear that any development proposal falling within the Green Belt will be tested ‘to destruction’ against the NPPF to create a sustainable Green Belt for York for at least the planned 30 years.	3356/8587	
	Support – agree with this policy.	5178/12364	
	Comment – Strensall has and will be adversely affected by infilling, why is Strensall not included in this list?	5189/12897	
	Objection – village of Fulford has been omitted from the list in 18.16.	5713/13463	Fulford Battlefield Society

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB3 Reuse Of Buildings	Support – agree with this Policy.	59/12669	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support – for policy GB3.	101/14242	York Natural Environment Panel
	Objection - re-use of buildings, conversion of farm buildings associated with working farms to residential use should normally be discouraged to avoid permanent loss of functional buildings to future farm use.	188/13949	
	Objection – buildings of ‘permanent and substantial construction’ should have been built at least ten years before an application for re-use.	192/14017	
	Objection - not considered to be compliant with the NPPF or considered the most effective policy. Criterion c) reuses of a building in the Green Belt should not be to restrict to the proposed reuse being the same type of use. The whole point of a landowner wanting to reuse a building is that it has outgrown its previous use. Should be reworded to say ‘...the reuse will not require extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension’ deleting reference to ‘the same type of use’. The policy should also remove the requirement for residential conversion of building to be within 800m of a defined settlement limit. Reusing buildings for residential use complies with the NPPF and should therefore be incorporated into Policy GB3. Also considered that criterion g) should be removed. This is an onerous requirement and should be deleted from the policy and text. Conversion of isolated buildings for employment purposes is considered less sustainable than converting the building to residential use.	528/16674	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – policy is not justified, together with the consequential elements of allocation policies related thereto.	544/16748	
	Support – agree with this policy.	1457/17424	
	Support – generally support this policy. Comment - recommend that the site of the new pavilion building on the Civil Service sports ground be used for a new primary/nursery school.	1589/17575	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with the preferred approach and providing local policy to guide new development or building reuse in the Green Belt.	2846/7566	
	Objection – seems to raise uncertainties. The key test surely is to determine whether a proposal is in conformity with the Green Belt as spelled out in the NPPF. This policy should be reviewed to make it clear that any development proposal falling within the Green Belt will be tested ‘to destruction’ against the NPPF to create a sustainable Green Belt for York for at least the planned 30 years.	3356/8588	
Support – agree with this policy.	5178/12365		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB3 Reuse Of Buildings Continued	Support – this policy.	6518/16423	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB4 "Exception" Sites For Affordable Housing In The Green Belt	Support – this policy, but have concerns in relation to allowing some element of market housing in developing an exception site for affordable housing. It appears to be a significant change which benefits landowners and developers rather than the community.	59/12670	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – in line with the NPPF (paragraph 54) Policy GB4 should be clarified, as currently drafted it is contrary to national policy which only permits exception sites in rural areas.	62/12716	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – whilst agree with preferred approach, the first sentence of policy should read: 'in 'very/exceptional/especially' special circumstances...' Have an additional sentence (GB4e) stating words to the effect that the development must have the highest environmental credentials; e.g. Code 5, zero carbon etc.	101/14234	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – there needs to be a stringent safeguard if any market housing is allowed or this could be open to abuse. Policy needs to be water tight, these exceptional sites are described as being 'small', what maximum number is 'small'?	192/14018	
	Objection – favour option 1; do not permit exception sites for affordable housing in the Green Belt.	433/16562	
	Support – fully support the element of the policy where it states that a proportion of market housing can be introduced into such schemes to ensure their viability and deliverability. This is in accordance with the NPPF. Comment – important to note that this will still remain a limited way to provide affordable housing through the local plan as landowners will want to make an acceptable return from the sale of their land. Reference should be made to the Local Housing Delivery Group (Viability Testing Local Plans June 2012) document and paragraphs 173 and 174 of the NPPF.	528/16675	York Diocesan Board of Finance
	Objection – policy is not justified, together with the consequential elements of allocation policies related thereto.	544/16749	
	Objection – have concerns in relation to allowing some element of market housing in developing an exception site for affordable housing. This element of the policy is rejected as it could open the door for inappropriate developments; it appears to be a significant change which benefits landowners and developers rather than the community.	1457/17425	
	Support – support the policy in principle. Comment – as indicated in the NPPF there must be a willing seller and purchaser of land in order to bring sites forward and this applies to an even greater extent to rural exception sites. Given the value of agricultural land today the incentive to bring	1801/9881	Stephenson & Son (Various Landowners)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	forward affordable housing on such land is often not present. In certain situations there needs to be a greater incentive to provide affordable housing.		
Policy GB4 "Exception" Sites For Affordable Housing In The Green Belt Continued	Support – fully support the element of the policy where it states that a proportion of market housing can be introduced into such schemes to ensure their viability and deliverability. Important to note that this will still remain a limited way to provide affordable housing through the Local Plan as landowners will want to make an acceptable return from the sale of their land.	2769/7330	
	Objection – do not agree with preferred approach, should not permit exception sites for affordable housing in the Green Belt.	2846/7567	
	Objection - do not agree with preferred approach, should not permit exception sites for affordable housing in the Green Belt.	3208/8258	
	Objection – seems to raise uncertainties. The key test surely is to determine whether a proposal is in conformity with the Green Belt as spelled out in the NPPF. This policy should be reviewed to make it clear that any development proposal falling within the Green Belt will be tested 'to destruction' against the NPPF to create a sustainable Green Belt for York for at least the planned 30 years.	3356/8589	
	Comment - agree with the exception policy, but have concerns in relation to allowing some element of market housing in developing an exception site for affordable housing. The subsidy should be in the value of the land, which in an exception site, by its very nature, should be low. This element of the policy is rejected as it could open the door for inappropriate development. It appears to be a significant change which benefits landowners and developers rather than the community.	5178/12366	
	Objection – housing (affordable or other) is not compatible with Green Belt principles, so the provision of any affordable housing in the Green Belt should be extremely limited. Non-affordable housing should be opposed.	5609/13181	
	Objection – no exception sites in Green Belt.	5674/13369	
	Support – agree with the approach.	6518/16424	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy GB5 Major Developed Sites In The Green Belt	Support – agree with this Policy.	59/12671	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support –agree with the preferred approach.	101/14235	York Natural Environment Panel
	Comment – propose that the boundary of the college should be amended. Proposed that the boundary should be an inset boundary rather than an Major Developed Site boundary to reflect the character of the college as a settlement in its own right.	261/15015	Askham Bryan College
	Comment – major developed sites in the Green Belt, Elvington WTW, Naburn, Rawcliffe and Haxby Walbutts Water Treatment Works all listed as large developments. Criteria should allow for continued development of the works to meet growth in housing and population proposed. Currently written, the criteria may impede the ability to create additional capacity and develop new and sustainable technologies.	295/14161	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection – favour option 1; do not permit major developed sites in the Green Belt.	433/16563	
	Objection – the Green Belt should have a life of at least 25 years. Support the preferred approach of identifying sufficient development sites for the duration of the emerging plan and sufficient safeguarded land to provide options for potential development in the longer term. Welcome approach but if genuine options for alternative patterns of growth are to be available in the longer term, the amount of safeguarded land to be provided in the emerging plan must be considerably in excess of the assessed development land needs in the next plan period.	540/16736	Jennifer Hubbard Planning Consultant
	Objection – no justification for the identification of major development sites. Concept of major development sites set out in PPG2 was revoked by the NPPF and replaced by differently worded policy.	544/16739	
	Support – permit certain developments in one of the 11 major developed sites in the Green Belt. Support inclusion of one of the preferred uses at the Clifton hospital site being residential. Need clarity on what is meant by 'limited infilling' for the preferred uses; employment and residential for the major developed site.	659/15088	Persimmon Homes
	Support – this policy.	1457/17426	
	Comment – should the plan support the redevelopment of Elvington Airfield (proposed as a new site) then it would need to be included within the list of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt.	1736/9833	Oakgate Group PLC
Objection – presume that major developed sites in the Green Belt designation is being retained in order to identify the larger previously developed sites around York that lie outside the urban area. Clifton Gate Business Park contains some 3453 sqm of built footprint; on this basis it exceeds the proposed built footprint guideline limit to be	2715/7208	Owners of Clifton Gate Business Park	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	included under GB5. In view of this seek its designation as a “Major Developed Site” in the Green Belt. If considered unsuitable to be described as above it would be helpful to identify substantial differences in planning terms between Clifton Gate Business Park and Hessay depot and explain those differences.		
Policy GB5 Major Developed Sites In The Green Belt Continued	Objection – do not agree with the preferred approach, should not permit major developed sites in the Green Belt.	2846/7568	
	Objection – option 1; should not permit major developed sites in the Green Belt.	3208/8259	
	Objection – seems to raise uncertainties. The key test surely is to determine whether a proposal is in conformity with the Green Belt as spelled out in the NPPF. This policy should be reviewed to make it clear that any development proposal falling within the Green Belt will be tested ‘to destruction’ against the NPPF to create a sustainable Green Belt for York for at least the planned 30 years.	3356/8590	
	Support – agree with this policy. Comment - believe Green Belt is especially valuable where it defines the boundary of a village, large or small, that would otherwise become indistinct or merge with another community. Similarly, the green corridor issue is important for any community of any size. Where the Green Belt is less sensitive, a Neighbourhood Plan should identify it as such and it is here that development could take place if the development itself is appropriate for example like Dunnington Cemetery.	5178/12367	
	Objection – preferred option should be as close as possible to option 1; no major developments in the Green Belt.	5609/13182	
Comment – it might be appropriate to revive some of the principles of Ebenezer Howard’s “Garden Cities of Tomorrow”. York already has a structure that embodies many of Howard’s principles. The existing Green Belt and surrounding agricultural land make up an ideal setting for this. If this is destroyed, it may remove any chance of creating a more self sufficient city in the future.	6518/16425	York Green Party	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 18: Green Belt Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 18.01	Support – the preferred approach outlined in Q18 and ask to be involved in the production of the local criteria.	101/14243	York Natural Environment Panel
	Support – agree with preferred options approach to development in the Green Belt; Exception Sites in the Green Belt; and Major Developments in the Green Belt.	188/13950	
	Comment – developments have been undertaken in Green Belt whereby major watercourses have to be diverted or where culverts have replaced open watercourses thereby reducing the storage capacity of watercourses and effectively ‘throttling’ the network. It may be appropriate for this policy area to make specific reference to such infrastructure issues. Would also support the development of local guidance and criteria.	190/13975	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Support – for proposed approach and guidance which the policies in this section provide especially insofar as they seek to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city.	238/14115	English Heritage
	Objection – Option 1. Major developed sites in the Green Belt should not be permitted.	529/16690	
	Objection – Option 1, Major developed sites in the Green Belt should not be permitted.	835/16914	
	Support – the preferred approach on providing local criteria for major development sites within the Green Belt should be undertaken.	943/16964	
	Comment – Green Belt needs to be preserved.	1109/17208	
	Support – accept the preferred approach. Plan should provide local policy to guide new development or building reuse in the Green Belt. Plan should provide local criteria for infill/exception site in the Green Belt. Plan should provide local criteria for major developed sites in the Green Belt.	1457/17421	
	Objection – the approach to development in the Green Belt should rely on the NPPF to guide development and not rely on local policy. Recommend not to permit exception sites for affordable housing and not to permit major development sites.	1589/17576	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – broadly support the preferred approach, question the strength of the policies if land was previously designated Green Belt can be conveniently overturned to suit other (new) policies.	1665/12970	York Environment Forum
	Support – subject to comments made on GB1 and GB5, support the preferred approach to Green Belt.	1736/9834	Oakgate Group PLC