

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Support – strong linkages between climate change, flood management, green infrastructure and minerals planning agendas. Should result in collaborative working between our authorities.	11/11683	North Yorkshire County Council
	Support – very supportive of all the suggested policies.	42/11721	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Comment – page 212, should add an additional bullet point to reflect paragraph 129 of the NPPF 'local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that maybe affected by a proposal...' this advice would justify the reference in the Local Context on page 215 to the Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Capacity in Yorkshire and Humber Study (2011) and reference to opportunities for further micro generation being balanced with the need to protect the city's heritage environment. Should also include a policy link on page 222 to Section 16 'design and the historic environment'.	188/13953	
	Comment - reservations about proximity of wind turbines to housing.	999/225	
	Support – welcome this section committed to addressing the causes and effects of climate change. Comment – although there are passing cross references to other important factors in combating climate change (such as transport, waste and biodiversity) there do not appear to be clear cross references within the policies. It might be helpful for this section to highlight the role played by a wide range of factors, not just construction and energy production.	1491/17456	National Trust
	Objection - the key evidence base falls short due to no Green Infrastructure Strategy and its multiple benefits and hidden values of the natural environment in adaptation and mitigation to climate change framework and action plans. An urgent Green Infrastructure management and delivery plan is required to improve the quality of life, biodiversity, landscape character and townscapes, flood impact and flooding, conserve & fresh water, purify it, adapt to climate change and all social and economic and the environment benefits of land use. The natural environment is not introduced into the policies.	4819/14304	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Support – agree with the preferred approach to renewable and low carbon energy development, code for sustainable homes and building regulations. Comment – reserve the right to disagree with specific conclusions reached or policies development.	6508/17685	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Comment - alternatives/Question 20 – Code for Sustainable Homes – 3. Set targets at CSH level 5-6 or equivalent (zero carbon option). 4. This would need some worked up examples of costs for people to be able to make a judgement. It would generally be	6518/16428	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>better to offer a professional EPC for a cost, unless the customer elected to select their own professional to do the work. Additionally it would be useful to require this assessment for all new Houses in Multiple Occupation registered with the authority and applications under the Article 4 directive for change of use to such housing so that future tenants could be clear about potential energy costs. Building Regulations – 3. Require that all development achieves at least an additional 10% reduction in excess of building regulations would be preferred approach.</p>		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation	Comment - positive renewable energy policy welcomed. Objection – limited assessment of their ecological effects within the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) to support their identification. Without ecological assessment these areas of search have not been justified and are unsound. Particularly concerned about those areas adjacent to the Lower Derwent Valley SPA, SAC and Ramsar, River Derwent SSSI, Derwent Ings SSSI, Heslington Tillmire SSSI and Acaster South Ings SSSI. If these are retained, thorough ecological assessments (including HRA) must be undertaken.	2/11590	Natural England
	Comment - some of the potential areas of search identified for renewable energy (i.e. wind farms) lie adjacent to or close to our boundary, and these are not subject to any joint working or discussion.	7/11649	Hambleton District Council
	Comment - considering future options towards renewable energy generation in the context of wind farming, and notes the significant areas of search highlighted on the proposals map adjacent to Selby District. Would welcome joint working in future studies to address this issue in a coordinated manner.	9/11659	Selby District Council
	Comment - the draft Plan identifies a number of areas of search for renewable electricity generation in close proximity to the River Derwent and the administrative boundary with East Riding of Yorkshire Council. It will be essential that proposals for renewable energy development within the City of York’s administrative area consider both the impacts taking into account existing and committed proposals within the East Riding of Yorkshire. It may also be the case that neighbouring communities within the East Riding would receive a proportion of any community fund that is paid as a result of developments within the York area.	10/11699	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Comment – note that the plan identifies a number of areas of search for renewable energy generation, in many cases close to the boundaries of neighbouring authorities including within north Yorkshire. It is therefore important that cross-boundary discussions take place to consider the wider impact of such developments, individually and cumulatively. It may also be worth noting that where neighbouring North Yorkshire communities are affected by such developments that they may be entitled to receive a proportion of any community fund that is paid as a result of them.	11/11692	North Yorkshire County Council
	Objection – supportive of the generation of renewable energy. However some areas are inappropriate for turbine installation due to the potential impact on wildlife, for example internationally important bird populations. The mapping from the AEA study does not appear to take into account potential impacts from turbines in the areas of search on sites important for birds such as the Heslington Tillmire and Lower Derwent	42/11702	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Valley. The Trust is pleased to see that the Habitats Regulation Assessment concludes that Policy CC1 has the potential to impact on European sites, and should be amended.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection - the search areas to the north and south of the A64. Were this to be a wind farm, it would inevitably damage this setting so crucial to the special character of York.	46/12592	Heslington Village Trust
	Support – endorse Policy CC1 but particularly the qualification in para iii “demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse impacts on landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets and Green Belt objectives”. Objection – ask that the search areas in the revised proposals maps should be substantially reduced to reflect the ministerial statement on 13 th July 2013.	47/12584	CPRE (York and Selby District)
	Objection – shows extensive areas of search to the north and south of A64. The Plan suggests that land by Whinthorpe could be suitable for solar farms using solar panels. This proposal if carried through would remove large areas of good and productive Grade 2 agricultural land. It also occupies the landscape forming one of the important and valuable Green Corridors into York. Were this to be a wind farm, it would inevitably damage this setting so crucial to the special character of York.	48/12601	Heslington Parish Council
	Objection – the ‘Skelton wind farm’ would feature wind turbines, allegedly 145 metres high, in a location previously rejected.	56/12611	Clifton Without Parish Council
	Objection – the Plan indicates an area to the west of Copmanthorpe as a potential area of search for renewable electricity generation. Given the location of this land, this can only mean a windfarm. A planning application (in this location) was refused on the grounds that it was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, that it would harm the openness of the Green Belt, and it would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and on the setting and historic character of York.	57/12624	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – the Plan is proposing to blight the area by installing over 40 wind farms of various sizes on green belt land. The cost/benefits of this part of the proposal make little sense. We strongly recommend that issues are fully researched for each of the proposed wind farms. The number and spread of wind rams is completely unacceptable as it will destroy the amenity of residents.	58/12625	Deighton Parish Council
	Comment – we do not accept that wind farms be built only to meet sustainable energy targets. Resident acceptance of location, aesthetics and noise must be achieved.	59/12676	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection –should clarify position about ‘potential sites for renewable energy generation’. Have been advised that these are no longer ‘a plan’ rather they are	61/12688	Elvington Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	'suggestions for evaluation'. Therefore request their removal from the draft Plan. Total opposition to these unjustified proposals, which in many cases affect SSSI and beauty.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – highly opposed to the proposals for renewable energy such as wind and solar farms in the immediate vicinity of the City and in particular those which would be visible from the Ring Road. Any benefit for the environment would be outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the setting and special character of the City. Note that the AEA Study said that the capacity of the city for commercial scale wind energy would be limited by the need to protect the historic setting of the city. The same must also apply to major solar farms being proposed adjacent to the Whinthorpe new settlement. Any renewable energy proposal in the Green Belt would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.	62/14210	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – the proposed wind farms are unacceptably close to existing housing, particularly the proposed site alongside Towthorpe Road. The turbines will impact of views of York from the north, and views of the North York Moors from the south.	63/12724	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – strongly object to the proposed allocation of potential areas of search for renewable electricity (CC1) north and south of Kexby and to the north east of Dunnington. Ground for objections are: noise generation, ecology, access, impact on residents, the potential wind farms cannot be justified on economic grounds.	68/12737	Kexby Parish Council
	Comment - note that there is a region within the Murton Parish that may have certain characteristics needed for a wind turbine. Need clarification given the open nature of the site in a particularly sensitive area of the Green Belt between Murton and Holtby.	69/13853	Murton Parish Council
	Objection – what are the benefits for the people of Naburn and the wider York community that outweigh the likely enormous environmental impact of the scheme on communities and presumably the loss of productive farm land? Wind farms are known to be restricted to an inconsistent supply of energy even on ideal sites. Has the Council investigated other sources of power generation such as the river with its weir at Naburn Locks? The Vale of York is not particularly well-suited to this form of energy because it lacks the kind of windy conditions normally required. The visual impact on the area of this kind of development would appear to be self-evident. The impact of the wind farm on the wildlife in the area. In particular, the proximity of the Naburn area to the Ouse attracts wide variety of birdlife all year round, including large flocks of geese and seabirds – what research has been carried out to assess the likely risk to significant numbers of these birds from such a concentration of turbines? Potential impact on the difficult and delicately-balanced water management issues in Naburn when the Ouse is in flood.	70/12742	Naburn Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection - the Plan contains several areas around Rufforth designated as Areas of Search for Renewable Electricity Generation (Wind Turbines). Request examination of the safeguarding plan for the airfield and the reaction of other nearby active airfields and remove these areas of search from the next version of the Plan. As well as being a potential hazard to aircraft, wind turbines in this area would create an unacceptable blemish on the open landscape.	74/12751	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection - there are large areas allocated in the Plan for renewable energy generation surrounding Skelton. Skelton opposes any wind turbines in or near the parish for the multitude of reasons that have been expressed. A feature of York has always been the historic, dramatic and welcoming view of the Minster when the city is approached from any direction. Only one wind turbine would be sufficient to destroy that view.	75/12760	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – opposed to any development of wind turbines other than at a small scale in suitable locations in connection with local power usage for the following reasons: the area of search in the parish is in the green belt, green wedge and in close proximity to Wheldrake Ings/Lower Derwent Valley Nature Reserve. The scale of a large wind turbine/farm would be detrimental to the visual amenity and heritage landscapes within the parish and the adjacent parishes. Connection would be required to the local/national electricity grid which would introduce further visual clutter on the landscape. The recent approval of an anaerobic digestion plant at the North Selby Mine will produce enough electrical power to supply the equivalent demand in the Parish without need to introduce further renewable capacity. Financial and betterment “carrots” offered by potential developers could lead to conflict within the community to the detriment of community adhesion and well being.	79/12787	Wheldrake Parish Council
	Comment – are we to assume that there are no suggested sites for renewable energy generation? If so, should they not be marked on the main map in the Plan?	88/12817	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Objection – York’s ecological footprint is 4.72 global hectares (GHA) per person, above the UK average of 4.64 GHA. Therefore Plan should aim to reach beyond national standards regarding reducing carbon emissions, improving waste management and the provision of a local renewable energy supply. In general, this does not appear to be clearly mitigated for in the wording of the policies outlined in the Plan. Reduction of energy consumption needs to take place alongside the promotion of local renewable energy and at a rate necessary for York to be able to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets in line with the requirements of the Climate Change Act. Planning permission should not be limited to the sites overlaid on the current plan, there should be a presumption in favour of the provision for wind farm sites at any location where	90/12794	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>an environmental assessment clearly demonstrates that the proposed turbines will reduce greenhouse gas emissions with minimal adverse impacts and this includes inside the Green Belt. Restriction of sites could increase demand for wind farm development within a limited number of locations and ultimately result in an inappropriate development not in keeping with the scale and nature of York. Community renewable energy schemes should be actively encouraged. Support use of solar power as a form of energy. Would like to see policies to promote installation of solar panels on many more buildings and support for local solar panel farms in appropriate areas. Council should adopt policies with a presumption against fracking as it will make reducing greenhouse gases difficult and has adverse local impacts.</p>		
<p>Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued</p>	<p>Objection - any wind turbines should not be higher than 125 metres to the hub to avoid being over intrusive in the landscape. They should be at least 200m from any dwelling, private or public highway, including bridleways and footpaths, also at least 'fall-over' distance from the same. Any solar farms should not impinge on the enjoyment by the public of any green corridors footpaths in their vicinity. Heat pumps, solar panels and the like on all new build could assist with fulfilling the renewable need.</p>	91/12855	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	<p>Objection - to the sending out of a map showing an intense scattering of wind turbines around York. This can only raise unnecessary alarm as to the proposed size, number and noise. The land near Skelton is relatively flat land with generally low wind levels and the technology/cost pay back is at best unproven.</p>	136/12875	Skelton Village Trust
	<p>Objection – wind farms are proven to be both inefficient and expensive, causing potential health problems and a loss of life for wildlife.</p>	164/13885	
	<p>Objection – with the constraints of the setting of the special character for York these is little opportunity for wind farms or even single wind turbines. Far too many potential sites are shown: if all were permitted. This policy should include that a wind farm or single wind turbine should be specific distance from the nearest habitation.</p>	192/14019	
	<p>Comment - support the requirement that proposals for renewable energy development should demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse impacts upon the landscapes character, setting views, heritage assets or Green Belt objectives.</p>	238/14117	English Heritage
	<p>Objection- designation as sites for renewable energy. This is incompatible with the breeding of waders on the Tillmire and wintering/passage of geese, ducks and waders. The development for renewable energy in this area is directly on the route used by gulls moving between their feeding site at Harewood Whin and their roosting sites in the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Humber estuary SPA</p>	401/16522	York Ornithological Club

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	as previously described. In our view any assessment of this site for wind turbines or solar panels would quickly identify that these would be incompatible and inappropriate developments for this area.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection - they are ineffective, extremely costly and the cost falls unequally on the users. Subsidy is paid for by all users and therefore those who are on the poorer incomes feel the cost most of all.	419/16530	
	Objection- object to the proposed Section 20 allocation of "Potential Areas Of Search For Renewable Electricity Generation. (CC1) in numerous areas around York in particular north and south of Kexby and to the north east of Dunnington. Objections are as follows. (1) Noise generation, given the current uncertainty on know impacts it is my view that the proposed wind farm development and for others in the York area, appear to be a playing a gamble on the health and wellbeing of local communities. (2) Ecology with a major potential impact on the Section 17 Green infrastructure on the banks of the river Derwent, in the SSI and in the Ings either side of the river. The proximity of the proposed development to the river corridor along the Lower Derwent Valley. The proposed sites to the north and south of Kexby should be omitted from the plan and 2 miles no turbine buffer zones created around all other nature conservation areas. (3) Access problems during construction and serving potential wind farm sites will generate extra traffic and noise. Extra vehicle movements will add to risks on narrow roads. (4) Impact on residents will be significant. The visual impact of wind turbines closes the villages and housing is unacceptable. (5) New national guidelines in relation to positioning wind turbines away from villages/housing should result in proposed sites being dropped/removed from the next version of the proposals Maps. (6) The potential wind farm sites cannot be justified on economic grounds. The negative effect of the potential wind farm sites is greater than the Section 20 Climate Change agenda requirements. The extent and location of the wind farms will be detrimental to York residents and visitors. Wind turbines are very ugly and inappropriate for the Green Belt. In view of the lack of landscape or visual impact information to justify the proposed allocation in what are arguably a very sensitive location I object to the Section 20 allocation north and south of Kexby.	421/16531	WR Dunn & Co. Ltd.
	Objection - Policy CC1 does not accord with best practice which seeks to reduce the use of a resource and a polluting omission rather than mitigating for it. Policy CC1 relates only to renewable standalone technologies and misses the opportunity to encourage low carbon technologies. With good design, building fabric, construction, energy efficient measures and proactive operation of a building, carbon emission can	434/16586	Associated British Foods plc

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be reduced in line with the Government’s carbon zero policy programme without the need for mitigation measures.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – object to the wind farm developments in the plan. If a wind farm of the size proposed were to be built at Copmanthorpe it would dominate the area and ruin the village. The council must accept that there are not suitable sites in the district area. Would rather see proposals for bio energy sites.	454/16615	
	Comment – cautious on subject of renewable energy sources; fundamentally believe that new and more impressive green technologies will come along and must ensure that over next 40 years we can adopt new practices, technologies and changes as well as prioritising current best practices.	525/16645	
	Objection – the calculation of need for wind farms is nonsensical and the proposals would completely surround the historic city and blight all views from the high points which are tourist attractions for the city. Low wind speeds mean they would consistently be operating below capacity, the area is inappropriate for wind farms which are unsuitable and unsustainable. The creation of the necessary infrastructure would require a huge investment. Would destroy the character and environment of local communities such as Huntington, destroy the charm and character of the city’s rural setting and devastate rural communities.	529/16684	
	Support - the policy is based on current government policy and therefore we do not object to the principle of the policy. Objection - when the policy is read in conjunction with the Proposals Map it implies that consent will only be granted for renewable and low carbon energy generation in the locations designated. This cannot be appropriate as these will inevitably be schemes which come forward and which are suitable in other locations. Also not convinced that the areas depicted on the Proposals Map are the most appropriate or the only sites which are suitable. Would therefore support the following criterion i) of Policy CC1 is deleted; and the symbol for potential areas of search on the Proposals Map is deleted.	534/16714	DPP One Ltd
	Objection - the plan would benefit from the deletion of this unnecessary policy. The plan contains significant amounts of unnecessary policy which merely repeats or re-states NPPF policy. In consequence, the plan fails to be succinct as required by the NPPF (paragraph 17, first bullet). Policy in different language is likely to lead to ambiguity.	544/16756	
	Objection – these monstrosities (wind farms) will damage the intrinsic beauty of the countryside. Strongly against them.	551/16791	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the many wind farms shown on the local plan would completely ruin the views of the city from almost every aspect of the countryside. They are unnecessary and would be ineffective due to the flat landscape.	670/16815	
	Comment – should not overlook the irrelevance of on short wind power in this area and feel more favourable about the more reliable and productive PV solar arrays.	671/16831	
	Objection – wind farms should be kept to an absolute minimum, they are simply not productive enough and they are a blot on the local landscape.	679/16859	
	Objection – see response 11	737/16884	
	Objection – see response 11	796/16895	
	Objection – surrounding Poppleton with wind farms will not be very efficient and is the wrong decision.	801/3981	
	Objection – the calculation of need for wind farms is nonsensical and the proposals would completely surround the historic city and blight all views from the high points which are tourist attractions for the city. Low wind speeds mean they would consistently be operating below capacity, the area is inappropriate for wind farms which are unsuitable and unsustainable. The creation of the necessary infrastructure would require a huge investment. Would destroy the character and environment of local communities such as Huntington, destroy the charm and character of the city's rural setting and devastate rural communities. Proposals to build very large site to the north east of Huntington would impact on the SSSI at Strensall common.	835/16906	
	Objection – lack of detailed technical assessment for the locations of the proposed wind farms. What is the forecast number of electricity units expected to be produced from each wind farm and what assumptions are made in arriving at these estimated. On how many days per year is it estimated that the turbines will be producing electricity. How to estimates compare with any national standards used to validate the location of wind farms?	850/16927	
	Objection – the introduction of wind farms would be a catastrophic intrusion on the views from Heslington village and would run counter to the clearly stated objectives of the Village Design Statement.	863/16933	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	917/3053	
Objection – much more thought must go into the proposals for wind farms. Positioned on the Wolds would catch better wind? Must be well away from housing.	945/16979		
Objection – the York area and its surrounding flat agricultural land is not satiable for wind farm development. Any development of the scale suggested on the maps would have a disastrous effect on the setting of the city and on the rural villages. It would	969/17001		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	make more sense to insist that any development carried out under the local plan should have its own sustainable heat source, OV roof panels or ground source heat pumps.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	<p>Objection – wind farms bases on an outdated report, in the three years since the report was written understanding of renewable energy especially wind farms has changed significantly. Without subsidies from Government the economic model makes little sense. No work appears to have been done regarding the practicality of these sites in regard to grip connection, whether they could interfere with low flying aircraft, radar or telecommunication transmitters and bird migration, or whether they would have appropriate noise footprints given their location. Further information must be made available before any informed decision can be made.</p> <p>Comment - worried about the impact on York’s skyline and on views of the Minster. No turbines should be higher than 45 metres. Increasing evidence of health issues for those near turbines. A buffer should be set, possibly of 1,000m between turbines and homes.</p>	995/17027	
	<p>Objection – many of the proposed sites lie adjacent to the SSSI’s along the River Derwent is this the best idea? Are there not conflicts with important wildlife and landscape considerations? Why not site them on the redundant Elvington airfield. How much power will the wind turbines generate? Power form these wind farms is heavily subsidised. Would that subsidy not be better used to insulate houses and factories and to install solar panels? Told that you can get more than enough power from gas fracking so why erect wind farms at all? Would it not be better if all new houses were obliged by law to have solar panels and small wind power generators as standards as well as double glazing and loft and cavity insulation?</p> <p>Alternative – support generating power from rivers and weirs.</p>	1008/17017	
	<p>Objection – object to proposals to build wind farms North and South of Skelton. Only just enough wind speed is available to make these wind farms viable. The area is flat. To make the most of these sites the turbines would need to be very tall and with adjacent houses would be totally unsuitable due to the noise and flicker. The visual impact on the skyline would dwarf the Minster.</p>	1009/17036	
	<p>Support – in favour of wind power</p> <p>Comment – would it not be more acceptable to have turbines in smaller numbers in more places.</p>	1049/17048	
	<p>Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Decisions should be made on sound reasoning only</p>	1053/3344	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1061/628	
	Objection - the economic future of the City of York is highly influenced by tourism. If the first impression of our magnificent city is a circle of grotesque wind turbines rather than our beautiful Minster, many will pay a flying visit rather than stop overnight i.e. reducing spending in the area. Question if wind turbines are a cost effective or indeed cost efficient solution. If we have to build them, there are other options in areas with lower population density in less dramatic countryside.	1079/17059	
	Objection – opposed to wind farms in the vale of York as they would not be cost effective. Alternative- solar panel farms could be encouraged in poor quality green belt land.	1109/17212	
	Objection – very few sites proposed for green energy have been properly assessed or either need or suitability and without full environment assessment of the whole of Outer York and the surrounding authorities. This can only lead to a succession of costly public inquiries in the future because of inadequate research into the local plan’s preparation.	1170/17089	
	Comment – appears to have changes its stance on renewable energy generation as only within the last year planning committee rejected an application to build a wind measuring mast on the same land in connection with a wind farm proposal.	1176/17097	
	Objection – wind farms only survive with a considerable subsidy passed on to customers via electricity bills. They can only operate with sufficient but not too high a wind this support power generate has to be permanently available. Surely we should be considering fracking and nuclear power before building more white elephants. Can understand their use in a coastal setting.	1210/17114	
	Support – welcome the emphasis on increasing renewable energy. Would welcome the development of wind power in the area. One approach would be to ensure that the proposed new settlements had accompanying wind farms. Any wind farms or other renewable energy developments should have to plough some of their profits back into the local community.	1261/17140	
	Support - the development of renewable and low carbon energy generation within the City of York and Whinthorpe (ST15). Welcome the initial work undertaken by the council in producing The Renewable Energy Strategic Viability Study for York (2010), which identifies a range of potential locations for this infrastructure. Note the ambition to increase renewable energy generation from 5MW to 39MW of installed capacity by 2020 primarily through medium to large scale wind. Objection - confirmed that this review is very much strategic in nature and does not	1337/17292	Halifax Estates

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>assess many of the technical constraints associated with the development of energy infrastructure. It is possible therefore that the sites identified in this report may not ultimately be viable and that other potentially viable sites (and technologies) have been excluded at this early stage. It is important therefore that the policy allows the development of sites not identified in the initial review, provided that they meet the strategic requirements of Policy CC1 and other policies within the Local Plan. Request that the following text be inserted into the Policy text: Sites for renewable and low carbon energy generation not identified within The Renewable Energy Strategic Viability Study for York (2010) will be considered by the council provided that they meet the strategic requirements of Policy CC1.</p>		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	<p>Objection – the proposed areas of search are absolutely unnecessary, if they are pursued they will do much to destroy the character and setting of the city. All of these sites should be removed immediately. Key arguments against the sites are the inaccurate calculation of need, their inappropriateness and the negative effects they could have on the economy. Detailed comments on these arguments provided in response.</p>	1355/17338	Mr J Sturdy MP
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	<p>Support - welcomes the attempts to adopt a spatial planning approach to guiding renewable energy project delivery. Objection - needs to involve a robust, evidence based approach that excludes areas where development would have the potential to have significant adverse environmental impacts, including to designated nature conservation sites. Therefore object to Policy CC1 as a result of concerns over some of the areas of search referred to under part i of the policy. It is not straight forward to list specific sites of concern as they are not individually named or numbered. However it is noted that several of them are adjacent to protected sites designation such as the Lower Derwent Valley SPA, SAC and Ramsar, River Derwent SSSI, Derwent Ings SSSI, Heslington Tillmire SSSI and Acaster South Ings SSSI. This is of concerns as several of the bird specifics supported by these sites are known to be vulnerable to adverse impacts from wind turbines. Unable to find any information in the consultation documents to suggest that potential impacts on SSSIs have been considered or addressed. This issue needs to be fully considered and addressed before the allocations can be taken forward. In addition both parts iii and iv should also include reference to biodiversity in order to be in keeping with paragraphs 109 and 114 of the NPPF.</p>	1399/17363	RSPB
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	<p>Objection - understand the consultation sites do not include those that would obstruct primary views of the Minster and the number of crosses on the Local Plan does not</p>	1457/17431	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	indicate numbers of turbines or their sizes. Further that no work has been done regarding the practicality of these sites in regard to turbine size, grid connection, interference with low flying aircraft, radar or telecommunication transmitters, bird migration routes and what noise footprints would result from turbines located in the areas of search. The scarcity of details and the technical complexities involved makes it impossible to do other than note these are areas identified by AEA as of suitable wind strength. Do not accept that Wind Farms be built only to meet sustainable energy targets.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1504/2184	
	Objection - paragraph 20.7 of the supporting text to Policy CC1 refers to potential areas of search for renewable electricity generation. These areas include land for medium and large scale wind turbines across part of the Land North of Clifton Moor: Strategic Site (ST14), land at the northern end of the Safeguarded Land (SF2), land north of Skelton and land at Wiggington Moor. A wind farm in this location would clearly be incompatible with the development of the urban extension at Clifton Gate. Trust that this location is no longer being considered for wind turbines and that it will be deleted from future iterations of the Local Plan?	1523/17510	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	Comment – need to be convinced that land is high enough for turbines to produce the amount of energy to cover the outlay costs.	1582/17545	
	Objection - cannot support this policy unless there is an agreement that no wind farm would be allowed if it would have any impact on the landscape, character of the area, setting as regards York and the rural villages, impose on views, interfere with heritage assets and Green Belt objectives. Considered that the Vale of York is an inappropriate site for the consideration of Wind Farms due to its geographical characteristics.	1589/17577	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – support for wind farms in the flat, uninteresting countryside up to the A59.	1590/17584	
	Objection – causes concern as it stands, does not provide an appropriate approach to renewable and low carbon energy generation. Particularly concerned with criterion i) which suggests proposals for renewable energy which respond to the opportunities in the renewable energy strategic viability study will be supported. This study makes clear that because it looks at the district as a whole it does not take into account a number of detailed considerations, including the intention to preserve and enhance the historic setting of York. It is appropriate for the policy to include more specific criteria for determining applications for renewable and low carbon energy generation, particularly wind turbines. In particular criteria to address how potential adverse impacts will be addressed, including cumulative landscape and visual impact. This is in	1592/17620	York Civic Trust

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accordance with paragraph 96 and 97 of the NPPF.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Support - extremely supportive of the intension of localised electricity generation, need to utilise all possible sources of generation to achieve the government's policy of reducing carbon emissions.	1599/9936	
	Objection - concerned about number of wind turbines built around City spoiling its character.	1605/131	
	Objection - how will the plan support and encourage the generation of renewable and low carbon energy. What is the strategy for this? Must be strong positive commitment to it in the Local Plan, otherwise nothing will happen and the stated commitments in the Climate Change Action Plan and Framework and the sustainable city chapter of the strategy for York will be severely undermined and lose credibility.	1665/12972	York Environment Forum
	Comment - note in the supporting text that Policy CC1 only focuses on stand alone renewable technologies. Would seem appropriate to make this clear within the policy itself to make sure that it is not miss-applied when determining planning applications.	1668/15044	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection – the proposals for a large wind farm to the west of Woodthorpe would proof a massive intrusion on an attractive agricultural area. We understand the wind power in Vale of York would not be sufficient for such a development.	1681/9763	
	Objection - the proposals for a large wind farm to the west of Woodthorpe would proof a massive intrusion on an attractive agricultural area. We understand the wind power in Vale of York would not be sufficient for such a development.	1682/9766	
	Objection – renewable energy sites should only be considered in suitable locations after extensive consultation with local residents. The Plan shows turbines in very close proximity to well established and heavily used bridleway near Holtby and will adjoin one of my fields and I have received no prior notice of this intrusion.	1692/9769	
	Comment – Policy CC1 seems more of a statement of intent or aspiration of the Council rather than an actual policy requirement.	1705/9795	Gladman Developments
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposal ignores public objection on ground of amenity and utility. Turbine farms would blight area and affect its “pull” for visitors, settlement and inward investment. Would change character of area from rural to industrial landscape.	1884/5	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1885/18	
Objection – what is the justification for including plans in Copmanthorpe for large wind farms near houses when the council rejected an application for this on the same land little more than a year ago?	1886/26		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – shouldn't someone be assessing the timber potential of wood as an alternative to wind energy?	1887/31	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Masts will be unsightly and cause noise and flicker. Wind generators are potentially dangerous. Inefficient and not financially viable. Dangerous to birds and other flying creatures. Will cause interference to TV and radio signals. Will cause unacceptable devaluation of property prices	1892/49	
	Objection – not convinced that our energy needs will be met by the massive expenditure required to install these massive, noisy, unsightly installations which will have a significant adverse impact on the character of Dunnington and all round York. Too much emphasis on wind farms to detriment of other options, such as solar panels or wave flow.	1898/6040	
	Objection – beyond the Council's remit to build monstrous wind generators.	1899/104	
	Objection – wind farms are an eyesore and are no good at generating electricity. Would be better off damming the Foss and putting in a water driven turbine.	1900/9904	
	Objection – to 'identified potential' turbines both north and south of Skelton on visual grounds, and also question their benefits, efficiency and viability, as well as the detrimental impact on the health of people living nearby.	1901/67	
	Objection – proposal for wind turbines is ludicrous. These are inefficient and expensive to produce and maintain. They are eyesores and will destroy the beauty of York's environment. They are also noisy and dangerous to birds.	1903/75	
	Objection – wind farms and expensive to develop and unsightly.	1913/102	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1917/119	
	Support – entirely appropriate for the Plan to show potential sites for wind farms as we should be responsible for sustainability creating the energy we use without jeopardising the climate and gas resources that our children inherit.	1918/122	
	Objection – wind turbines are hideous things and do they really produce the amount of power that is mentioned. They are very costly and are a blot on the landscape. Will have an adverse impact on this area. What about solar panels – this would be a cheaper option to offer individuals and they would be sending energy back t the grid.	1920/9914	
	Objection – build a wind farm west of Woodthorpe. Wind farms are expensive and do not pay their way apart from being unsightly and potentially noisy.	1930/142	
	Objection – who would plan for 40 wind turbine sites in what is effectively a vale and spoil forever a historical vista? Why has higher land further away from the city not been considered? Every new house should be fitted with solar panels that are efficient in energy transfer and silent.	1931/150	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – no justification for including a site for ‘potential renewable energy generation’ when the council planning committee rejected application to build a wind mast on the same land less than a year ago.	1937/170	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1940/179	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farms are inefficient and not financially viable. Mast unsightly and too close to dwellings causing noise and flicker. Certain weather conditions, generators are potentially dangerous. Dangerous to birds and other creatures. Generators will cause interference to TV and radio signals. Unacceptable devaluation of property prices. Wind farm already rejected by Council.	1942/1546	
	Objection – wind farm here was turned down a year ago. They are not efficient, use up valuable agricultural land and affect the habitat of wildlife.	1943/196	
	Comment – no objection as long as the height is reasonable so as not to be an eyesore.	1945/199	
	Comment – wind farms would not be a real threat if they were built. So much controversy surrounding their effectiveness that nobody would build them until proven. Cheaper to provide every home with solar panels.	1946/204	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1954/239	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Unrealistic to build wind farms in the geographically small and largely urban York. If a windfarm the proposed size was built near Copmanthorpe it would dominate the area and ruin the village. There are no suitable sites. Would rather see proposals for bio energy sites.	1959/253	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1960/261	
		1961/269	
		1963/284	
		1964/292	
		1965/300	
1966/308			
1967/316			
1968/324			
1969/332			
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Object to wind farms being built within 2km of existing communities and housing. If they are proven to be an economic way to reduce carbon consumption, they should be located in places where there is minimal	1970/340		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	impact on residents in terms of visual appearance, noise, construction disruption, flicker etc.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1971/348	
		1972/356	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farms do not deliver cost effective power. Other options should be considered first.	1973/363	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1974/371	
		1976/384	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1977/392	
		1978/400	
		1979/407	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farm equals no houses. No builder would work at any site in Copmanthorpe. Loss of rates. Houses would need rate reduction. Council should seek to conserve energy – generating energy is not the responsibility of the council. Site already rejected for mast last year.	1980/415	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	1981/423	
		1982/430	
		1985/448	
		1986/456	
		1987/464	
		1989/479	
	1991/494		
	1992/502		
	1993/510		
	1994/524		
	1995/531		
	1996/539		
	1997/547		
	1999/561		
	2000/569		
	2001/577		
	2002/585		
	Objection – proposed site for wind farm in Copmanthorpe appears to be too near existing and proposed housing and will impact on quality of life for existing and new	2003/589	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	residents. Look again and find new sites which are as far away as possible.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – definite no. York is below sea level therefore common sense denotes lack of wind.	2006/595	
	Objection – already said no to wind farm at Hogg Wood. It is disappointing to find that this is being proposed again.	2007/598	
	Objection – with proposals for wind turbines the green belt is destined for the trash can. Wind farms are inefficient, noisy blots on a beautiful rural area. Without tax payers subsidy they are completely unviable.	2009/6486	
	Objection – why do you want to plant unproven and ugly wind farms into the rural countryside of York? Research is sceptical about their sustainability and they are inappropriate for this historic city that relies on its beauty and heritage to attract tourists.	2010/604	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2011/612	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Object to proximity to housing. What is justification when Council rejected an application on same site less than a year ago.	2012/620	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2013/636	
		2014/644	
		2015/651	
		2016/659	
		2017/667	
		2019/681	
		2020/689	
		2021/697	
		2022/704	
2023/712			
2024/720			
2025/728			
2027/742			
2028/750			
2029/757			
2030/764			
2032/777			
2033/784			
2034/792			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2035/800	
		2036/808	
		2037/816	
		2038/824	
		2039/832	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Why would anyone want to move into a new home which may have a wind turbine near the back?	2040/840	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2041/848	
		2042/856	
		2043/864	
		2044/872	
		2046/887	
		2047/895	
		2048/903	
		2049/911	
	Objection – turbines are not a reliable source of energy. The electricity they provide is very expensive and subsidies have to be provided by both tax payers and consumers to make them viable to their owners. Nuclear power is a better option as proved by studies carried out by other countries. The proposals will destroy the pleasant approaches to York and the views of the Minster for no good economic reason. Turbines will destroy bird life around the city and drive away other wildlife. There will inevitably be some noise from them and the ring of turbines around the city will create a continuous hum when the wind is blowing. Where is the landscape sensitivity assessment?	2055/6509	
		2058/942	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2059/949	
		2061/963	
		2063/977	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind turbines will not pay - mist and fog in Vale of York.	2064/985	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2065/993		
	2066/1001		
	2067/1008		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2068/1016	
		2069/1024	
		2070/1031	
		2071/1038	
		2072/1046	
		2073/1054	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2074/1062	
		2075/1070	
		2076/1078	
		2077/1086	
		2078/1093	
		2079/1101	
		2080/1108	
		2081/1116	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Purpose of the land re-designated NOT renewable energy.	2082/1124	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2083/1131	
		2084/1139	
		2085/1147	
		2086/1154	
		2087/1162	
		2090/1181	
	2091/1189		
	2092/1197		
	2093/1205		
	2094/1213		
	2095/1221		
	2097/1234		
	2098/1242		
	2099/1250		
	2100/1257		
	2102/1271		
	2103/1279		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2104/1287	
		2105/1294	
		2106/1302	
		2107/1310	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cannot see Vale of York is right place, surely higher ground would be better.	2108/1318	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farm so close to village is beyond belief.	2109/1326	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2110/1334	
		2111/1342	
		2112/1350	
		2113/1358	
		2114/1366	
		2115/1374	
		2116/1382	
		2117/1390	
		2118/1398	
		2119/1405	
	Objection - do not wish these monstrosities (wind farms) encircling the City of York and Haxby and Wigginton in particular.	2120/1412	
		2121/1420	
	Objection - Opposed to wind farms encircling the City of York and Haxby and Wigginton.	2122/1428	
		2124/6513	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2128/935	
		2129/1443	
		2130/1451	
2131/1459			
2132/1467			
2133/1475			
2134/1483			
2135/1491			
2136/1498			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2137/1506	
		2138/1514	
		2139/1522	
		2140/1530	
		2141/1538	
		2142/1554	
		2143/1561	
		2144/1569	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2145/1577	
		2146/1584	
		2147/1592	
		2148/1600	
		2149/1608	
	Objection - Manor Heath is being proposed for something other than land for Askham Bryan College. How can farming land/green belt be suddenly proposed for wind turbines and housing.	2150/11585	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2151/1622	
		2152/1630	
		2153/1637	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. House buyers will not want to own property next to a possible wind farm.	2154/1645	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2155/1652	
		2156/1660	
		2157/1668	
	2158/1676		
	2159/1683		
	2160/1691		
	2161/1699		
	2162/1707		
	2163/1715		
	2164/1723		
	2165/1730		
	2168/1751		
	2169/1759		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2170/1766	
		2171/1774	
		2172/1782	
		2173/1790	
		2174/1798	
		2176/1811	
		2178/1826	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2179/1834	
		2180/1850	
		2182/1864	
		2183/1872	
		2184/1880	
		2185/1888	
		2186/1896	
		2187/1912	
		2188/1920	
		2189/1928	
		2191/1942	
		2192/1950	
		2193/1958	
		2194/1966	
		2195/1974	
		2196/1982	
		2215/2136	
		2216/2144	
		2217/2152	
		2218/2160	
		2219/2168	
	2220/2176		
	2221/2192		
	2222/2200		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2224/2214		
	2225/2222		
	2226/2230		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2227/2238	
		2228/2245	
		2229/2253	
		2230/2261	
		2231/2269	
		2232/2277	
		2233/2285	
		2235/2300	
		2236/2308	
		2237/2315	
		2238/2323	
		2239/2331	
		2240/2338	
		2241/2346	
		2242/2354	
		2243/2362	
		2244/2369	
		2245/2377	
		2246/2385	
		2247/2393	
		2248/2400	
		2249/2408	
		2250/2416	
		2251/2424	
		Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Cost of each wind farm is a poor way of providing green energy.	2252/2432
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2253/2440		
	2254/2448		
	2255/2456		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Object to windfarm since it was rejected last year. None of the conditions have changed.	2256/2464		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2257/2472		
	2258/2479		
	2259/2487		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2260/2495	
		2261/2503	
		2262/2511	
		2264/2525	
		2265/2533	
		2266/2541	
		2267/2549	
		2268/2557	
		2269/2565	
		2270/2573	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Delivery and assembly of proposed unit will ruin environment, especially when this is an inefficient system.	2271/2581	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Against wind farms situated close to residential areas because of both the visual and noise aspects. Wind farms are less effective and more expensive to run than was previously thought. Just last year an application for wind turbines here was rejected.	2272/2589	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2273/2597	
	Objection - cannot have a wind farm so close to such a development or vice versa.	2274/3993	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2275/2611	
	2276/2618		
Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Assuming renewable energy is a wind farm, it would be far too close to the village, an eyesore and would change character of the village. Wind generation in this location is not the way forward.	2282/2636		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2283/2644		
	2284/2652		
	2285/2660		
	2286/2668		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Proposals are breaking planning regulations, as structures over 3 metres high within 100-200 metres of public footpaths. Detrimental to Green Belt of York and the ambience of the entrance to a medieval city and major tourist centre. Could cause distractions as its visually too close to A64 and trunk road. Location is major migratory route for thousands of birds. Danger to light aircraft using Rufforth airfield.	2287/2676		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2288/2684	
		2289/2692	
		2290/2699	
		2291/2707	
		2292/2715	
		2293/2723	
		2294/2731	
		2295/2739	
		2296/2747	
		2297/2755	
	Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2298/2763	
		2299/2771	
		2300/2779	
		2301/2787	
		2302/2795	
		2303/2803	
		2304/2811	
		2305/2819	
		2306/2827	
	Objection – wind turbines not the most efficient producer of electricity. Government paying subsidy to wind farm owners at a cost to taxpayer. Consumers will pay higher energy bills. Blot on the landscape and would significantly effect views across the Vale of York and towards the Minster.	2316/6523	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2318/2835	
		2319/2843	
		2320/2851	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2321/2858		
	2322/2866		
	2323/2874		
	2324/2882		
Objection– see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Who will buy a house with a wind turbine farm in the next field?	2325/2890		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2326/2898		
	2328/2912		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2329/2920	
		2330/2927	
		2331/2935	
		2332/2943	
	Support – Copmanthorpe area must be dedicated to providing wind farm resources needed to power increasingly challenged sustainable future as an immediate strategic priority.	2333/3992	
	Objection - expensive electricity generation which destroys landscape views.	2334/3284	
	Objection - wind farms in Haxby & Wigginton, together with existing pylons will blot beautiful landscape that is the Vale of York.	2342/3296	
	Objection – has it been proved hat wind farms are worth the cost in the destruction of the landscape?	2348/6530	
	Objection – wind farms – certainly not. Leave the Green Belt alone.	2359/6550	
	Objection – wind farms – certainly not. Leave the Breen Belt alone.	2360/6552	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2367/3159	
		2368/3167	
		2369/2956	
		2370/2963	
		2371/2971	
		2372/2979	
		2374/2994	
		2375/3002	
		2376/3009	
		2378/3023	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2379/3031	
		2380/3038	
		2381/3045	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. If we have to have some houses, why can they not be fitted with solar panels? Far better than wind farms.	2382/3061		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Object for same reasons original application was refused. Installation should be offshore on Dogger Bank with other wind turbines.	2383/3068		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2384/3076		
	2385/3084		
	2386/3092		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2387/3099	
		2389/3114	
		2390/3122	
		2392/3136	
		2393/3144	
		2394/3151	
		2396/3181	
2397/3189			

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms only function when the wind blows. According to reports from Askham Bryan College, which studies wind patterns in the area, say there are only two possible areas around York where the position of wind farms would produce electricity profitably.	2404/6561	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2410/3197	
	Objection – proposal to erect wind farms would destroy the beauty of the surrounding countryside.	2411/6572	
	Objection - who benefits from wind farms? To put them around York will destroy what York is.	2421/6704	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2448/3204	
		2449/3212	
		2450/3220	
		2451/3251	
		2452/3228	
	Objection – the scatter gun effect of the proliferation of sites suggested for 'renewable energy' (i.e. wind farms) suggests, at its worst, almost a complete ring around the city. Council just refused application here a year ago. A significant number of the sites are in the shadow of Rufforth airfield, one of the biggest obstacles to a wind farm.	2469/2623	
	Objection – there is talk of wind farms. Surely the Vale of York lacks the wind required except possibly for one of two sites towards Selby.	2471/6757	
	Objection – if wind farms are necessary then they should be in a remote area, miles away from anyone's homes.	2482/6766	
	Objection – any realistic wind farm development in these areas would be an unacceptable hazard to any flying operations at Rufforth. There is an obligation under schedule 2 part 6 of the General Development Procedure Order to take this into account.	2483/6767	York Gliding Centre Ltd
Objection – not happy about wind farms. This is a low lying area and there is hardly any wind to warrant such an endeavour.	2485/4550		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2488/3235		
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farm does nothing for local community. Lack of efficiency and output.	2489/3243		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2490/3258 2493/3360 2494/3368	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2495/3376 2496/3383 2497/3391 2498/3399 2499/3407 2500/3415 2501/3423	
	Objection – wind farms proposal is not sustainable as required by NPPF. Sustainable development includes protection of the environment. Turbines not sustainable without subsidy paid for by the ordinary consumer. Huge damage to landscape. Tourism would be damaged. Historic setting of York Minster would be ruined. Health and amenity of thousands of residents would be damaged. Value of many footpaths would be extinguished. Economy would be damaged.	2504/6777	
	Objection – location and effect of Dunnington wind farm on scenic character and peace of the village would be devastating. Would destroy view of Wolds from Mill Hill. Wind farms proposed for Murton and Osbaldwick would destroy views of York and the Minster.	2505/6778	
	Objection – the Plan doesn't give sufficient information to residents to make an informed response re wind farms.	2511/6786	
	Objection – site to east of Dunnington near Holtby is too close to existing properties. The large turbines would be an unacceptable intrusion in to the landscape. Will interfere with views into the Wolds and Minster. Loss of visual amenity for cyclists on Route 66. Damage openness of the Green Belt. Will detract from historic setting of York. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Threat to biodiversity.	2517/6804	
	Objection – see Response 11	2521/6808	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2524/3336	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would have detrimental impact on everyone's lives and adversely affect the conservation area.	2525/3352	
	Objection – Wind farms are not a viable proposition in the Vale of York. Cash should be directed into harnessing wave energy, after all, we are an island nation.	2533/6813	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the Plan for 40 windfarms to surround York makes no sense. York is major tourist city and tourist experience starts with first glimpse of Minster across the Vale of York - do we really want to hide it behind ugly wind turbines.	2538/6826	
	Objection – MOD at Linton on Ouse – if wind turbines in line of sight and within 35km of radar, sustained objection issued. No wind farms currently in Vale of York due to radar.	2547/6837	
	Objection – the three wind farms proposed near Dunnington beggars belief.	2552/6863	
	Objection – wind farms are a blot on the landscape and believe plans by government for new onshore wind farms are in abeyance.	2553/6871	
	Objection – just rejected wind farm at Copmanthorpe. Reasons for this were visual impact, proximity to residential properties, safety reasons, danger to birds, gliders and hot air balloons and perhaps helicopters and light aircraft. Environmental impact.	2559/6890	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2569/3313	
		2570/3321	
		2571/3328	
	Objection – damage to wildlife, noise pollution, despoliation of Green Belt, safety at Rufforth airfield.	2580/6917	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farms are inefficient, in the wrong location here at the bottom on a valley, unsightly, problem to wildlife, problematic to flight paths.	2589/3305	
	Support – need energy and wind farms provide pollution free energy.	2595/6952	
	Objection – wind farms are proved expensive and impractical, ugly and intrusive in a quiet area such as Poppleton.	2605/6959	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2609/3438	
		2610/3446	
		2612/3461	
		2613/3469	
2614/3477			
2615/3485			
2616/3493			
2617/3501			
Objection – views of Minster would be obscured by encircling wind farms	2631/6975		
Objection – wind farms are not cost effective. CYC have not fully explored adverse effects on environment and green areas.	2635/6991		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farm east of Dunnington. This is an area of productive arable farmland. Adverse effect on landscape, local setting, view and the character of the area. Also noise pollution, the size and proximity of turbines to homes and businesses are concerns. Wind levels are not excessive and land is fairly low lying.	2636/6447	
	Objection – excessive amount of wind farms too close o communities.	2638/6998	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy wildlife. Noise of turbines would be unreasonable. Would ruin outlook towards Minster & ancient City of York.	2640/6017	
	Objection – wind farms are a mad cap idea.	2668/7065	
	Objection – wind turbines would cause excessive noise nuisance due to proximity of existing housing. Wind speeds are too low for wind turbines to be viable.	2673/7079	
	Comment – nothing against the windmills but do they make any difference, do they create enough energy?	2677/7100	
	Objection – wind farms should never be allowed on land. They are inefficient relative to cost, unsightly and for people living close by they are blight on their lives and property. Even now with the thousands of wind turbines so far commissioned they struggle to provide 2% of the country’s power.	2681/7117	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Would any developer in their right mind be able to sell houses so near to a wind farm?	2689/3579	
	Objection – wind farm proposed over A16 from Holtby – this will be an eyesore.	2692/7142	
	Objection – erection of wind farms north and south of Skelton are bizarre and unnecessary.	2696/7148	
	Objection – totally against wind farms that are close to homes. Blight on the countryside. They should be built off shore or alternatively build more solar. Turbines would kill birds from Wheldrake Ings.	2701/7158	
	Objection – wind turbines are noisy, blot on landscape. Alternative energy e.g. solar. Creates problems for birds, don’t have the wind inland, should put them off shore.	2702/7159	
	Objection – against wind farms, expensive and ugly and no research that they are economically viable.	2707/7171	
	Objection – wind farms are not cost effective or efficient.	2708/7178	
Objection – more information on wind farm proposals are needed. Opinion is wind in Vale of York not strong enough for efficient wind farms to be viable. Turbines are unsightly, a blot on landscape, adversely affect beauty of area and detrimental to tourism. Construction and connection to grid involves widespread disturbance to land and human habitation and they become a permanent disturbance to livestock and wildlife and a hazard to birds. Isn’t nuclear energy more efficient, less costly to	2711/7190		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	construct and operate and more environmentally friendly?		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – benefits of wind farms are as yet unknown. These unsightly edifices would destroy beauty of city. They look monstrous and be of little or no use.	2725/7221	
	Objection – wind farms would spoil countryside and if erected near to housing could prove detrimental to health.	2729/7233	
	Comment – probably supportive of plan for wind farm near Holtby. Would like to know which field.	2732/7239	
	Support – in favour of wind turbines which can help provide energy alternative to gas.	2734/7244	
	Objection – wind farms are not the way to generate effectively and efficiently additional energy. Their appearance would devastate views of York. Would ruin tourist appeal of this cathedral city.	2739/7257	
	Objection – wind farms have been proven not to work and show no real difference in saving the environment.	2760/7295	
	Objection – wind farm to east of Dunnington will have affect on Gate Helmsley and as its in Ryedale, residents weren't consulted.	2764/7305	
	Objection – wind farms are completely inefficient and they will ruin the unique nature of York's surroundings.	2766/7312	
	Objection- entirely against wind farm proposal to west of Woodthorpe.	2773/7337	
	Objection – wind farms - there are not enough details on the numbers, sizes and associated practical and technical details.	2778/7355	
	Objection – wind farms - There is a lack of information regarding the position and closeness to the village, the number of turbines and their size and the actual noise they will create.	2779/7361	
	Objection – the wind farms, if erected will ruin the lives of those living locally.	2784/7374	
	Objection – wind turbines are useless. A feature of York has always been the historic, dramatic and welcoming view of the minster, only one wind turbine would be sufficient to destroy that view.	2788/7389	
	Objection – the wind turbines to the north and south of Skelton will make the surrounding countryside an eyesore.	2790/7402	
	Comment – there is a need to grow energy for the future.	2793/7412	
Support – in favour of the proposed wind farms in the Skelton area.	2795/7415		
Objection – wind turbines will affect York's tourist and hospitality industry which could result in job losses, not to mention the visual, noise and potential health impact on residents.	2796/7419		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment - the proposal for wind farm turbines from Askham Bryan to the Rufforth road is an excessive concentration in one small place.	2801/7433	
	Comment – not opposed in principle to but would like to know the size and nature of these turbines, the noise that they generate, whether their proximity to Rufforth and Linton on Ouse airfields will cause problems.	2802/7437	
	Objection - wind farms will destroy the unique character and setting of this beautiful city, with likely impacts upon visitor numbers etc. York is not particularly windy. Askham Bryan college could only find one viable site when it carried out its recent survey. Do not believe that these developments are technically/financially viable, not sustainable in the long term.	2806/7444	
	Objection – protest against wind farms around Dunnington. Would like to know how the figures justify wind farms generally. Wind farms impact on the environment and are clearly at odds with character of village. Also question whether CYC have conducted a proper survey.	2811/7465	
	Objection – note that wind farms are mooted. The merits and benefits of these eyesores are questionable. Should be offshore.	2814/7470	
	Objection – fine views of minster should not be obscured by encircling wind farms.	2826/7487	
	Objection – wind farms cost vast sums of resources and they wear out and need more resources. Have a huge impact on visual aspect of the countryside. Provide so little in power for all their size and acreage covered. Cannot work when it is too windy or not windy enough. Vibrations distress people. They are a distraction to drivers. Blades break off and cause a hazard. Kill birds. Temperatures are raised around the wind farms.	2828/7497	
	Objection – wind farms pose a threat to Dunnington.	2836/7512	
	Objection – the fine views of the minster would be obscured by encircling wind farms. York is unsuitable for wind farms, it is in a low lying vale with little wind.	2837/7513	
	Objection – need to know where wind farms will be sited, so their proximity to Dunnington may be judged. Need to know how many turbines and their height. Need information on their noise level, particularly at night	2842/7529	
	Comment – not against wind farms but both Parish Council and our local MP say ‘York is in a Vale’.	2846/7571	
	Comment – climate change is an important issue that should be covered in much detail.	2851/7592	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the case for wind power is far from proved, fear any such a project may be good for politics but a bad investment.	2860/3980	
	Objection – the concept of wind farms is outdated and useless.	2866/3982	
	Support – the wind farms would be ok, they have to go somewhere and we need the electricity.	2870/3983	
	Objection – wind farms are an expensive ‘green’ con. Go nuclear.	2872/3985	
	Comment – must have a public consultation regarding proposals for any wind farms in Poppleton.	2873/3986	
	Objection – oppose the proposals for wind farms on the sites shown on the plan.	2875/3987	
	Objection – no wind farms within 50 miles of York city.	2883/3988	
	Objection – no for wind farms, they are not really necessary as their contribution to the electricity supply is negligible. Land around York is not high and exposed to constant strong winds therefore not suitable.	2890/3989	
	Support – happy for wind farms to be located at Harewood Whin and on the A59 between Poppleton and Hessay.	2891/3990	
	Objection – oppose wind farms behind new farms as this is inappropriate development and too close to Poppleton village.		
	Objection – the wind farms will be a blot on the landscape and upset all the wildlife.	2897/3991	
	Objection – wind farms have no place in the vale of York due to their impact on the many local communities and on the long distance views of the city of York.	2911/4141	
	Objection – visually wind turbines will not enhance the York vista. Should be placed on higher ground away from residential areas.	2914/7626	
	Objection – do not believe wind farms should be located close to residential areas as they have adverse impact on landscape character.	2916/7645	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	2932/4003	
	Objection – significant impact on character of the landscape.	2941/7692	
	Objection – wind turbines not justifiable at this location (Dunnington) as not finically viable in a vale, construction would damage productive arable land. Solar energy should be greatly encouraged. Wind farms would be blot on landscape.	2942/3996	
	Objection – do not agree with wind farms. They do not provide enough power.	2947/7708	
	Objection – must provide details of actual sites, how many turbines proposed and what noise will be created.	2956/7715	
	Objection - these are not as beneficial as they should be.	2957/7723	
Objection – not convinced they are economically justified. Not environmentally	2958/7725		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	friendly, due to massive concrete foundations. Visual impact on open rural setting is overpowering and ugly. Should increase use of solar panels.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – oppose plans to build large wind farm to the west of Woodthorpe.	2982/7763	
	Objection – to concept of wind farms; little wind even in winter, not cost effective and blot on landscape.	2983/7764	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe analysis	2988/4526	
	Comment – very little information on wind farm on Murton Moor. Questionable whether additional turbines would be viable or blot on landscape.	2991/7776	
	Comment – no wind farm should be built within at least 1 mile of any substantial built up area.	2994/7779	
	Comment – wind farms close to housing should not be considered, but placed well away from developments and on higher ground.	2995/7789	
	Objection – site is too close to Dunninton, Holtby, Gate Helmsley and the Scoreby Estate – risk of noise pollution, unacceptable intrusion into the landscape, would interfere with views of Yorkshire Wolds, loss of visual amenity for touring cyclists, will damage openness of the Green Belt, will detract from the historic setting of York, threat to biodiversity of the Vale of York.	3027/7872	
	Objection – will destroy much of the local environment around York. Not windy around Skelton. Does not fulfil basic requirement for power generation – cannot be relied on.	3034/7883	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3035/4010	
	Objection – no work done regarding the practicality of these sites in regard to grid connection, whether they could interfere with low flying aircraft, radar, telecommunication transmitters, bird migration routes, noise footprints, potential impact of 'flicker' effect, will alter open character of the area.	3056/7915	
	Support – yes to wind farms.	3068/7941	
	Objection – York is generally sheltered from regular/strong winds and is unsuitable for major wind turbine investment. Site proposed near Skelton/Shipton is intrusive by virtue of its visual and noise impact	3071/9752	
	Objection – wind farms blot the landscape and are an ineffective method of energy production.	3101/7997	
	Objection – wind farms are not the future of energy and is a box ticking exercise.	3104/8002	
Objection – the Vale of York is not windy and doubt that turbines will rotate enough to be viable.	3105/8004		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind turbines will wreck the landscape and tourism will be killed off.	3109/8013	
	Objection – wind turbines north and south of Skelton. Ghastly sight.	3112/17757	
	Objection – wind farms are monstrosities.	3115/8025	
	Objection – although support increase in use of renewable energy generation, remain to be convinced that wind farms are appropriate in UK and are especially inappropriate in York. Not convinced that their efficiency, effectiveness and reliability outweigh adverse impact on local setting.	3116/8029	
	Objection – area north of A64 already suffers noise pollution from A64 and this would be exacerbated by wind turbines. Character of Heslington should be preserved and so immediate surrounding area should be left to natural countryside.	3121/8038	
	Objection – wind turbines are very close to sharp practice to smuggle outline plans for major industrial construction into a local plan.	3134/8072	
	Objection – proposals for wind turbines are unsupportable. The noise, health and visual impact of wind turbines are indisputable. Impact on Green Belt is permanent and damaging.	3139/8084	
	Objection – wind turbines are environmental vandalism – on prime arable land. Removal of ancient hedgerows and mature oak trees cause environmental damage. They would blight the city and damage tourism. Causes noise pollution and impact on peoples’ health. Damage to scenic footpaths and cycle routes.	3143/8092	
	Objection – wind farms have huge visual impact and alter landscape of historic city. Plan does not address sustainable ways of dealing with municipal and industrial waste or means of converting it to heat energy and power in a district heating station. No mention of biomass power plans or geothermal technology – these have lower visual impact and higher load factor than wind power. Four of designated wind farm sites are close to active airfield.	3151/8114	
	Objection – proposed locations for wind farms adjacent to Askham Richard, Rufforth, Acomb, Knapton and Woodthorpe are inappropriate. Vale of York is not an area of high mean annual wind speed. Areas are close to airfield. Turbines would affect skyline of York. Grid capacity in the area will need to be reinforced.	3151/8123	
	Objection – wind farms east of Dunnintgton in t eh Scoreby plains are in green belt area and would dominate landscape for miles around. Noise of turbines would disturb area and reflection of sunlight from the rotating blades will also have an impact.	3156/8128	
Objection – wind turbines near Skeltonwould dominate landscape, and produce energy only in a light breeze. Benefits only come to landowner, energy production is erratic, they are transient, needs conventional fuel on standby.	3157/8132		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms east of Dunnington in the Scoreby plains are in green belt area and would dominate landscape for miles around. Noise of turbines would disturb area and reflection of sunlight from the rotating blades will also have an impact.	3159/8134	
	Objection – siting of wind turbines close to Skelton will be unsightly but are also uneconomical. York is not windy.	3162/8139	
	Objection – proposal for wind turbines are insupportable. The noise, health and visual impacts are indisputable. Impact on Green Belt is permanent and damaging.	3168/8150	
	Objection – wind turbines would have significant adverse impact on character of Dunnington’s landscape.	3169/8156	
	Objection – no wind speed in York. Surely insufficient to make this a viable proposition.	3194/8221	
	Objection – wind farms NE Dunnington and E Scoreby Wood. How is surrounding York by wind farms considered to be protecting current and future residents from environmental impacts? Current picturesque approach would be ruined and would detract from visual impact and enjoyment. Wind turbines dominate natural landscape. Potential health issues with residents living near wind farms. Hagg Wood is a SINC. Wind farm detrimental to birds. Route 66 important cycle route – wind farms would have negative impact. Derwent SSSI would be impacted on by wind farms.	3218/8282	
	Objection – wind farms are inefficient, uneconomic, and have adverse environmental impacts. Significant carbon emissions in the manufacture of wind turbines. Noise pollution. Conventional generators will be required to back up wind turbines when wind speed drops. Should consider solar PV farms as alternative.	3219/8283	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe. Same location as rejected Banks application. Wind turbines inefficient, expensive electricity, create health issues. Should consider alternatives such as pv and growing crops for biomass.	3222/8292	
	Support – yes to energy efficiency in homes and to all forms of renewable energy, including wind farms and solar panels in the green belt. Must learn to admire or at least accept wind pumps, as we do electricity pylons.	3242/8300	
	Objection – wind turbines obscure historic urban townscape. Logical that wind is strongest at high point and not in Vale of York. Electricity derived from wind turbines is expensive, unreliable and wildlife suffers.	3245/8324	
	Objection – what will the density of the wind turbines be? The locations seem to be picked at random. Views of York will be obscured forever.	3246/8330	
	Objection – not enough information. Will obstruct views of the Minster.	3247/8343	
Support – wind farms are the way forward. Hopefully to keep cost of electricity down	3252/8348		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and guarantee power for future generations.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – not against wind farms on aesthetic grounds but they might compromise your aim that the York skyline is not compromised.	3256/8365	
	Objection – the height of turbines would need to be excessive in order to be viable and therefore unsuitable in residential areas. Would be too close to homes for the noise generated.	3262/8376	
	Objection – wind turbines would have detrimental visual impact on York’s views.	3265/8383	
	Comment – not adequate reasoning as to why the wind turbines are thought to be necessary in such numbers.	3269/8396	
	Objection – strongly opposed to the wind farm development.	3271/4258	
	Objection – not convinced wind farms are answer to our energy problems. Not healthy or visually appropriate to build them near villages.	3278/8426	
	Objection – wind farm directly in surrounding landscape of Gate Helmsley. Understand need that alternative sources of power need to be developed but do not believe there is sufficient reason to throw up a few dozen wind turbines wherever an open piece of land presents itself with no consideration for local population.	3279/8427	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3282/4018 3283/4026	
	Objection – wind farms should not be built on the green belt.	3287/4282	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3288/4042	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farms not viable.	3289/4050	
	Comment – has viability and benefits of this proposal been fully investigated and proven both in financial and environmental terms to be of benefit and taking into account the effect on the local landscape.	3290/8440	
	Comment – has viability and benefits of this proposal been fully investigated and proven both in financial and environmental terms to be of benefit and taking into account the effect on the local landscape.	3291/8448	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3292/4034	
	Comment – there is insufficient information in the Plan on the numbers of turbines, or size, level of noise, practicalities, impact and risk assessment (for birds, transmitters, radar etc) to allow residents to make a useful comment. Whilst not against wind farms in principle, there is much debate as to whether they are most effective, environmentally friendly, means of alternative sustainable energy.	3293/8456	
Comment – there is no indication on the map of the 40 wind farms that the Council	3295/8459		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	are proposing should be built in the area.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – against wind farm sites in an area which is completely unsuitable, namely the Vale of York. These should be sited on higher ground.	3299/8469	
	Objection – proposal to build wind farm north of Skelton. Almost three times height of Minster thus spoiling the skyline in an area that is not very windy. Impact of noise will also be detrimental.	3302/8473	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3318/4058	
		3327/4065	
		3330/4073	
	Objection – already registered objection to wind farm in Copmanthorpe when application was rejected.	3331/8517	
	Objection – believe people living nearby are badly affected by the noise and they alter the landscape where they are situated.	3353/8553	
	Comment – the bar over which developers of wind farms have to jump should be very high indeed in the case of York. This is to preserve the quality of the approaches to the historic city of York.	3356/8592	
	Objection – the three large wind farms (south and east of Heslington) carve up even more Green Belt and ruin lovely rural areas.	3360/8618	
	Objection – proposed wind farms will detract greatly from the overall character of the city and its environs.	3364/8629	
	Objection – consider turbines to be inefficient, expensive/costly to build/erect, intrusive and a blot on the landscape.	3365/8633	
	Objection – inclusion of wind farms is a concern as the sites are based on a study undertaken in 2010, in addition exact locations are vague. There is mounting controversy over wind power as a viable source of energy. Has any work been done on the practicality of the sites e.g. grid connection, noise, impact of low flying aircraft, transmitters, bird migration routes. Turbines would have massive impact on adjacent communities and the setting of the historic city.	3368/8639	
	Objection – 40 wind turbines when even the Government are not fully behind this form of alternative source of energy.	3370/8650	
Objection – do not believe that York is a suitable place for wind farms at all. Any new housing should have solar panels as standard.	3372/8655		
Objection – these seem to be all over the place. They cause annoyance to most people within hearing distance and are a danger to birds. Solar panels are more	3374/8664		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	efficient now.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – what other options are being looked at?	3377/8670	
	Objection – totally opposed to wind farms both from visual and cost implications.	3383/6059	
	Objection – these wind turbines are totally unsuitable for a residential environment on the grounds of noise and safety.	3384/8691	
	Objection – wind farms adjacent to Dunnington. No work has been done regarding the practicality of these sites in regard to grid connection, whether they could interfere with low flying aircraft, radar, telecommunications transmitters, bird migration routes, whether they have appropriate noise footprints given their locations. Also concerned about 'flicker' effect. They would alter the open character of the area with views to the Wolds.	3402/8709	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3412/4081	
		3413/4089	
		3414/4096	
		3415/4104	
		3416/4112	
	Objection – wind farms surrounding York and fear that once their useful life has expired, they will remain as monuments to the monumental folly of building them in the first place.	3427/8750	
	Objection – proposed wind farm has little merit on aesthetic, noise and health grounds and is unlikely to be effective or efficient because of York's climatic conditions and relative lack of wind.	3428/8772	
	Objection - the proposed sites will have an impact not only on Dunnington but also on residents on Ryedale and East Yorkshire.	3434/8769	
	Objection – very much against the proposed development of any wind farms in the vale of York.	3441/8808	
	Objection - lack of information. Strongly object to any approval for wind farm site without proper information being available, allowing informed decisions to be made.	3446/8829	
	Objection – wind farms are of dubious benefit as energy creators, particularly in a low lying area such as Skelton. Proximity of RAF training area at Linton on Ouse.	3450/8839	
Objection – nuclear power rather than wind turbines.	3463/8889		
Objection – proposed sites will impact not only on Dunnington but also on residents in Ryedale and East Yorkshire.	3464/8899		
Objection – strongly oppose any plans to create new wind farms. It adds to the cost	3468/8934		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of energy and it disfigures the countryside.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – waiting to hear more about wind turbines.	3471/8911	
	Objection – opposed to siting of wind turbines adjacent to Poppleton village.	3474/8960	
	Objection – surely wind farms belong on the top of hills.	3476/8914	
	Objection – against any proposals for wind farms in the immediate area to Poppleton.	3481/8986	
	Objection – wind farms are the fad of the moment. Power stations sill have to be built and don't support you can switch these on and off. As ever things seem more like job creation schemes. Consider there to be more worth while solutions which don't involve wrecking the landscape.	3483/9005	
	Objection – absolutely against any wind farms planned to go relatively close to our lovely villages. This intrusion into our peace and privacy is quite unnecessary.	3486/9035	
	Objection – wind farms have not been proven to supply enough energy to even begin to scratch the surface in terms of shortfall of future needs.	3488/9054	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3498/8846	
		3499/8854	
		3500/8862	
	Objection – no wind farms please in Poppleton area. They just ruin the landscape, including the approaches to our delightful city.	3502/9118	
	Objection – proposed site for wind farm was rejected less than a year ago. Situation has not changed.	3511/9440	
	Objection- whilst support renewable energy, do not believe that wind farms actually deliver. Apart from obvious detrimental impact on environment, there is a fatal flaw in their design.	3522/9460	
	Objection – wind farm near Holtby. Object due to its proximity to village with noise and pollution. What about buffer zones? Wind farms are not cost effective.	3524/9466	
	Objection – wind farm to south of Wheldrake would have detrimental impact on visual aspect for many miles and a threat to birds at Wheldrake Ings	3535/9486	
	Objection- accept that alternative energy sources should be investigated, absence of detail makes it difficult to comment. Need to know where they will be sited, how many turbines, their height, noise level.	3537/9489	
Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3552/6032		
Objection – yet to see concrete evidence of wind farms efficiency to say nothing of their impingement of the countryside	3554/9179		
Objection – disagree with the concept of wind farms generally, certainly object	3556/9196		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	strongly to wind farms on the sites identified in the plan.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – object to wind farms and was unaware of them as no mention on plans seen at Poppleton.	3558/9211	
	Objection – site is too close to existing properties in Dunnington, Holtby, Gate Helmsley and Scoreby Estate. Risk of noise pollution and visual intrusion. 500m buffer not enough, should be 1000m. Would be unacceptable intrusion into the landscape and would interfere with views of Wolds and York Minster and would detract from York’s historic setting. In Green Belt and would damage openness and there are no very special circumstances. Threat to bird life.	3582/9539	
	Comment – appreciates the comments about windmills.	3585/9550	
	Objection – wind farms are expensive and useless as gas fired power stations are needed as back up.	3588/9555	
	Objection – no wind farms should be built within a 3 mile radius of Dunnington. They are unsightly and would dominate the visual amenity of a small village.	3589/9562	
	Objection – totally against the two large areas outlined for windmill farms near Strensall.	3604/9590	
	Objection – there is no data to prove that the site near Dunnington is a good site.	3610/9607	
	Objection – this is a ridiculous proposal. Vale of York not windy. Precious distant views of the Minster would be lost.	3619/9628	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe – only a year since proposal was rejected. Too close to potential housing. Flat land of York totally unsuitable. It will be major eyesore. Will spoil views of Minster.	3621/9638	
	Comment – why so many wind farms? Heard there’s only a couple of suitable sites in York.	3625/9643	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3626/9318	
	Objection – on short wind farms should be resisted at all costs. They are not only unsightly but their contribution to the supply industry is pitifully small for their costs and upkeep.	3630/9343	
	Objection – no hard evidence that wind farms are efficient. They ruin the landscape and disturb wildlife.	3634/9364	
	Comment – do not have enough facts and figures to decide whether or not there would be financial benefit. Undoubtedly, the presence of tall generator masts would be a hideous addition to the local countryside.	3636/9654	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – would pose a threat to Dunnington.	3679/9701	
	Objection – building of wind farms near Dunnington – insufficient research has been done to establish; viability of wind power, amount of wind around Dunnington, siting of the windmills.	3681/9708	
	Objection – why wind farms in vale of York? They would look horrendous and be ineffectual.	3683/9713	
	Objection – more research is required as to most efficient way of producing energy. Wind farms are questionable. They are a blight on countryside.	3689/9723	
	Objection – large wind farm planned to west of Woodthorpe.	3714/10002	
	Objection – York is a vale –no constant wind. Siting wind farms here would be unbelievable.	3719/10009	
	Objection – the impact of wind farms on York’s skyline and views on Minster will be damaged. Too close to housing and will destroy habitats and green belt land.	3720/10016	
	Object – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3726/6002	
	Objection – proposal for wind farms in Copmanthorpe rejected last year. Why is it featured on proposal?	3727/10031	
	Objection – wind farms are an unsightly blot on the landscape and the benefits have not been proved.	3729/10044	
	Objection – strongly object to any wind farm development in or around York. It will do nothing for the environment, it is a costly experiment and will destroy the countryside and views of York.	3730/10056	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3734/6010	
	Objection – strongly object to the siting of wind farms on the proposed areas which would blight the landscape.	3735/10076	
	Objection – see response 11.	3737/10084	
	Objection – no to wind farms full stop.	3738/10092	
	Support – no objection to wind farms, consider them to be a good thing.	3741/10107	
	Objection – consider that wind farms should be sited off shore.	3742/10117	
	Objection – the wind farms would be a distraction to traffic and hazardous to gliders at the airfield near Poppleton.	3745/5804	
Objection – not enough information to assess impact of wind turbines on Dunnington. Need to know exact location, number of turbines, height of turbine and noise they generate. Overall, structures are unsightly and obtrusive and likely to impinge adversely upon visual amenity. Turbines are inefficient as they only produce small	3756/10156		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	amount of energy and are noisy.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – do not believe wind farms should be located near to residential areas as they have significant adverse impact on landscape character. If they must, should be located out at sea or in open areas of Moors/Dales.	3765/10175	
	Objection – proposed wind farms are grossly unattractive and inefficient. Some of the proposals are too close to houses. Visual impacts would be devastating.	3768/10180	
	Objection – very large wind farm proposed to west of Woodthorpe.	3785/10205	
	Objection – the flat land near Poppleton is not an efficient site for any wind farms.	3797/10229	
	Objection – information available is insufficient. Should be informed of exact location, number of turbines, height of turbines and information regarding noise generated. Structures are unsightly and obtrusive and impinge adversely on visual amenity.	3798/10233	
	Comment – map shows many areas of potential development of wind farms. How effective would they be in this area and what sort of detractor from the aesthetics of our beautiful city would result?	3799/10246	
	Comment – wind farms are best way to create electricity and would like to see many more but it could be that this area is too low to get sufficient power to make them viable.	3818/10275	
	Objection – rejected plans for wind mast last year. Situation hasn't changed.	3820/10282	
	Comment – these are proposed in beautiful countryside and in a valley. More thought and research to the effectiveness of wind power is needed before blighting the fields and countryside.	3823/10296	
	Objection – siting of wind farms near to Dunnington or anywhere in York. Not enough information regarding siting, size, number etc. Nuclear power is the only efficient way forward. Wind farms should be in the sea or in areas already ruined by power stations.	3829/6474	
	Objection – inclusion of 40+ wind turbines in the Plan contradicts national policy as it impacts on views important to their setting i.e. York Minster. Wind turbines are unsuitable as York is flat. Appears to be no input from aviation authorities, private airfield users and RAF regarding the siting. Throughout the word, laws being made to ensure a 2km unpopulated area around wind turbines. Leaflet omitted the industrial wind turbine sites.	3836/10309	
	Objection – wind turbines are uneconomic and research indicates only one possible site in York (Copmanthorpe). Vale of York is aptly named. York is one of the few Councils to envisage such wind farms.	3839/10317	
	Comment – how effective would wind turbines be in this are and what sort of	3842/10328	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	detraction from the aesthetics of our beautiful city would result> They would probably be a blot on the landscape.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – believe these are by no means fully authenticated scientifically and they are certainly hugely expensive and ugly. They are neither practical nor energy efficient development.	3853/10351	
	Comment – wind farms are not a very good way of getting electricity. What if the wind drops? Why build houses and then put noisy wind farms next to them?	3856/10360	
	Objection – 40 proposed wind farms- what a scandalous waste of money. Should pass a law that all now houses must have solar panels, it would not be a blight on the landscape.	3857/10363	
	Objection – who thought that wind farms would be suitable close to houses?	3858/10370	
	Comment – not enough information regarding noise, size etc. Against any wind farms without this information although would be open to the idea if the Council had any actual details.	3866/10387	
	Objection – no to any wind farm sites. Over 40 will ruin the whole of the Yorkshire countryside.	3875/10408	
	Objection – wind turbines should not even be considered near Rufforth and its active airfield. They would be dangerous as well as an eyesore.	3879/10417	
	Objection – those areas of search shown around the active airfield should be examined in more detail and removed from the plan where they have an impact on the airfield safeguarding plan and a detrimental impact on the open nature of the countryside.	3880/10421	
	Objection – see response 11.	3884/10428	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Wind farm sites not shown on Local Plan Leaflet.	3888/4562	
		3889/4570	
	Objection- wind farms are obnoxious, noisy and will not have enough output to help the National Grid. They are useless.	3894/10439	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	3903/4589	
	Objection – the low lying location of York is not conducive to getting the best potential for wind farms. Installation of solar panels on new builds would be a more effective source of power.	3907/10446	
Objection – wind turbines seem unsuitable for the area south of Heslington as there are migrating birds that could be at risk from wind farm collisions.	3908/10450		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms industrialise the countryside. Efficiency declines after 8 years and they need replacing after 12-15 years. No need for wind farms around York blighting the landscape and reducing value of houses.	3918/10458	
	Objection – wind farms are totally out of character with the area. Blot on landscape with questionable worth. Noisy.	3932/10474	
	Objection – questionable whether energy in vs energy out ratio is high enough to warrant massive expenditure and subsidy on wind turbines around York which would have adverse impact on landscape character. Renewable energy sites should only be considered in suitable locations after extensive consultation with local residents.	3934/10482	
	Comment – not opposed to wind farms in suitable locations, it is questionable whether the input/output ratio is high enough around York to make this an economic success. Information at present is inadequate re location, numbers and size.	3941/10492	
	Objection – no to wind farms.	3942/4631	
	Objection – on 3 grounds; efficiency, visual intrusion and effects on migrating birds. Don't have steady strong winds needed. Constant humming noise and flicker.	3944/10497	
	Objection – wind farms are inefficient and expensive energy option. They are noisy, obtrusive and ugly. They only work when there's the right type of wind.	3949/10509	
	Comment – lack of information – the map doesn't show the number of wind turbines. Assume there will be further consultation.	3952/10519	
	Objection – siting of turbines will substantially impact on and be detrimental to visual landscape and unique historical character of York. Tourists could be put off. Lack of details re numbers, size etc.	3955/4653	
	Objection – proposal to build 40 wind farms in Green Belt, three of which are around Haxby/Wigginton. The area will be destroyed.	3956/10533	
	Objection – not in favour of wind farms anywhere. They are inefficient, expensive, and ugly and provide questionable benefits.	3958/10540	
	Objection – the visual, noise and health impact of the proposed wind farms situated north and south of Skelton.	3969/10562	
	Objection – no to wind farms – they are proved to be inefficient and reported incidents show that they can be unsafe.	3970/10567	
	Objection – proposed sites to NE, SE, W and SW of Rufforth airfield are inappropriate and dangerous due to proximity to airfield. One site in directly on the approach/departure path.	3975/4666	York Microlight Centre
Objection – sites around Rufforth. There is a very active airfield. Would also be blemish on landscape.	3980/10584		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – large scale introduction of wind farms a farce. Individual units in remote locations can be invaluable as a supplement power supply. No justification locating them in countryside when still need traditional power stations.	3999/10612	
	Objection – wind farms will blight the landscape and be of no practical benefit to local residents	4003/10622	
	Objections – wind farms will blight the landscape and be of no practical benefit to local residents	4012/10638	
	Comment – will people buy houses close to wind farms? York is the only Council to indicate where wind farms are planned. York is a Vale and low lying – not ideal place for a wind farm near Copmanthorpe.	4040/10685	
	Objection – if wind farms are built near York, it will never be a beautiful city again.	4043/10694	
	Objection – will proposed renewable energy sites generate enough electricity? Solar panels on the new stadium roof would be more efficient.	4044/10698	
	Comment – should be a feasibility study re Wind farms e.g. Lovely views of Minster, amount of low flying aircraft, hot air balloons, gliders and microlights.	4045/10706	
	Comment – AEA report out of date. No indication that identified areas will provide suitable sites. Will not provide environmental benefit. Region does not suit turbines. Not cost effective and cannot be used in high winds.	4049/10718	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – seem to have randomly chosen various sites around York. Do we really need any wind farms at all? Have the established wind farm sites been worth their costs? Need to know more about what is proposed and where exactly they will be sited before any decision can be made. Comment - the only site that may be feasible in this area could be at Harewood Whin but more needs to be known about this before any decision is made.	4055/4684	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4057/4692	
	Objection – concerned about noise levels and aesthetic damage that wind farms around Skelton would have.	4065/10743	
	Objection – proposed wind farms sites to north and south of Skelton – excess noise plus disfigurement of area for dubious benefits.	4068/10752	
	Objection – very large wind farm site to north and south of Skelton.	4074/10760	
	Objection – would not like to see a wind farm in Poppleton which will spoil the beautiful village.	4082/4753	
	Objection – area outlined for Wheldrake is too close to village. Doubt a suitable return would be made in low lying land. Turbines should be situated on hills. Concern that delivery of power to national grid would cause eyesore of cables and pylons in what is currently agricultural landscape.	4083/10770	
	Objection – the potential wind farms at Harewood Whin would be detrimental to the area for many reasons, including causing problems for RAF Linton on Ouse.	4084/4763	
	Comment – area proposed is huge. Will take over landscape and are very expensive to erect, kill local birds, local wildlife and countryside affected. Would prefer grants so local people can install solar or other alternative energy solutions therefore helping the environment without using more countryside.	4086/10775	
	Objection – do not believe that wind farms should be located near residential areas as they have significant adverse impact on landscape character. If they must, they should be located out at sea or in open areas of the Moors/Dales.	4092/10781	
	Objection – proposed wind farms sites to north and south of Skelton – excess noise plus disfigurement of area for dubious benefits.	4095/10785	
	Objection – inefficient – only generating a minute amount of electricity when weather conditions are favourable. Disfiguring countryside and killing wildlife and birds within vicinity of blades.	4096/10791	
Objection – previous proposal only rejected a year ago. Concerns have not dissipated.	4099/10799		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – proposals for the potential sites at Harewood Whin and to the south of the A59 must be much more widely publicised before decisions can be made.	4103/4803	
	Objection – need more information for residents who may be affected. Where will the turbines be sited, how many, what size, what actual noise will they create? Is the energy input vs energy output high enough? Impact on landscape character.	4108/4809	
	Objection – wind turbines extremely expensive, very inefficient and do not provide a predictable source of energy. They would also be a blot on York’s landscape. York is a Vale with little wind.	4110/10813	
	Objection – appalled by the proposed wind farm policy. The impact on the York skyline will be horrific. Views from the Minster and other parts of the historic city will be spoilt by such enormous monstrosities. Not good for the thousands of visitors and local residents. Think again.	4111/4823	
	Objection – three large wind farms around York. Not enough meaningful consultation.	4112/10816	
	Objection – area south of Wheldrake not suitable for wind turbines. Incompatible with landscape character appraisal management guidelines, the SSSI designation, historic character and setting paper and Derwent corridor as a whole.	4117/10820	
	Objection – over 40 proposed wind farm sites of various sizes across the constituency.	4128/10834	
	Objection – people of Haxby do not want wind farms in this area. Would damage ancient city being surrounded by wind farms.	4129/10837	
	Objection – wind farms are waste of public money, of no advantage to needs of country.	4151/10866	
	Objection – wind farms – too large, too many.	4155/10869	
	Objection – three potential wind farms to north, east and west of community (Haxby)	4158/10877	
	Objection – three potential wind farms to north, east and west of community (Haxby)	4159/10883	
	Objection – not in Huntington. Further out of the suburbs and somewhere higher with better winds.	4169/10899	
	Objection – the encirclement of wind turbines around York will degrade the views and give an impression of York that is entirely inappropriate.	4197/4901	
	Objection – do not support any wind farms in the vicinity of Poppleton as they are unsightly.	4198/10929	
Objection – suggested ‘identified potential’ for large scale 2.5MW turbines both north and south of Skelton is highly dubious. Wind turbines need wind. Vale of York is flat and is therefore a most unsuitable location. Disastrous visual impact on the skyline. Why were people not informed of this when the 2010 renewable energy study was published?	4204/7795		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farm site to east of Dunnington would be in sight of Gate Helmsley. Will aggravate problem of congestion on A1079/A166. Proposed site is in low lying vale of York with suggestion that a more elevated site would generate more wind power. To site huge wind turbines in such close proximity to historic city of York is a travesty. Should liaise with MOD regarding low flying fighter jets and helicopters. Yorkshire has its fair share of wind turbines and with the whole energy debate open to further scrutiny due to disappointing return from existing wind turbines in relation to their numbers and the potential development of racking which would make wind power redundant.	4207/10948	
	Objection – no work been done regarding practicality of sites in regard to grid connection, whether they would interfere with low flying aircraft, radar or telecommunication transmitters and bird migration routes or whether they would have appropriate noise footprints given their locations. Almost complete absence of details and technical complexities involved makes it impossible to offer more than a general objection. They are unsightly and could dominate surroundings and have significant adverse effect on the visual setting of Dunnington and views across the Wolds or towards the Minster. Continue source of noise. Need more information re where they will be sited and how close to the village, their size, noise etc.	4214/10960	
	Objection – no work been done regarding practicality of sites in regard to grid connection, whether they would interfere with low flying aircraft, radar or telecommunication transmitters and bird migration routes or whether they would have appropriate noise footprints given their locations. Almost complete absence of details and technical complexities involved makes it impossible to offer more than a general objection. They are unsightly and could dominate surroundings and have significant adverse effect on the visual setting of Dunnington and views across the Wolds or towards the Minster. Continue source of noise. Need more information re where they will be sited and how close to the village, their size, noise etc.	4215/10963	
	Objection – further wind turbines absorb wind energy leading to less energy available in the atmosphere to dilute noxious air and replace with oxygenated air. They require massive concrete bases eating up and polluting green land. Tourism would suffer too.	4217/10968	
	Objection – introduction of wind farms would be catastrophic intrusion on the views from Heslington and would run counter to the objectives of the Village Design Statement. Solar farms with many hectares of good and productive agricultural land covered in plastic cannot be a sustainable solution to any problem and would disenfranchise the current tenant occupiers.	4222/10977	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farm near Gate Helmsley. Wind turbines at this site would go against the Council’s proposal to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets and Green Belt objectives. Proposed site south of A166 contributes to the first wide open vista of the Wolds as one leave the city.	4223/10978	
	Objection – large wind farm north of Skelton. The wind turbines could be almost three times the height of the Minster thus spoiling the skyline in an area that is not very windy. The impact of noise would be detrimental.	4225/10980	
	Objection – proposed wind farms across York is inappropriate. Haxby and Wigginton should be protected from development by the rural green belt land.	4230/10988	
	Objection – wind farms/solar panels are a total waste of space and money as experiences in other areas have proved.	4231/10991	
	Objection – over 40 proposed wind farms sites of various sizes around the city. Sheer madness. They are not sustainable and are expensive monstrosities that are not wanted in any shape or form.	4253/11069	
	Comment – proposals for wind farms in locality of Dunnington is too vague to give any reasonable comment. More detailed plans must be available. No developments should be undertaken so close to the village that they dominate village landscape destroy view over Wolds or views of Monster. Will have to demonstrate that there is no noise or other pollution caused by the turbines.	4257/11045	
	Objection – unhappy at prospect of two wind farms in close proximity to Dunnington. Create an unsightly impression and spoil the landscape. They are also rather noisy and obtrusive.	4263/11054	
	Objection – proposed wind farm is impractical. To be effective they need to be built at certain height which will spoil the views. To be effective they need to run at 100% for approx 8 years to pay for itself, however they never run at 100%.	4268/11072	
	Objection – proposed wind farms in vicinity of Dunnington. They are noisy and unsightly. Green footprint is questionable as it takes a lot of energy to make and fix turbines to the ground. Beautiful skyline will be compromised. There are currently other alternative energies being debated – should wait and see.	4270/11080	
Objection – wind farms been proven to be a non viable way of producing power and impact on environment in unacceptable. York does not have the desirable weather conditions for such an out of date technology.	4297/11146		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – all wind turbines; are inefficient and require back up power stations; require huge public subsidy; enormous cost both of money and earth’s resources; height of Minster is 60m, turbines are much taller and will dominate skyline of an historic city attractive to tourists. They will be on agricultural land required for food production now and in the future; disruption whilst under construction would be huge; other alternative energy sources (e.g. solar) are preferable and more environmentally friendly. In Rufforth, too close to houses and will be noisy. Will dominate outlook. Dangerously close to Rufforth airfield. Rufforth already does its bit by hosting Harewood Whin landfill.	4299/11150	
	Objection – have no wish to see the outskirts of the city blighted by these monstrosities. Some of the proposed sites look dangerously close to houses and are even in areas where new houses are planned.	4300/11154	
	Objection – to encircle the city with such monstrosities will destroy the city’s rural setting. This has be coordinated with planning for additional housing.	4301/11158	
	Comment – encourage development of wind farms. However, would suggest that, to mitigate against some of the complaints that will arise, turbines are placed no nearer than 1000m from a group of dwellings of 10 or more and no nearer that 500-600m from a single dwelling unless agreed with the owner.	4305/11179	
	Comment – misled the public by not including the wind farms on the household leaflet.	4307/11183	
	Objection – land based wind generation is not recognised as a reliable or efficient way of producing electricity in flat, low lying region such as the vale of York. CYC proposal is based on a report which is three years old and technology has moved on since then. These are monstrous structures to put in place if they are going to only have a limited short life and will have a negative impact on the landscape long after their useful life is over. Will have a disastrous impact on York’s skyline and destroy the views of the Monster which are visible from miles away.	4327/11229	Badger Hill Residents Community Group
	Objection – wind farms will be an oppressive blot on the landscape in a totally inappropriate site and place.	4328/11231	
	Comment – water is a much more effective power source. How about giving some attention to the potential of rivers which run through the city?	4329/11237	
	Objection – wind farms have not been proven to be cost effective. They are ugly, noisy and they blot the countryside. Wouldn’t it be better to use wave power? It is there all the time and it would help to stop the erosion of our beautiful green country.	4332/11247	
	Objection – wind farms have not been proven to be cost effective. They are ugly, noisy and they blot the countryside. Wouldn’t it be better to use wave power? It is there all	4333/11249	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the time and it would help to stop the erosion of our beautiful green country.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – a feature of York has always been the historic dramatic and welcoming sight of the Minster when the city is approached from any direction. Only one turbine is enough to destroy the view.	4345/11264	
	Objection – wind farms have a detrimental impact on the countryside both visually and audibly. York does not have the supply of wind to justify these monstrosities in the area.	4351/11273	
	Comment – insufficient information in the Plan on the size/number of turbines and the noise levels they will generate. The proposals should be withdrawn until more information is available.	4352/11279	
	Comment – insufficient information in the Plan on the size/number of turbines and the noise levels they will generate. The proposals should be withdrawn until more information is available.	4353/11284	
	Comment – value of wind farms is questionable, besides the energy spent in construction and the damage to wildlife. Have the ground source methods for energy been considered?	4359/11300	
	Objection – wind turbines that are constructed near people’s homes blight their lives and make the area surrounding them a much less pleasant place to live and visit. The need for renewable energy should not override environmental protection and the planning concerns of local people. Will affect lives through the noise they generate. Question the cost-effectiveness and value of such in-shore schemes. Object to potential loss of farmland. There are alternatives to wind power that have not been adequately explored because wind farms are seen as a quick and easy fix to tick the government’s green energy box. The proposed turbines are between 40-100m high. The Minster is 70m high. The plans would eliminate the Minster tower as a key defining feature of York. This would damage the unique attractiveness of York as a tourist destination. Greater consideration should be given to alternative forms of carbon reduction.	4366/11314	
	Objection – surprised and disappointed that the Council intends to allow any wind farms let alone such a huge number in so small an area. Such structures are ugly intrusions into the environment.	4367/11317	
	Objection – strongly object to proposal to site wind farms around the city on what is largely flat open land. Not in favour of solar farms either. More thought needs to be given to the siting of wind farms with due consideration being given to nearby	4370/11322	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	communities, the visual and auditory impact as well as the impact on bird migration.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – as the wind farm a mile away from Copmanthorpe failed to get planning permission, the other sites would seem to be even less ideal.	4379/11339	
	Objection – Wind turbines situated close to picturesque Skelton as they should be sited well away from residential areas. Perhaps should offer residents opportunity to install free solar panels and share benefits of generated electricity.	4381/11345	
	Comment – do not object to the wording or the requirements of criterion but feels North Selby Mine been overlooked as being suitable for inclusion as a potential area of search for renewable electricity generation despite the Site being referred to as being well suited to the development of green technologies and generation of renewable technologies. Objection – iii) Consider wording of criterion to be inconsistent with national policy and too restrictive.	4382/11351	Peel Environmental & North Selby Mine Waste Ltd
	Objection – proposals shouldn't go ahead as they are inefficient and poor value for money. Excessive development of such sites will require the use of high carbon fossil fuel for back up power generation. Risk of property damage and injury/death. On going investigations of the effect of ultrasound wave effects and noise pollution and their effects on human and animal life. Threat to bird life. Number of alternatives available such as hydro, solar and ground heat pumps/heat exchangers. Visibly they are unwelcome, unnatural structures which spoil the views of open green belt countryside. Will damage historic skyline and historic setting of York.	4383/6456	
	Objection – inefficient and poor value for money. Excessive development of such sites will require the use of high carbon fossil fuel for back up power generation, Threat to bird life. Will damage historic skyline and historic setting of York.	4384/6458	
	Comment – proposed wind farms will create more environmental damage to put them up than they save. Safety must be a concern with RAF Linton on Ouse nearby.	4386/11364	
	Objection – the inclusion of information on wind farms in this plan is offensive and unnecessarily provocative. Vale of York, owing to its flat and low lying geography has poor wind force levels resulting in high levels of humidity. Height of these proposed wind mills (allegedly higher than York Minster) an attempt to compensate for these low lying geographical feature. Will be another factor in decreasing the attractiveness of the city thus deterring visitors whilst its inhabitants are left to endure these eyesores and their noise.	4391/11377	
	Comment – without further details it is impossible to comment fully but wind farms in	4399/11400	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	close proximity to housing are not good and they would be detriment to visual amenity whilst proving questionable benefits.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – question the environmental impact of manufacturing and erecting wind farms using fossil fuels etc and their efficiency as regards wind speed and direction. Energy in vs. energy out ratio. In a low lying relatively flat area like York, wind farms would have a significant detrimental impact on the landscape and visual amenity, in Dunnington. Appears to be no detail of the numbers or exact sites of these turbines nor details of their size.	4401/4907	
	Objection – to massive proliferation of wind farms. These large scale developments are inappropriate in the Green Belt.	4403/11405	
	Objection – inclusion of wind farms surrounding the city cannot be scientifically viable.	4404/11407	
	Objection – green belt with its open aspects (and protection from A64) is valued by residents of Copmanthorpe and provides protection for wildlife. Loss of this land would be devastating. Previous application (wind farm) was refused to protect this area. Wind farm would ruin the village and will be lo on landscape for historic York. Previous objections to wind farms application still valid- uneconomic, detrimental to people of village and wildlife, noisy, hazard to traffic (A64) and blight on landscape.	4412/11427	
	Objection – proposals show poor understanding of potential impact on landscape and long views in the City/Minster and on the wildlife. Must protect views. Benefits of wind turbines outweighed by loss of setting for the city. Areas earmarked within 1km of River Derwent corridor should be excluded for turbines on grounds of proximity to the internationally protected designated wildlife sites.	4413/11433	Carstairs Countryside Trust
	Objection – wind farm would ruin the village (Copmanthorpe) and would be blot on landscape for historic York. Previous objections to wind farms application still valid- uneconomic, detrimental to people of village and wildlife, noisy, hazard to traffic (A64) and blight on landscape.	4414/11439	
	Objection – no wind farms please.	4425/5072	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4434/5203 4436/5210	
	Objection – can the low lying vale of York really be justified as a suitable efficient location for wind farm turbines, to say nothing of the effect on surrounding views.	4437/5100	
	Objection – fail to see the need for unsightly wind farms. Have they been proven to be efficient or cost effective? Is this just the start of many?	4439/5114	
	Objection – the proposed site for a wind farm in Copmanthorpe as rejected less than a year ago by the council.	4343/11617	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – no to wind farms.	4444/5155	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4451/5218	
	Comment – apart from the proposal for wind farm on land between A1237 and Towthorpe Lane, would like to suggest that any wind turbine structure should not be allowed within 10 miles of the city of York.	4467/11476	
	Objection – 40 wind farms seem excessive number for a compact city like York. Also it would be questionable whether there would be enough wind on the flat plains around York to generate enough power.	4468/11481	
	Objection – proposed encirclement of York by wind turbines is unacceptable for York residents as a whole, including Haxby. Development might be considered worthwhile – however unsightly and noisy from the environmental perspective. If wind turbines were able to produce much electricity, amount would be negligible compared to future energy needs. Furthermore, wind turbines on anything like the scale proposed are an environmental outrage for such a city as York with its outstanding historical and architectural heritage.	4481/11497	
	Objection – concerned about the allocation of up to 40 wind farm sites. These monstrously over subsidised white elephants will further damage the countryside.	4489/11504	
	Comment – there need to be a lot done in assessing if there is a need. What power will be supplied, how much, the impact on local communities. A more detailed study is required.	4490/11509	
	Objection – opposed to proposed siting of wind farms as they are monstrous blot on landscape and it has already been shown that they make only a minor contribution to the energy demands on the country.	4491/11516	
	Objection - the pros and cons of wind farms are as yet unproved either ay. Judgement on these developments must be help back until such a time as more detail is given i.e. exact location? How many? And how many designs in the future may vastly improve this reducing unsightliness and noise.	4502/11532	
	Objection – wind turbines are not beautiful structures which improve the landscape, nor have they proved to be a viable economic escape from the problems that they were designed for, so why waste more money? And how will the y protect York’s heritage.	4578/11564	
Objection – there is little information in the Local Plan to make a proper assessment of proposals. What steps have Council taken to ensure that energy in vs energy out ratio is high enough to warrant the massive expenditure and subsidy on wind turbines around York? Would have significant impact visually on historical landscape.	4626/11582		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – siting of wind turbines near Wheldrake is appalling and will destroy countryside.	4635/11766	
	Objection – proposal of wind farm near Scoreby. Proposal places numerous wind turbines which are unproven and dubious eco value in a flat valley on the plains just short of the River Derwent. This plain of agricultural greenbelt is clearly an area of open countryside which the locals view as one of outstanding beauty. Believe this area would be seriously damaged and spoilt by this proposal.	4636/6223	
	Objection – land north of Haxby Moor Road outside Strensall. Development of wind farm here would be outrageous especially given the low wind power available on this low lying inland area. Green Belt should be protected. Environmental report – recommendation do not seem to be based on a logical analysis of the facts.	4637/11767	
	Comment – lack of information. Not necessarily opposed to wind turbines (in appropriate locations). But how many, where, size and noise need more information. Careful consideration has to be given to impact of wildlife and visual impact and noise impact.	4643/6068	
	Objection – siting of wind farms around the city. They are unsightly, inefficient; require power stations to be on standby. If Yorkshire must have them, site them offshore. Those proposed near airfields are dangerous.	4648/11774	
	Objection – understand need for renewable energy, wind farms are not cost/energy effective when compared to offshore wind or tidal/solar.	4649/11777	
	Objection – oppose the potential plan to site a wind farm behind New farm, Nether Poppleton as it would be too near a residential area.	4650/5245	
	Support – see response 11	4651/11782	
	Objection – see response 11	4652/11788	
	Support – see response 11	4653/11794	
	Objection – some sites taller than the Minster. Onshore wind is not only unsightly but inefficient. York in a middle of a plain where lack of wind is notorious.	4654/11800	
	Objection – see response 11	4655/11806	
	Objection – see response 11	4656/11812	
	Objection – see response 11	4657/11818	
	Objection – see response 11	4658/11824	
	Objection – see response 11	4659/11830	
Support – see response 11	4660/11836		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – see response 11	4661/11842	
	Objection – see response 11	4662/11848	
	Support – see response 11	4663/11854	
	Objection – see response 11	4665/11860	
	Objection – see response 11	4666/11871	
	Objection – see response 11	4667/11877	
	Objection – see response 11	4668/11883	
	Objection – see response 11	4670/11894	
	Objection – see response 11. Want to know more about the proposals.	4671/11898	
	Objection – see response 11.	4672/11903	
	Objection – see response 11.	4673/11909	
	Objection – see response 11.	4674/11914	
	Objection – see response 11.	4675/11920	
	Objection – see response 11.	4676/11926	
	Objection – see response 11.	4677/11932	
	Objection – see response 11.	4678/11938	
	Objection – see response 11.	4679/11944	
	Objection – see response 11.	4680/11950	
	Objection - wind farms are yet to be proven cost effective and they are undoubtedly a blot on the landscape especially so close to city. Will spoil long distance views of Minster and noise will be disruptive.	4681/11956	
	Objection – see response 11.	4682/11963	
	Objection – see response 11.	4683/11969	
	Objection – see response 11.	4684/11975	
	Objection – Windfarm south of Bishopthorpe. Supporters of sustainable energy solutions but object to this. Unconvinced that wind farms are cheap and economical. Concern that maintenance is high and on flat Vale of York is not best location for structures which require high wind speed and exposure. The proposed wind farm will be very visible from Bishopthorpe, Acaster Malbis and Naburn and have a negative impact on skyline. Area benefits from business brought in by leisure and has several caravan sites as well as marina – wind farm would have negative impact on these. There are more suitable locations at higher elevations, far from local population/houses. Will also impact on footpath/cycleway.	4686/11978	
Objection – wind farms were not on household leaflet. Wind turbines are less efficient	4689/14245		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	than solar panels and require more maintenance. York is so flat and wind turbines so tall; these would be visual disaster for historic city. There are sites near Harewood Whin which is a major food source for gull – the chance of bird strikes will cause damage to the machines and death to the birds.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – studies indicate York’s flat, low level location is ill-suited and fails to generate adequate prevailing wind to make wind turbines viable.	4691/14248	
	Objection – need lots of wind and this can’t be found in any great volume in a low lying area. Historically, water power was more reliable.	4693/11984	
	Comment – wind turbines need wind.	4694/11987	
	Objection – wind farms are inefficient, expensive to construct and service and are waste of money. Only work between minimum and maximum wind speed and need back up energy. Major eyesore. Adverse effect on plant/animal life.	4701/11993	
	Objection – proposed new wind turbines to north and south of Skelton will have disastrous visual and noise impact on the countryside. It would be better to spend money on solar panels. Concern re impact on wildlife. Damage to York’s visual and historic character.	4719/12013	
	Objection – proposed new wind turbines to north and south of Skelton will have disastrous visual and noise impact on the countryside. It would be better to spend money on solar panels. Concern re impact on wildlife. Damage to York’s visual and historic character.	4720/12016	
	Objection – wind turbines to east of Heworth Without. Unsuitable in the green belt. Will destroy character and feel of the city/ area and wind turbines are unsightly. Not an efficient source and supply of energy and have questionable benefits. Other greener solutions should be investigated more fully.	4721/12021	
	Objection – proposed use of land for wind farms is contrary to the draft green belt.	4726/14262	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4737/5283	
	Objection – formula which translates wind speed into energy and you will not put a wind farm in a valley. Biomass would be less obtrusive. Solar voltaic panels are marginal.	4748/12037	
	Objection – wind farm sites including three south of Heslington, if built would change character and appearance of York and its surroundings forever.	4750/12041	
	Objection – proposals for renewable energy generation will be very unsightly in an area off considerable beauty for questionable and uncertain benefits.	4753/12055	
	Objection – not convinced that wind farms are a viable proposition. They are very costly to install and that money could be used for a much more profitable electricity	4755/5294	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	supply.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – wind farm proposals need to be referred to the Ministry of Defence who recently objected to proposals in Poppleton.	4756/5303	
	Objection – wind farm proposal for Wheldrake. Height of turbines will affect village and be a blot on landscape. Migrating birds could be affected. Not effective inland as need constant wind power. Noisy. Pollution is produced by the manufacture.	4757/12058	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. More data is required on noise impact and prevailing winds. Concern over road safety due to driver distraction. Impact on surrounding land and drainage. Turbine flicker will be significant for houses on Manor heath and Homefield Close.	4761/5339	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	4762/5347	
		4763/5355	
		4764/5363	
		4765/5371	
		4766/5379	
		4770/5387	
	Objection – jury is out on financial and environmental benefits of wind farms. The potential development would dramatically change the character of the city.	4780/12074	
	Objection – wind farms would have significant adverse effect on landscape and views of Minster. Not in a location that optimises potential energy from wind.	4782/12081	
	Objection – wind farm near Dunnington. Not appropriate location will dominate local landscape and will have adverse affect on visual amenity. Spoil views to Minster and Wolds. Noise pollution. Need more in depth plans.	4794/5994	
	Objection – plans for wind farms in Green Belt are ill-conceived and fundamentally flawed. As well as being unsightly, inefficient, unreliable and noisy, Wind turbines can cause interference to Radars used for air traffic control and air defence. Major aviation issues.	4797/12097	
Objection – wind farms are large and unsightly, noisy and have a significant adverse effect on the visual setting of the village. Haven't seen conclusive proof that they are a necessity in Dunnington.	4804/12108		
Objection – wind farms do not live up to their billing as sources of renewable power. Building wind turbines requires significant industrial input and has a significant negative effect on the area. Their ability to generate power is highly suspect. Wind farms have significant detrimental effect on local residences in terms of noise pollution as well as horrendous visual impact.	4806/12114		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms should not be built anywhere near built up areas. They should only be allowed when a long way from houses.	4810/12124	
	Objection – the visual, noise and health impact of the proposed wind farms situated north and south of Skelton.	4816/12133	
	Objection - wind farms are large and unsightly, noisy and have a significant adverse effect on the visual setting of the village. Haven't seen conclusive proof that they are a necessity in Dunnington.	4821/12140	
	Objection – high level of wind farms around Deighton and Crockey Hill will exacerbate pollution, only in this case the pollution will be noise.	4830/12152	
	Objection – would question the need for three large wind farms to north, east and west of Haxby and Wigginton. Besides being a blot on the countryside, current thinking is not in favour of their worth in providing reliable power.	4832/12159	
	Objection - sceptical of wind farms and their questionable benefits are fundamentally opposed to any plans to build wind farms on York's greenbelt. In addition to the questionable benefits, the wind farm developments proposed to the North of York may cause problems for military aircraft using the nearby Linton-on- Ouse airfield, and a negative impact on birds such as the Red Kite which are breeding in the area, and bats.	5111/12219	
	Objection - the environment will be damaged by the introduction of wind farms in a previously designated green belt.	5112/12224	
	Objection - wish to lodge objections to the proposed wind farm sites between Hagg Wood, A166 and Scoreby (Map 8b North Derwent) and east of Scoreby Wood (Map 8a South Derwent). Hagg wood (Woodland Trust) is part ancient oak Wood, and along with other belts of woodland near Scoreby, forms a vital corridor for birds and other wildlife. The same is true for Scoreby wood. The woodlands along this Derwent Valley provide areas for many of these birds to roost en route to the flooded areas, and a permanent habitat for others such as the predators. We are seriously concerned about the possible risk to such wildlife of the wind farm sites listed above. Another concern relates to the historic site along the Derwent in Scoreby, with the Roman camps and later Battle of Stamford Bridge. Believe that development of such sites could lead to damage to such historic sites, and there is potential detriment to those who might visit such sites as tourists. Finally, would have you recognise the importance of Scoreby as a through-post on the National cycle route 66. The proposed wind farm between Hagg wood and Scoreby would be to the detriment of this scenic stretch of the route, and may act to discourage those cyclists from supporting this important route for safe	5125/12240	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	exercise and leisure. Do not believe that the proposed wind farms reflect the statements you have made in other areas of this document (see representation for detail).		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection - the renewable energy plans in the form of wind turbines encircling the City of York is a horrific thought, especially as they have been proven to be inefficient. Solar panels would be less obtrusive and less of an eyesore and considerably more efficient. The wind turbines between Harewood Whin Tip and Knapton that are proposed are in the direct flight path of large numbers of gulls that feed on the tip during the day and roost in the Derwent Valley (an SSSI site) at night. This is explained in greater detail in a submission by The York Ornithological Club.	5134/5680	
	Objection - disagree with the proposed windfarms in the area. Need more energy but, as most people will realise, at the times when our requirements are at their greatest in Winter, there is no wind. Believe it is about time that use was made of water power in our rivers. There is more water in the rivers in Winter when energy requirements are at their greatest. Not bothered by the appearance of wind turbines but most people are and in view of the noise they apparently make disagree with their siting close to residential areas.	5135/12253	
	Objection - York is beautiful cathedral city and attracts millions of tourists to the area every year. International tourism to the area has increased in recent years (2011 29% to the area were from visitors from the US). The creation of wind farms would spoil the aesthetics of the local area which would have a negative impact on visitors to York. During times of recession, the growth of tourism is one way that York can safeguard existing businesses and promote the growth of jobs for its local residents. In addition the creation of wind farms would threaten local wildlife including local bird populations. It is understandable that renewable energy has environmental benefits however in the case of wind farms, there has been recent speculation that the jobs created in return for the amount of subsidies received has been very small and that the economic and environmental benefits of power generation are questionable.	5146/12269	
	Objection - York is beautiful cathedral city and attracts millions of tourists to the area every year. International tourism to the area has increased in recent years (2011 29% to the area were from visitors from the US). The creation of wind farms would spoil the aesthetics of the local area which would have a negative impact on visitors to York. During times of recession, the growth of tourism is one way that York can safeguard existing businesses and promote the growth of jobs for its local residents. In addition the creation of wind farms would threaten local wildlife including local bird populations.	5147/12274	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	It is understandable that renewable energy has environmental benefits however in the case of wind farms, there has been recent speculation that the jobs created in return for the amount of subsidies received has been very small and that the economic and environmental benefits of power generation are questionable.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the plan includes 44 areas designated for renewable energy generation - presumably mostly for wind farms. Since the most efficient wind turbines are taller than York Minster, it is hard to see how even one turbine (let alone the many needed to attain the 2020 renewable generation target of 20mW) could not have a major impact on views across York. This is contrary to the council’s own Policy CC1 target.	5165/12297	
	Objection - assume the inspector will be made aware of the Council Planning Committee’s reasons for turning down the application to build a wind-test mast close to the edge of the city. It is important to note that, although in this instance the application concerned a proposal to build turbines ridiculously close to houses, the fundamental concern was that to build large turbines anywhere in what was referred to as greenbelt around the city would constitute an unacceptable despoliation of the skyline of the historic city that is currently dominated by York Minster. The inspector will be aware that the economy of the city is very dependent on tourism and so she/he will be surprised to see a Local Plan showing a scattering of potential turbine sites surrounding the city. It will be clear that the Council has not yet engaged with the difficult problem of how to make a contribution to a reduction in greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere, without undermining the attractiveness of York as a tourist destination.	5166/12299	
	Objection - in spite of government propaganda, wind farms are ugly, intrusive, uneconomical, and environmentally unfriendly. Currently upon approaching the City the first vision is that of the Tower of the Minster. Forever may it remain. Not the sight of wind farms.	5177/12323	
	Objection - understand the consultation sites do not include those that would obstruct primary views of the Minster and the number of crosses on the Local Plan does not indicate numbers of turbines or their sizes. Further that no work has been done regarding the practicality of these sites in regard to turbine size, grid connection, interference with low flying aircraft, radar or telecommunication transmitters, bird migration routes and what noise footprints would result from turbines located in the areas of search. The scarcity of details and the technical complexities involved makes it impossible to do other than note these are areas identified by AEA as of suitable wind strength. Do not accept that Wind Farms be built only to meet sustainable energy	5178/12370	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	targets.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Support – do not object in principle to the idea of wind farms. Objection - feel there is insufficient information in the Plan about wind farms on their size/number of turbines and the noise levels they will generate to be able to form a view on the suggested locations and the proposals should be withdrawn until more information is available. Comment - any move toward renewable should also include consideration of possible biomass solutions for electricity generation. The actual generation does not have to be located in York but the Council could support the creation of a feeder industry.	5181/12379	
	Objection - the provision of a site for potential renewable energy in the plan at the exact location in Copmanthorpe where York City councillors refused an application for a wind mast less than a year ago is an insult to local views and has no justification in planning policy. With regard to renewable energy (and wind farms in particular which is what this phrase is probably concealing) the Council must take into account the relevant Secretary of State’s recent guidance to planning inspectors that they must respect the views of affected communities when considering planning decisions. Additionally with regard to renewable energy the city council should be aware that even legal counsel for wind farm developers now acknowledge that minimum acceptable distances from habitation should now be considered before development is permitted. The council should acknowledge that tourism is a major employer in the city. Surrounding the city with wind farms (euphemistically called potential renewable energy generation) will potentially discourage visitors to the city, resulting in reduced economic activity and greater unemployment.	5186/12393	
	Objection - the wind farms omitted from the map (by design) should not be erected any where near houses. Whilst we have to have green energy - wind farms should not spoil areas of natural beauty or impose on houses.	5194/12418	
	Objection - do not agree with the wind farm plans in the Copmanthorpe area, wind farms should not be included in the plan.	5202/12428	
	Objection – don’t need all those red windmills that you have planned on the Local Plan Map	5203/12430	
	Objection - with regard to the wind turbine siting proposals in York noted that on a comparable Scottish based site a complaint was made about wind turbine noise at 1.7 miles distant. This is audible noise. It is also known that adverse medical affects can occur for some people when exposed to sub-audible sound waves and these appear to carry further. Think a minimum distance is required between present and also future	5206/12433	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	planned housing especially in the areas of York within a certain radius of the wind turbine sites indicated in the Plan. Think it is advisable to site these turbines (which only run at 25% peak load compared with 50% offshore) at 2 miles (3.5 km) from the nearest habitation. Agree that the UK is crowded but this could mean the target of 13GW onshore may be the cause of great dissent and should be reduced.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment - given the expansion of fracking over the next 40 years would question the wind farm programme which can only be described as eyesore developments surrounding a beautiful city in an area of green belt and outstanding natural beauty.	5208/12441	
	Objection - horrified at the location and extent of the areas marked as potential sites for wind turbines. All the work that has been done to preserve the City's skyline including the setting of York Minster would be put at risk by the installation of giant wind turbines within the City Council's area. The proposed areas are all too close to the City's urban area - other means of developing renewable or low carbon energy should be adopted.	5210/12448	
	Objection - putting wind farms in the areas proposed near Skelton will have a huge impact on the wildlife as well as the health of the residents living nearby who will have to put up with increased noise and the health impact. Would not have thought York was a particularly suitable place for wind farms, given that it is in a valley and there aren't particularly strong winds.	5213/12479	
	Comment – for the purposes of ongoing consideration of the proposed wind farm sites please publicise computer generated pictures of how these would impact on the long distance views towards and outwards from the city. Two examples in mind, from Garrowby Hill and from the Minster tower.	5224/12516	
	Objection – bad bargain lane/A64 area, wind farms will scar the landscape of York and destroy the skyline of York Minster that many people view from the A64 that draws people in. Wind turbines are inefficient and have a negative affect on house prices and local wildlife. Should be investing and encouraging proper long term energy sources not 'fad' schemes that make minimal contribution to energy needs. Safety issue from additional traffic accidents as the turbines will become a visual distraction to people using the A64. Limited roads to service any wind turbines, new roads will have to be build resulting in more local traffic and more local roads become short cuts and a loss of the local countryside.	5227/12521	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Support – in principle in favour of renewable energy Objection – not possible to support the wind farm proposals at this stage in the process, insufficient information is provided about specific location, size and number of turbines. Without this information it is not possible to know whether there will be any issues relating to proximity to housing resulting in noise issues. Dunnington is a quiet village therefore background noise is minimal. Would like to see an assessment of noise impact on surrounding properties. Would be helpful to see a set of guidelines which will be applied to specific site selection e.g. minimum distance from nearest housing.	5230/5857	
	Objection – wind farms are a waste of money and simply a nod to the green lobby. They are ineffective, obstructive and simply too costly.	5231/12543	
	Objective- the York area and its surrounding flat agricultural land is not suitable for wind farm development. The scale of development suggested would have a disastrous effect on the setting of the city and on the rural villages. Comment - it would make more sense to insist that any development carried out under the Local Plan should have its own sustainable heat source such as PV roof panels or ground source heat pumps. For employment sites the equipment could be buried beneath any parking or circulating areas.	5238/12565	
	Comment – the wind farms seem excessive and would they be cost effective without subsidy?	5295/14433	
	Comment – wind turbines – really would be poorly sited generally across the area of the Vale of York and generate little return.	5313/14476	
	Objection – wind farms are ugly and generally useless when you need most power. Case for them has not been made and within sight of York’s beautiful city centre. Shudder at impact on visitors.	5314/14479	
	Comment – supportive of intention of localised electricity generation. Local Plan doesn’t stipulate type of generation considered suitable for the locations so it is difficult to provide response. Objection - Wind generation better in exposed areas and is significantly affected by wind shadow. Area proposed for wind between Rufforth and Knapton would seem to be at high risk of wind shadow from Northminster Business Park. This problem throughout the city and therefore oppose location of wind generation in close proximity to city unless detailed assessment can demonstrate commercial viability. Object to site near Low Moor as it would present an unsightly view from the village. Comment – Allocation of energy generation plant near Harewood Whin provides an	5332/14999	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	opportunity to develop energy from waste proposals. Also, zone allocated near Rudding Ings in close proximity to River Ouse would be possible to accommodate an array of hydro-electric generation capacity.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – although in favour of wind farms rather than nuclear power, plans to put turbines in the Kexby/Holtby/Scoreby area are flawed. Turbines should be sited at a minimum of half a mile from local residences and should not be put along public walks and bridleways. Intrusion into peaceful landscape over farmland and would be better way from houses and woodland.	5337/14519	
	Objection – wind farms are an eyesore and totally unviable economically.	5340/14525	
	Objection – historic city and views of the Monster would be blighted by Wind turbines.	5351/14540	
	Objection – proposed wind farm developments fly in the face of para 2.13 which identifies views of Minster as “defining feature of skyline of York...prominent in longer distance views towards the city from the surrounding countryside. It is important this is not compromised as one plans for the future.”	5357/14555	
	Objection – York is historic city, which would be ruined by wind turbines. Do not place these ugly and noisy things close to any urban area. It would affect tourism.	5359/14556	
	Objection – proposal site east of Dunnington would seriously impact on the scenic beauty of the Gateway to the Wolds which is a significant part of York’s tourist attraction. Route 66 should not be damaged by wind turbines spoiling the views. Too close to residents – the visual and noise impact would be huge. Also is grade 2 arable land. Poor consultation re household leaflet excluding wind turbines sites and the lack of a key for the proposals map.	5365/14571	
	Objection – wind farms are a total waste of money as they only perform when conditions are right whereas nuclear now is clean affordable, relatively cheap and safe.	5376/14588	
	Objection – wind farm east of Dunnington. Damage openness of Green Belt. Any wind farms in the vicinity of the city will detract from the historic setting of York. Will provide threat to bird populations/biodiversity. No very special circumstances have been established o justify such a widespread development of wind farms within York’s Green Belt. Has a business case for the development of wind farms been produced? Proposed wind farms too close to existing properties – 500m would not be enough to give protection from noise pollution. Unacceptable intrusion into the landscape. Interfere with views of Wolds. National cycle route 66 would have lost visual amenity.	5377/14592	
	Support – in favour of wind farms.	5385/14613	
	Objection – wind farms – no evidence presented which would support environmental argument that wind farms necessary in York. Impact on skyline would be catastrophic.	5389/14627	York Navigator Ltd

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	York set in Vale- no areas with sufficient wind generation.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – west of A1237. No objection to wind farms in principle, question suitability of site so close to residential dwellings as understand they create considerable noise. Also too close to Rufforth airfield – hazard. Also hazard from flock of seagulls flying to Harewood Whin.	5390/14630	
	Objection – proposed wind farms being within York bypass – too close to residential properties. Impact negatively on people in area – same height as Minster. Questions re time scale, what other forms of energy have been considered, all new houses should have solar panels. Should not be in Green Belt.	5392/14640	
	Objection – strongly object to the placing of wind turbines in a green belt sites.	5393/14641	
	Objection – wind power isn't very efficient. Should keep them off shore and consider increased funding for alternative sources of energy e.g. river flow or tidal.	5395/14645	
	Comment – destruction of Green Belt. Large wind or solar farms on green belt land.	5402/14661	
	Comment – wind turbines must be placed on correct sites. Do we need so many? The one near the Rufforth airfield does not seem practical.	5406/14668	
	Comment – benefits of wind farms should be carefully considered against potential impact on people living in view of them.	5407/14671	
	Object – most strongly object to all planned wind turbines. Should not be in Plan at all.	5410/14683	
	Objection – wind turbines not shown on plan. Wind farms are an eyesore and will ruin countryside.	5411/14685	
	Objection – wind farm at Scoreby. Quite and beautiful rural area in close proximity to York. Large number paths and bridleways. Wind farms would ruin the feel of the area and scare the horses. Would threaten wildlife in Hagg Wood. Properties too close – health implications. Not logical that this site suitable for wind energy.	5424/14732	
	Objection – wind farm north east of Dunnington. Mill Hill will shield site from wind. Damage to nature conservation sites and footpaths. Properties too close. Health impacts. Wind speeds not enough – only just above minimum of 6m/s.	5425/14734	
	Objection – green belt around Skelton – wind farms will change the area for the worst forever.	5429/14753	
	Support – in favour of wind turbines as they are environmentally sound and aesthetically pleasing on the landscape.	5437/14768	
	Objection – wind farm near Gate Helmsley. Feel that 500m distance from existing dwellings is insufficient. Residents need compensation.	5451/14791	
	Objection – siting wind turbines near Heslington would be an abomination and no clear evidence that they are of real benefit.	5462/14807	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – why wind turbines so close to homes? Haxby not a windy place.	5465/14811	
	Objection – wind Farm near Grimston Wood/Gypsy Corner. Currently a beautiful peaceful spot. Bad effect on wildlife.	5472/14827	
	Objection – proposed wind farm in flood zone and too close to residential homes and has no identified real need to be built. Significant bird activity in area and turbines would pose a threat.	5480/14834	
	Objection – wind farms should not be considered in any part of the Vale of York.	5484/14839	
	Objection – inappropriate proposals for wind turbines which would dominate York and are against government rules where need for renewable energy should not override environmental protections or planning concerns.	5505/14884	
	Objection - wind Farm west of Woodthorpe. Noise and sight pollution that is present 24 hours a day and is of questionable benefit when considered alongside other renewable energy options.	5506/14887	
	Support – happy with proposals for possible sitings of wind turbines.	5509/14892	
	Comment – the environmental impact or so-called carbon offsetting muted in the solar panel farms is controversial, surely York should work to cut the carbon it uses in the first place as opposed to investing in high-cost, weather dependent solar panels.	5513/14901	
	Objection – Copmanthorpe – Wind Farm rejected by Council last year due to local opposition. Do views of residents mean nothing? Concerned about impact on local wildlife, in particular bats.	5514/14911	
	Objection – oppose wind farm near Copmanthorpe. Would not be appropriate use of Green Belt land. Plans previously rejected by Council due to local opposition.	5515/14917	
	Objection – don't like that the Council is trying to sneak in wind farms.	5516/14923	
	Objection – proposed wind farms south of Wheldrake. Would harm countryside views and impact on beautiful landscape and green belt should be preserved.	5531/14950	
	Objection – Stockton on Forest. Plan for wind farm 400 m from east side of village – currently views of trees and Wolds. Bridleways and footpaths over the site. Wind turbines are thoroughly discredited system which operate under capacity and Vale of York is a windless plain. Impact on tourism for one of the most historic cities in Europe.	5532/14953	
	Objection – plan for wind farm should be rejected as it was last year (Copmanthorpe). Also Government is also rethinking onshore wind farms.	5539/14959	
Support - welcome proposals to investigate potential for renewable electricity generation via wind power to west of Woodthorpe. As long as sites are designed and developed with sensitivity and minimal impact on the natural environment.	5541/14968		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – thought of York being encircled by wind farms is anathema.	5555/13025	
	Objection – wind farm plans should be removed as inappropriate development in the Green Belt especially in such a beautiful city.	5557/13036	
	Objection – proposal of wind or solar farm to south and west of Wheldrake. Concerned how it will affect wildlife – close to Wheldrake Ings and Derwent Valley. Too close to village and visually would be detrimental. No indication to size of the farm. In addition, connection to national grid would be an eyesore on the landscape.	5560/13042	
	Objection – encircling York with wind turbines would have detrimental effect on tourism, historically managed landscape, people of York and would spoil many views. Weather/wind power unpredictable and National Grid can't cope with such peaks and troughs. Human health can be affected – 'wind turbine syndrome'. Should look at wave/tidal power and off shore turbines instead of blighting green belt areas.	5566/5872	
	Objection - wind farm locations would spoil the very views the plan on other pages values for highly.	5570/13053	
	Objection – sites omitted from leaflet. Questionable how much generation capacity would be appropriate for the City. Optimum areas are off the coast, on the Pennines and in upland areas, not in the Vale of York.	5573/13061	
	Objection – north of A1237 for wind farms inappropriate. Too close to residences – sound pollution.	5577/13067	
	Comment – agree with sustainable energy developments, would question this type of development in the Vale of York as constant wind required to produce energy.	5584/13086	
	Objection – wind farms around Skelton. . Not enough wind speed to make these viable. To make these work, would need to be very tall and too close to houses in terms of noise and flicker. Visual impact on skyline would dwarf Minster.	5589/5875	
	Objection – level of wind farms proposed – concentrations such as the level proposed to south of Wheldrake and north/south of Kexby will impact heavily on quality of life in villages.	5592/13118	
	Comment – should compel all new buildings to have solar tiles and be very energy efficient. Wind farms would not be allowed in this area due to proximity of RAF airfields. Would spoil beautiful historic city of York and would block views of Minster. Impact of tourism.	5597/13131	
Objection – wind farms means approach to historic city of York would be severely compromised.	5602/13150		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind turbines. No logic in an area known to be flat and relatively calm. York hinterland would be ruined for years to come and would adversely affect residents and tourism industry alike.	5604/13154	
	Objection – wind farms would create blight around perimeter of the city, spoiling wonderful views on approaches to it. Also in proximity to housing, potential creating distress in terms of noise, vibration and flutter.	5606/13163	
	Objection – inappropriate and unjustified inclusion of wind turbines. Issues regarding the efficiency and possible detrimental effects when located near domestic residences. No requirement to include them in local plans. The scale and location of potential sites in this area, with its green belt surrounding the historically significant skylines which are critical to the Plans vision of tourism are also impossible to justify.	5622/13230	
	Objection – windmills are a joke.	5633/13258	
	Objection – proposals near Dunnington. Too close to existing properties – risk of noise pollution – 500m insufficient protection from both visual and noise intrusion. Should be minimum of 1000m, although some authorities use 2km. Intrusion into landscape given its green belt. Low lying area therefore turbines have to be very high. Damage views of Wolds and Minster. Touring cycle routes visual amenity damaged.	5636/5880	
	Support – in general support proposals to increase the amount of green energy generated around York. Would encourage the Council to look widely at opportunities to harness wind, sun and water power.	5645/13281	
	Comment – how many wind farms are expected to be sited? How much energy are they expected to develop per annum in average conditions? Who will benefit from them?	5657/13307	
	Objection – electricity generation from wind is inefficient and expensive. Without government subsidy none would be built. They do not stop pollution because other systems need to be held on standby for the many times the weather is calm. People are realising that we went too far in tacking what is now seen to be a non threatening event. The warming stopped 15 years ago and is no need by many to be natural and not man made. A wind farm would be an investment in a market in decline.	5659/13313	
	Objection – cannot understand why if the Council talk about York’s unique character we want to surround the area with the horrendous eyesore of wind farms. These are a blot on the landscape and will not be in keeping with the area. Its not as if York has hills which catch the wind, the turbines will be stationary for the majority of the time (although been told that the providers are compensated by the Government when the turbines are stationary).	5660/13316	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Comment – in agreement that we need to look at using natural resources for energy, has anyone looked at the possibility of solar energy farms as they a currently being development in Leeds. These are low level and do not spoil the skyline and should not be a danger to the glider and microlight pilots who use Rufforth Airfield.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Support – no objections to the proposed wind farm (in Huntington)	5661/13321	
	Objection – object to any wind farm development on green belt.	5662/13326	
	Objection - wind farms are expensive to build and notoriously inefficient in reliable power generation as well as being blots on rural landscapes and damaging to wildlife. Will be to the detriment of York and the local landscape.	5666/13336	
	Objection – validity of the AEA study is questionable	5667/13341	
	Objection – wind farm sites in the green belt are ridiculous to propose over 40 is sheer madness. They are unsightly and unproven. Mounting evidence that efficiency begins to decline after 8 years and they need to be replaced after 12-15 years. Do not want to live on a building site surrounded by a very expensive white elephant.	5672/13354	
	Objection – object to the three potential wind farms to the north, east and west of Haxby.	5673/13363	
	Objection – object to the proposed site for renewable energy to the east of Dunnington, it would seriously impact on the scenic beauty of the area as it is the start of the gateway to the wolds and as such must be preserved. Would destroy the natural beauty of the vale of York for those leaving York and approaching from the wolds. It is on grade two prime arable land essential for sustainable food production and wind farms should be placed on less ecological land.	5679/13384	
	Objection – oppose the proposed wind farm in the Scoreby area. There are a large number of cycle paths and footpaths A wind farm would put people off visiting the area including Hagg Wood. The wind farm is too close to the houses in the area. It does not appear to be in an efficient location, particularly with Mill Hill reducing prevailing winds.	5682/5889	
	Objection – understand the requirements to move towards renewable energy however the evidence seems to suggest that wind power is not very efficient. Comment - wind farms should be kept off shore and increase funding for alternative sources of energy such as rivers flow or tidal.	5683/13389	
Objection – to the proposals for wind farms to be considered in the Strensall area. Fail to understand how a wind farm in this low lying position would generate enough power for the area. The costs of installation and construction would far outweigh the power	5700/5893		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	produced. The disruption caused would be detrimental to the farming in the area. Damage to infrastructure and wild life of which there is an abundance of in the area. The turbines are noisy – the area is surrounded by bridal ways and public footpaths, a place for peace and quite in this hectic world.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the number of new wind farms proposed is ridiculous as York is a vale and has relatively low wind levels.	5701/13434	
	Objection – always opposed onshore wind farms. Question both their costs effectiveness and claims as to their benefit. Will destroy the beauty of the countryside.	5711/13459	
	Objection –concerned about wind farms being planned so close to residential properties in Skelton. Understand there is considerable noise pollution from such wind farms and this will put a great noise burden on residents who have chosen to live in a quiet village. Not convinced that wind farms would make a significant contribution to the generation of power. It would be tragic if the skyline of the city were to be littered with unnecessary wind farms. Please think carefully and do not destroy the character of the beautiful city.	5746/13552	
	Objection – horrified to see the wind farm sites in the plan, what research ahs been done on this? Is York such a windy area? It is doubted that it is and it is considered that York will be surrounded by static turbines for 95% of the time. Is this just to pacify some government directive? What is the preference of these over solar panels? York has a source of heat and power flowing right through the middle of it, has this been fully investigated and rejected for some reason?	5753/13585	
	Objection – to the inclusion of potential wind farm sites, these should be removed as an inappropriate development in nay case and especially around such a beautiful city as York. When approaching York the Minster is the main structure that should stand out as it has done for hundreds of years not wind farms.	5755/13604	
	Objection- surrounding the lovely, ancient city of York with wind turbines is not a good idea. The amount of energy produced is very small compared with their effect on the landscape.	5762/5897	
	Objection – the majority of the potential areas of search for renewable energy generation fall within the green belt yet do not meet any of the Plan’s proposed criteria for greenbelt criteria. The sites encircle York which means all views of the Minster etc would have a backdrop of large wind turbines detracting from the view. The plan repeatedly refers to maintaining and improving York’s relationship with its landscape and then ignores it completely in this proposal. Given the disruptive and anti-social nature of large wind turbines they should not be positioned within 2 miles of	5767/13642	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	residential areas. Houses build close to wind farms may prove to be unsalable thus impacting on the viability of the local plan. Commercial scale proposals for renewable energy should not be encouraged.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the Vale of York has always had a history of stagnant air causing fog and chest complaints in the area so what is the point in depending on wind for power generation?	5771/13650	
	Comments – wind farm sties within 850m of residential areas will be difficult to deliver given the potential impact on residential setting, hence likely need for an appeal/inquiry – all set against a declining subsidy for the wind farm developers. The area south east of Heslington is less than 450m, the 850m radius would place any new turbines close to the A64 and most likely within safety clearance so effectively an undeliverable site.	5776/13668	
	Objection – there cannot be any inclusion of wind turbines in the plan as the draft consultation does not state where exactly they will be. Until a detailed map is offered for full consultation this should be removed from any future plan.	5777/13670	
	Objection –to the proposed wind farms at Kexby, Scoreby and Elvington on the grounds that they are too big, too noisy, of no benefit to the community, would be built on green belt land and are an inefficient way of producing energy. The site south of Kexby would be alongside or near to the Ings and a menace to wildlife and a blot on the landscape.	5778/5898	
	Objection – would expect the performance of renewable energy farms to benefit from diverse siting rather than grouping	5779/13674	
	Objection – wind farms shown on the proposals map 8b derwent north would totally ruin the area’s natural beauty including the view form the A166 across the farm landscape to Garroby Hill. Noted that the AEA study omits any reference to the potential of electricity generated from the river Derwent eg. at the weir near Stamford Bridge.	5784/13694	
	Objection – note the reappearance of wind farm proposals. What are consultations and planning decisions worth when an application to build a wind farm is roundly rejected only to reappear less than a year later?	5787/13707	
	Objection – object to wind turbines to the north and south of Skelton. Would spoil the skyline of the city and therefore spoil its historic appeal (being so much taller than the Minster). Would also cause serious flicker problems for Skelton and Shipton being so close to these villages – a serious risk to those with photosensitive epilepsy living within 100 times the hub height from the turbine if turbines are too close to one	5797/13727	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	another or rotate too fast.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – the wind farms are too close to housing at Copmanthorpe and there are too many sites. York is a low wind area. Invest in solar directly on houses, instead of paying subsidies to less efficient wind farms.	5799/15008	
	Objection – installation of wind farms is an example of exploitation that must not be allowed to take place. Would be helpful if the relevant authorities have been consulted to confirm that appropriate guidelines have been considered, particularly with regard to the sites in close proximity to Rufforth airfield.	5800/13735	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	5806/6231	
		5807/6239	
	Objection – wind farms, together with their associated connections to the grid will disrupt the local ecosystems (particularly avian activity) and through their numerous and scattered nature will completely undermine the Council’s attempts to maintain the historic and low profile approaches to the city. Motivated by financial greed of the developers exploiting the current legislation for their own gain and has nothing to do with integrated power generation policy. Comment – historically has not been expected to provide all its fossil fuel based energy locally, is it not possible to consider funding directly a smaller number of larger scale ‘city of york’ turbines in more geographically and technically appropriate locations e.g. Drax, Eggborough, industrial wasteland etc. to help York more effectively meet its CO2 targets.	5809/13746	
	Objection – concerned how the proposed wind or solar farm to the south and west of Wheldrake will affect the wildlife as it is so close to internationally important Wheldrake Ings and Lower Derwent Valley Nature Reserves. It is far to close to the village itself and would be visually detrimental. No indication of the size, would it be one turbine or solar panel or many? Once built it may only be a matter of time before more were added. Connection would be required to the local/national electricity grid which would also be an eyesore on the landscape.	5810/13750	
	Comment – wind farms are unsightly and if considered for the environment they should be sited in the absolute best places so as to retain as much unspoilt beauty of the landscape as possible.	5815/13757	
	Objection – proposed wind farms are a sop to the environmental lobby and will not provide sufficient power that is needed.	5816/13761	
Objection – object to siting of wind farms as they are a blot on the landscape for very little return. Solar panels on every house would be a better return.	5825/13783		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Comment – it appears that several development sites (ST14 & ST15) have also been highlighted for potential wind farms, these two functions seem to be entirely incompatible and the overlap should be removed.	5826/13790	
	Objection – to the area identified to the south of Kexby. Noise generation will have a negative impact on nearby residents and a large visual impact on local communities. Objection due to the proximity of the proposed development to the river corridor along the Lower Derwent Valley which is a nationally and internationally important site for its bird populations and the river corridor is vital for migration.	5830/13807	
	Objection – wind farms have already been stated as useless in the Vale of York.	5834/15004	
	Objection – construction of wind farms in the vicinity of Heslington will impact the unique nature of this conservation village.	5838/15001	
	Objection – wind farms will impact on the landscape of the area surrounding Elvington.	5842/13823	
	Objection – no evidence or statement in the plan as to how the proposed wind farms are going to benefit the people affected. Is there more wind in the south of York than elsewhere?	5862/15129	
	Objection – wind farms are a joke, a survey carried out by one of the big companies suggested only two sites were identified as a possible investment, one being Askham Bryan College and the other Murton. York is called the vale of York for a reason. Output from the proposed sites would only supply 33% efficiency at best at any one time and the impact on the city would be catastrophic.	5871/15151	
	Objection – object to the proposal of a wind or solar farm to the south and west of Wheldrake. Concerned how it will affect the wildlife as it is close to the internationally important Wheldrake Ings and Lower Derwent Valley Nature Reserves. Concerned that once built it would only be a matter of time before more were added. In addition, connection would be required to the local/national grid which may also be an eyesore on the landscape.	5872/15155	
	Objection – wind farms are deeply unpopular, unsightly, noisy and would be a blot on the historic setting of York. The economic argument is overstated and driving up fuel prices for ordinary people.	5874/15159	
	Comment – do not see on the leaflet the wind farms proposed to surround the city with	5885/15184	
	Objection – totally against the proposed wind farms in the Rawcliffe area	5886/15187	
	Comment – understand that the Government have fulfilled their quota up to the year 2020 and think peoples should be made aware of the fact. It would be a shame to ruin York when wind farms are not inevitable.	5897/15205	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms are a complete waste of money, they are inefficient, have immense costs in their installation and future maintenance. We do not want them or need them in Haxby and Wiggington or any other are for that matter.	5900/15209	
	Comment – the re-introduction of wind farms indicates that the Council have not learnt anything from the expense and time wasted having the Copmanthorpe wind farm turned down.	5902/15217	
	Comment – as an environmentalists consider that wind power ought not to be despised and should be encouraged, but centralised units (as wind farms are) is considered to be the wrong way to go about it. Wind power ought to be dispersed and diffuse and on a much smaller scale.	5903/15219	
	Objection – the large amount of wind farm proposed is very bad news. Wind farms are a very costly and inefficient way to generate energy and will ruin the beautiful countryside around Bishopthorpe, probably making an awful noise.	5904/15222	
	Comment – wind turbines are generally an inefficient means of generating power in low lying inland areas such as the vale of York. They are an eyesore which is especially significant in relation to the tourism aspect of the region.	5906/15225	
	Objection – total aversion to wind farms	5910/5981	
	Objection – strong objection to wind farms around York and near Bishopthorpe in particular	5911/15236	
	Objection – opposed to wind farms everywhere. Preference for nuclear energy.	5915/15241	
	Objection – totally opposed to wind farms	5920/15250	
	Objection – it is known how useless and unsightly they are.	5926/15260	
	Comment – wind farms are becoming increasingly unpopular and inadequate in answering the nation’s power requirement and believe they need replacement after 25 years.	5927/15263	
	Objection – object to the very large potential wind farm site to the north of Skelton. The proposal is not appropriate for a rural village setting such as Skelton, especially when records show that wind speeds will not sustain this.	5939/15280	
	Objection – wind farm proposals are unsustainable, unsuitable and will destroy the city and its environment. Overseas visitors simply will not come.	5945/15290	
	Objection – strongly object to wind farms anywhere but especially in Poppleton.	5948/6250	
	Objection – object to any wind farms for electricity generation. They get paid for through elevated electricity bills whether they operate or not. They are unreliable; if they are turning they are not necessarily generating power.	5954/15307	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – no wind farms in Skelton.	5957/15311	
	Objection – successive governments have failed to invest in nuclear power like in France, listen to the green party of one MP. Cannot have wind mills on every tennis court.	5958/15313	
	Objection – having just come back from the Northumberland coast and appalled to see the scenery ruined by wind farms would hate this to happen to York.	5962/15324	
	Objection – no to wind farms.	5963/15326	
	Objection – why is Australia exporting 1,000,000 tonnes of coal and we have to have wind farms. No way.	5990/15371	
	Objection – opposed to wind farms where ever.	5997/15384	
	Objection – very opposed to wind farms. Think it is to do with money being thrown at anything under the disguise of it being good for the planet. It has yet to be proven conclusively.	5998/15387	
	Objection- object strongly to wind farms.	6017/15412	
	Objection – hate the proposed plans for wind farms.	6020/15417	
	Comment – any wind farms need to be looked at seriously to see if they really benefit from building them and where they will be sited.	6025/15431	
	Objection – no to wind farms.	6026/15433	
	Objection – wind farms would spoil the Fulford area and be an eyesore. Solar power on roofs should be done instead.	6034/15444	
	Objection – wind farms nears Whinthorpe should not be built.	6035/15446	
	Objection – no to wind farms	6036/15449	
	Objection – object to the development of wind farms in and around Poppleton. They are inappropriate and detrimental to the landscape in a highly populated rural village.	6038/15460	
	Comment – the proposals do not give any information on the viability of the council's ideas for wind farms	6039/5985	
	Objection – the landscape is relatively high quality and too flat to accommodate wind turbines of any size without a disproportionate visual impact, particularly on views to and from the Howardian Hills AONB and the North York Moors National Park.	6041/15465	
Objection – the proposed wind farms are an example of Skelton being developed in a way which will impact on the natural habitat and wildlife will be disastrously affected. Currently have a wonderful variety of plants and animals ranging from wild orchids to deer both will be gone if the proposals go through.	6043/15471		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Support – agree that wind/solar power needs to be increased in York.	6052/15496	
	Comment – current research is beginning to show that the use of land based wind turbines are not fir for purpose and that off short turbines are more appropriate. The location of York in a vale makes it a poor choice for the use of wind turbines. Recent controversial proposal for a wind farm at Copmanthorpe showed there was insufficient wind in the area. As York is such a poor area for the use of wind turbines are we to be faced with acres of solar panels? This is further erosion into prime agricultural land.	6055/15503	
	Objection – concerned about the visual impact of the large number of potential areas of search for renewable electrical energy. These wind farms could obscure the views of the city and minster in particular and impact on the city’s wild bird populations.	6060/5920	
	Objection – see response 11	6064/15523	
	Objection – see response 11. Definitely no wind farms, they are not viable without subsidies.	6065/15529	
	Objection – wind farms on the plain of York is not the right place due to the lack of elevation. Nobody has given finances for the expenditure and subsidy required to justify the expense that this development would require.	6109/15537	
	Objection – wind farms are not cost effective and a blot on the landscape. More electricity could be generated with the strategic positioning of Archimedes Screw turbines along the length of the river Ouse.	6131/15563	
	Comment – if the local authority is committed to increasing the spread of renewable energy installations across its territory it needs to consider making a public declaration on the issues of Renewable Energy Projects business rates retention scheme. Could choose to declare that such business rate revenue would be split between the local authority and the local community in which the renewable energy plant was installed. Would potentially generate significant sums of money for local communities. Objection – disagree with the preferred approach, considered that the city needs to provide detailed local criteria/identify sites to guide renewable and low carbon energy development. Will need to properly quantify the local energy resources available in different parts of the city and across the city as a whole. Energy consumption figures in the Renewable Energy Viability Study need to be broken down into individual communities so that those communities can understand how much electricity and heat they are consuming and thereby evaluate and quantify the contribution that say a wind farm could make to offsetting that consumption. Did not find reference to the consumption of heating oil in communities around York. This too needs to be quantified.	6137/15589	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – nothing has been convincing that wind farms encircling York is the answer to our energy problems.	6141/15610	
	Comment – wind power technology is now being discredited as not having the benefits first thought of.	6143/15614	
	Objection – to the impact on residents of the proposed wind farms both north and south of Skelton including the noise, the affect on health and the sheer visual impact on this historical village on the outskirts of York.	6145/15618	
	Objection – wind farm proposals are without foresight, who wants to visit the White Horse and view it through wind farms?	6155/15646	
	Comment – the proven benefits of renewable energy via wind farms is suspect to say the least.	6167/15685	
	Comment – wind farms should not be built in the vale of York which gets little wind. Water power is more use. Maybe rivers could be used as in the days of water mills? Is there not a ruling that no building had to be higher than/obstruct the view of the Minster?	6169/15694	
	Objection –wind farms are ambitious at this stage, no convincing figures to prove they are effective but there is lots of evidence to suggest they are expensive to maintain, unsightly and harm local wildlife.	6187/15728	
	Objection – wind turbines should bat least 1.5km away from properties, low average wind speed in York compared to other places in Yorkshire. Shale gas has been found and it is considered that it would be better to wait and see if this would be a better source of energy for the local plan.	6200/15737	
	Objection – against wind farms in all but the most remote areas. Certainly not anywhere near housing.	6203/6130	
	Objection – proposed wind farm next to the Ings is a not suitable as it will create havoc to bird life.	6209/15743	
	Objection – wind farms in a vale seems ridiculous and they have not been proved to be cost effective. Will be another eyesore for York.	6217/15757	
	Objection – wind farms are not as environmentally friendly as previously thought and are quite inefficient, only people who benefit are the landowners and they become a drain on resources without providing anything worthwhile to the local economy.	6220/15764	
Objection – wind farms would have a significant negative impact on the landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets and green belt objectives and the appearance of the historic city of York. This especially applies to Knapton. There would also be health and safety issues for York Flying Club at Rufforth Airfield.	6222/15769		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms will never address the country’s energy needs. Do not want one in the field behind their house. It’s green belt and should stay that way.	6223/15772	
	Objection – to proposals for wind farms close to the city boundary.	6224/15776	
	Objection – proposed wind farm site east of Dunnington, prime arable land, removal of ancient hedgerow and mature Oak trees, adjacent to the A166 which is a main tourist gateway and noise pollution will have a significant impact on people’s health. Proximity to adjacent public footpath, bridleway and cycle route which are supposed to follow scenic routes. Will the developers be instructed to install an Anemometer mast to record the wind speed?	6228/6158	
	Objection – why would York need wind farms when there is a ready made supply of energy from the river? A replacement generator at Linton Locks would be better and would not cause any problems with wind noise and would work all the time not just when there is wind.	6230/15790	
	Objection – proposed wind farms will blight the entrance to a lovely city. Turbines are unsightly and are not efficient.	6233/15799	
	Objection – whilst no objection to wind farms there is not sufficient information to make a reasoned opinion at this stage.	6234/15804	
	Objection – to propose so many wind turbines near to housing will destroy the outlook for hundreds of residents. Questionable to contemplate investing so heavily in a technology that is looking increasingly inefficient.	6243/15816	
	Objection – large wind farms north of Askham Richard and Askham Bryan objected to given its proximity and visibility to the village. Would object to wind farms in principle wherever they are proposed near urban areas with housing. Wind farm developments should be sited well away from houses. Proposals would ruin the whole setting of this part of rural west York.	6245/6172	
	Objection – the proposal for wind farms to the north and south of Skelton would be a blot on the landscape for anyone coming down the A19 from the north. They are grossly inefficient	6248/15818	
	Objection – in danger of having our beautiful city becoming like an approach into the industrial area of Middlesbrough where the smoking chimneys are synonymous with the area but with giant wind farms for the approach to York.	6253/15825	
	Objection – wind farms are a blight on a beautiful area. Do not produce meaningful levels of power for large periods of time when there is no wind.	6261/6190	
Objection – an excessive amount of wind farms are proposed, are we certain of their efficacy. They will be visually intrusive.	6269/15846		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind power is a waste of money given the limits of current technology. Beyond belief that a huge expansion of this nonsense is planned.	6291/15903	
	Objection – to the proposed wind farm to the west of Copmanthorpe, would detract from the character of the green belt.	6292/15909	
	Objection – to the proposed wind farm to the west of Copmanthorpe, would detract from the character of the green belt.	6293/15915	
	Objection – wind farms around York would be a blight on the landscape	6294/15917	
	Objection – the proposed site for a wind farm was rejected less than a year ago by the council, the situation has not changed.	6297/15926	
	Objection – whilst the extensive wind farm shown to the north of Skelton is speculative it is a strange idea to site such an array in the midst of a plain where wind frequency and speed is quite low.	6310/15954	
	Objection – site to the south of Kexby is in extremely close proximity to the River Derwent SSSI and SAC, represents extremely high ecological valuing’s land. Lies entirely in the green belt, would have a disproportionate visual impact. Land is in private ownership and the landowners have no intention of either selling the land or pursuing wind farm development. Proposed site is both inappropriate and ineffectual. Site should be deleted from the plan.	6314/15963	
	Objection – York is not the place for wind farms. It is obviously a revenue source and the Council is prepared to accept any method of raising funds regardless of the effect it will have on its residents.	6323/15984	
	Comment – renewable energy if the way forward but the wind farms should be undertaken sympathetically.	6325/15988	
	Objection – wind farms are both noisy and environmental eyesores.	6328/6210	
	Objection – wind farm sites, particularly north and south of Kexby and to the north east of Dunnington are objection too due to the noise generation, the impact on ecology, the generation of extra traffic on narrow roads, the impact on residents will be significant, the visual impact is unacceptable, they cannot be justified on economic grounds. They should be removed from the plan.	6330/15992	
	Objection – wind farms proposed are unnecessary. Surrounded by water power which could not only be harnessed to run generators continuously but at less cost.	6332/15995	
	Objection – wind farms are unsightly and will spoil the natural beauty of the Heslington area. York is in a valley, wind farms would be better placed on the edge of the valley where the wind is stronger, or out to sea, why is this not being considered?	6338/16019	
Objection – wind farm sites, particularly north and south of Kexby and to the north	6365/16079		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	east of Dunnington are objection too due to the noise generation, the impact on ecology, the generation of extra traffic on narrow roads, the impact on residents will be significant, the visual impact is unacceptable, they cannot be justified on economic grounds. Wind turbines are very ugly and inappropriate in the green belt		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – to wind farms surround the beautiful city.	6370/16090	
	Objection – why do we need wind farms when the Government recently has issued figures indicating that they have already reached their target?	6374/16101	
	Objection – wind farm proposals in Skelton are offensive to Skelton’s very nature on visual and noise factors in an area that is both countryside and residential.	6375/16103	
	Objection – dislike plan for wind farm near to Illingworth Wood which is too close to houses. The wind farm will destroy the tranquil setting.	6376/16106	
	Objection – just because Copmanthorpe have rejected a wind farm don’t try to impose it on a mile down the A1237 thinking it will be accepted.	6380/16111	
	Objection – to a wind farm in the Gate Helmsley area which is very fertile and has good crops. Noise is another problem and many houses would be affected or devalued greatly. The A166 is busy enough without a distraction to cause more road accidents.	6391/6254	
	Objection – what evidence is there that wind farms would be of benefit? Would it be better to utilise more solar power on all the new homes to have it installed from the start?	6392/16134	
	Objection – do not believe Poppleton is a good siting for wind turbines. Too flat, lack of wind and local airfields a danger.	6418/6298	
	Objection – wind farms are economically and scientifically misjudged and are seriously expensive to erect, maintain and most importantly are inefficient.	6423/16144	
	Objection – to wind farms in Poppleton.	6425/6318	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis. Will destroy beautiful green surrounding landscape that makes Copmanthorpe such an attractive place to live	6433/6335	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6434/6343 6435/6351	
	Objection – the proposed site for a wind farm was rejected less than a year ago by the Council, the situation has not changed.	6439/16160	
	Objection – appears that sites for wind farms have been selected randomly by sticking pins into a map, particularly north of Skelton. Will provide an unsightly entrance to what is currently unsightly main entrance to the city.	6443/16164	
Objection – proposing to surround Bishopthorpe and Naburn with wind turbines which	6444/16166		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	will have a massive visual impact. Intention may not be to allow turbines in every location but as it stands it will be very difficult to turn down any applications on an identified site. Average wind speeds are also very low and it is only through subsidies that make turbines commercially viable.		
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – proposed wind farms are a blot on the landscape and achieve very little saving.	6455/16181	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6457/6372	
	Objection – unnecessary method of long term energy production.	6469/6401	
	Objection – the cost/benefit calculations and their contributions to the UK energy plan have not been detailed for a decision to be made locally. Planning proposals should be deferred until better guidance can be offered.	6473/6407	
	Objection – see Copmanthorpe Analysis	6486/6439	
	Comment – wind farms that work are of more benefit to the environment and community than more urban sprawl. Once green belt is developed under buildings and roads it is lost forever whereas wind farms take up minimal space.	6502/16247	
	Comment – wind farms that work are of more benefit to the environment and community than more urban sprawl. Once green belt is developed under buildings and roads it is lost forever whereas wind farms take up minimal space.	6503/16251	
	Objection – see response 11	6505/16258	
	Objection – see response 11	6506/16264	
	Comment – land at wetherby road/knapton moor is currently agricultural but would like consideration for the area for renewable electricity generation. Understand it may already be allocated for this and would be grateful for confirmation.	6507/17240	City Of York Council Property Services
	Objection – object to the siting of wind farms ('renewable energy generation') throughout the green belt which would create an unacceptable degradation of York's historic fabric	6508/17656	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – a feature of York has always been the historic, dramatic and welcoming view of the Minster when the city is approached from any direction. Only one turbine would be sufficient to destroy that view.	6510/16290	Cllr Joseph D Watt
	Objection – land proposed for renewable electricity generation in the Heslington Ward should be ruled out in order to preserve its setting given the significant visual impact of many forms of renewable energy.	6511/16294	Cllr David Levene
Objection – wind farms are less viable than other green power equipment and would decimate the skyline.	6512/16296	Cllr Tony Richardson	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC1 Supporting Renewable And Low Carbon Energy Generation Continued	Objection – wind farms are totally unsuitable for the environ of this historic city and would be a blight aside from the9ir questionable efficient and huge cost which must surely render them useless in a vale location such as ours.	6514/16302	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Comment – no problem with the general approach but concerned about the huge swathes of countryside identified on the proposals map as areas of search for wind turbines. It is obvious that not all of those areas would be developed for this purpose but leaving them in causes residents great concern and uncertainty.	6516/16341	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Support – strongly support this policy in general terms. It is vital that York, along with everywhere else in the country contributes to the development of renewable energy. Strongly support criterion iv) that applications should demonstrate benefits to local communities. Objection – do not support the current approach of identifying specific areas of search which has misled many people into thinking that vast numbers of wind turbines are going to encircle York. Do not wish applications for renewable energy to be turned down because they are not in an area of search.	6518/16429	York Green Party
	Objection – no wind farms should be built until nearby residents have been made fully aware of the impact of the wind farm and agree to it. There should be practical demonstrations of the height and noise involved. Do not accept that wind farms are effective way of reducing carbon emissions given that their output is unreliable.	6519/16461	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	Objection – object to eh location of nay wind turbines in the York Area as included on the proposals map. Primary purpose of the green belt is to protect the views of the Minster across the relatively flat topography of the landscape. The location of wind turbines is detrimental to that purpose as well as de-spoiling the countryside views enjoyed by residents and of course compromising the most important function of the countryside in food production. If this city is to meet carbon emission targets then a different approach should be taken which is not so detrimental to the historic setting of the city. All industrial estates should be encouraged to incorporate solar panels, far more efficient than turbines and minus the visual effects on the skyline.	6521/16500	Cllr Mark Warters
	Objection – do not want the wind farms	6523/16510	
	Objection – to inclusion of land East of Metcalfe Lane as suitable for the siting of wind farms. Site is green belt which is offered full protection by RSS policy. Removing this land from green belt is counter to all five of the green belt objectives set out in the NPPF. Majority of the Heworth Without area remains characterised by open rural aspects and its character is visibly distinct to that of the urban area. Area is bounded by the historic stray, open farmland that forms one of the green wedges into the city	7313/17764	Cllr N Ayre

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and the currently unidentified green wedge around Tang Hall beck. The land clearly forms part of a distinct green wedge that characterises the city yet has not been included in the green belt appraisal. The proposals will coalesce boundaries with Osbaldwick resulting in the loss of two distinct and separate areas which is against the plan's own policies.</p> <p>No assessment has been made of the environmental impact of developing this site. Land currently houses numerous species.</p> <p>Evidence base includes the view from the A64 to the Minster as one 'which above all, capture and express the very image and essence of York' yet the plan proposes obstructing this. Site is listed in the Core Conservation Area Appraisal as one of the city's 26 key views. It is clear therefore that removing this land from the green belt would cause significant harm to the character setting and context of the city and would challenge the visibility of the Minster. Heritage Topic Paper states it is essential to protect the views of the Minster Tower from the Ring Road.</p> <p>There are numerous rights of way running through the land including the Millennium Way Walk. These provide informal recreational space for residents in an area of identified deficiency of open space and also key to experiencing the setting and character of the city as highlighted in the Heritage Topic Paper.</p> <p>Poll undertaken by the parish council showed over 95% of respondents were opposed to the plans.</p> <p>Information circulated failed to show sites for wind farms.</p>		
	<p>Objection – save the traditionally green belt protected sites adjacent to Copmanthorpe from being developed for renewable energy generation.</p>	<p>Petition 9</p>	
	<p>Objection – research into the effectiveness of wind power is needed before blighting the fields and countryside.</p>	<p>Petition 20</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction	Objection - part A only mentions cutting carbon and energy efficiency. Consider more should be done to recognise the importance of water efficiency and demand in the future especially when bearing in mind climate change. The efficient use of water resources is therefore important as climate change adaptation and mitigation measure.	3/11632	Environment Agency
	Comment – suggest changing policies to increase the number of green roofs, green walls, rain water harvesting and Sustainable Urban Drainage etc would be valuable for residents, would increase biodiversity, reduce pollution and could also save money for the city.	42/11722	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection - environmentally sustainable housing is becoming more economically viable, the plan should be more ambitious and lead the way on statutory BREEAM/Code for sustainable homes standards. BREEAM excellent standard should be required for commercial and residential. CC2 should include BREEAM excellent for building or conversion of non-residential and Code for Sustainable Homes standard 5 or 6 for building or conversion of residential. CC2 should also omit or more clearly define the term viable.	90/12825	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – the NPPF requires local planning authorities to adopt national sustainability standards. The current draft policy is more onerous than national standards. Future iteration of the Local Plan should reflect national standards.	144/12888	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Support - agree that should rely on 2010 Building Regulations for carbon savings (until proposed 2013 Building Regulations are implemented). Objection - the combined effect of the requirements set out in the policy will create significant viability issues for residential development and should be deleted. As noted elsewhere a thorough viability assessment of the cumulative impact of policies and obligations has not been undertaken. However given that the affordable housing requirement together with open space and education contributions already puts some development at risk it appears unlikely the plan could sustain such requirements. The plan does not provide any justification for setting a threshold of 10 homes or more for the implementation of the district heating requirements. The plan provides no justification for the threshold of 10 homes, or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government's national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The plan does not provide an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability	145/13877	Home Builders Federation

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and question the deliverability of the whole plan.		
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	Objection – the Chamber is concerned that the requirements of CC2 will discourage development through onerous requirements. The policy is unsound as it repeats and duplicates matters covered by other statutory codes. These matters are addressed under building regulations and it is up to the developer to decide how best to meet the targets in a way that best suits the business. Particularly concerned at the lack of justification for the requirements to meet code level 4 for new residential development and BREEAM excellent for major non residential developments. Also a lack of justification for the requirement for all new residential development of 10 dwellings or more and commercial development of (1000sqm+) to provide integrated combined heat and power and district/block heating networks or cooling infrastructure.	187/13923	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Objection –part B ‘consequential improvements to existing dwellings’ should be amended to include a reference to listed buildings and to conform with the statement in paragraph 20.18 that a flexible approach will be applied when dealing with listed buildings or buildings in conservation areas where it may be that measures that would help safeguard the asset from harm arising as a result of climate change will also be considered.	188/13954	
	Objection - focuses purely on energy demand and renewable technology and fails to include information and requirements related to water saving and sustainable drainage. Designing in and retrofitting water saving technology into developments is key to ensuring an adequate supply of clean water for future generations. Reducing the reliance on drinking water for tasks such as flushing toilets and watering gardens etc. should be considered in all new development.	295/14164	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection – disagree that an additional 10% CO2 saving should be applied to major residential developments. Noted in paragraph 20.13 that building regulations are being increasingly tightened up, do not agree that an additional burden should be placed on developers when this is occurring anyway through another set of regulations. Technologies are constantly improving; consider that these should be allowed to develop at their own speed so that when there is a requirement to achieve code 5 rating this will be technically and financially viable.	432/16554	Church Commissioners for England
	Objection - it is stated on page 213 that “The local plan has an important role in delivering sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”. The NPPF paragraph 95 states “when setting any local requirement for a building’s sustainability [local planning authorities should], do so in way consistent	434/16585	Associated British Foods plc

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>with the Governments zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standard". The Local Plan must not adopt requirements that exceed national policy. To do so may have an unacceptable impact on viability and deliverability, and would not be in accordance with the NPPF, in particular paragraph 173. There are no nationally adopted standards relating to Code for Sustainable Home (CSH) and BREEAM. The requirements highlighted at Policy CC2 Part A(i) (CSH Level 4 and BREEAM 'Excellent' for major non-residential developments) are therefore not in accordance with the NPPF. Object to this policy on these grounds. Policy CC2 does not accord with best practice which seeks to reduce the use of a resource and a polluting omission rather than mitigating for it. Reference is made in Policy CC2 to new development being required to integrate Combined Heat and Power and district / block heating networks or cooling infrastructure, unless it is technically unfeasible or unviable. Have serious concerns relating to the viability of such requirements and therefore object to this policy requirement, notwithstanding the reference made to viability in the policy. Comment - the Housing Standards Review process is likely to result in considerable changes to CSH and BREEAM. If the Government objective of reducing duplication, bureaucracy and complexity is to be achieved it is conceivable that CSH and BREEAM may be removed as a planning requirement. Furthermore the Government's zero carbon building policy is implemented via building regulations. The next change in building regulations is expected in October 2013. Whilst at the time of writing the carbon omission compliance target within the forthcoming building regulations has not been published, Government documentation indicates that it will be an improvement of 8% - 25% beyond the 2010 requirements. CSH Level 4 has a mandatory requirement for a carbon omission reduction beyond 25%. It is therefore likely that as soon as the changes to building regulations come into effect, CSH Level 4 will go beyond the Government's zero carbon building policy.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Support - the aims of this policy are not of concern. Objection - the NPPF includes guidance on meeting the challenge of climate change. It recognises that planning has a role to play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Paragraph 95 of the NPPF states specifically however with regard to setting local requirements for building sustainability that LPA's should do so in a way that it consistent with the Governments zero carbon building policy and "adopt nationally described standards". In setting local standards that depart from the national approach, evidence must be produced to test its viability or implications for output. Consideration should be given as to the effect on viability of the Code for Sustainable</p>	<p>452/16614</p>	<p>Miller Homes Ltd</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Homes (CSH) standards which are set out in the policy. For example, the cost review of the Code for Sustainable Homes published by the DCLG showed that the cost of building a 3 bedroom semi detached house on a small brownfield site (20 dwellings at 80 dwellings per Hectare) to Code level 4 would be 5.3% higher than to Code level 3; for Code level 5 this increases to 24.6%, and for Code level 6 it increases to 36.8%. All new residential developments effectively reach Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 because of updates to the Building Regulations during 2010. Equally, future changes to the Building Regulations will in effect enforce Code level 4 and upwards. In so doing, the Code will be wrapped up in the Building Regulations which are universally applied at the national level. The Building Regulations are a more logical and appropriate mechanism to control sustainable construction, and there is no need to replicate this in planning policy within the Local Plan, particularly in the circumstances here where the localised standards have not been justified, nor their implications on viability and ultimately delivery understood. The requirements of Policy in relation to the Code should therefore be deleted, and the national requirements through the Building Regulations should be enforced.</p>		
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	<p>Objection - the plan would benefit from the deletion of this unnecessary policy. The plan contains significant amounts of unnecessary policy which merely repeats or re-states NPPF policy. In consequence, the plan fails to be succinct as required by the NPPF (paragraph 17, first bullet). Policy in different language is likely to lead to ambiguity.</p>	544/16757	
	<p>Objection – number of concerns. Object to Part A(i) which sets out what needs to be submitted as part of application process (Sustainability and Sustainable Energy Statement). Inappropriate to request an assessment for all new development regardless of its location, also inappropriate to apply this to all minor and major development, given that not all of these would require an assessment. Policy should be more streamlined so that assessment is dependent on type of development proposed and its location. Should Local Plan be setting this out – shouldn't it be via a validation checklist? Recommended change: Part A (i) should be deleted and local validation checklist should instead set out criteria for requiring sustainable design and construction and this can be linked to CC2.</p> <p>Object to part A (i) point 1 – all new residential developments should be built to Code Level 4. Imposing standards over and above nationally set requirements is not acceptable. Far better and achieve far greater results in reduction of CO2 if Council provided wording in CC2 that addresses wasteful energy consumption levels in the</p>	659/15089	Persimmon Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>existing housing stock and commits to practical initiative to improve standards. Not aware of credible evidence base to justify why York should set energy rules different to rest of country. Government likely to delay when new homes are to be built to Code Level 4 standards, never mind zero carbon. Setting out locally prescribed standards with a specific date that is likely to change is unnecessary and unhelpful. Viability study has assumed all dwellings will be built to Code Level 4 and not at a higher code level, or at Zero Carbon Standards. There fore the Council should not allow the policy requirement to reach any of the Code Levels beyond the current level. Recommend that part A (i) is deleted and replaced with the following: "All development should comply with Building Regulations as at the time of construction unless otherwise agreed in writing by the NHBC.</p> <p>Object to CC2 part A (ii) and part C that require all allocated new sites of over 10 dwellings or more to integrate CHP and district/block heating networks or cooling infrastructure. Do not support this unjustified requirement. Should reflect Government requirements and viability work. Recommend deletion CC2 at part A (ii) and part C and instead the Council should allow Building Regulations to deliver set reductions in CO2 emissions.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Support – support the council’s suggestion that industry should rely on 2010 building regulations for carbon savings (until proposed 2013 regulations are implemented). Objection - the plan does not provide any justification for setting a threshold of 10 homes or more for the implementation of the district heating requirements. The Council have provided no justification for the threshold of 10 homes, or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government’s national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The Council have not provided an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The Councils own viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and raise into question the deliverability of the whole plan. Suggest that this policy be deleted.</p>	<p>673/16855</p>	<p>Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</p>
	<p>Comment – welcome the emphasis on decreasing carbon emissions. Would like to see a commitment that all new buildings be low (or zero) carbon.</p>	<p>1261/17141</p>	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	<p>Comment - in new developments as many, if not all, houses and apartment buildings should be oriented so that solar power collectors (PV or water heating) fitted on their roofs can be installed to operate to best advantage. In other words, there should be a preference for new housing developments to have south-sloping roofs rather than roofs that slope towards the west or east. This in turn may also have some influence on the planned layout of streets in such developments. Also solar power and/or ground-source technology should be built in from the start on new developments. The city centre has many listed buildings that cannot be fitted with rooftop solar energy collectors (unless those specially designed tiles that look like slates are used) so it is important for the city's overall carbon footprint and level of renewable energy technology that all new buildings as far as possible should be so fitted to 'even up the score'.</p>	1317/17250	
	<p>Support - the strategic principles of Policy CC2 to develop a strategy to achieve high standards of sustainable design and construction at Whinthorpe. Support the requirement for new development to submit a sustainability and energy statement to demonstrate that, as a minimum, the requirements of Policy CC2 have been implemented. With regard to district heating and combined heat and power networks. Halifax Estates supports in principle (subject to our recommended changes) the inclusion of minimum BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes (or suitable alternative) values unless it can be demonstrated that they are not feasible or viable. Should be aware, however, of the work of the Housing Standards Technical Review Group which is currently reviewing the viability of the Code for Sustainable Homes in light of the duplication between certain aspects of the code and Building Regulations. Support in principle the requirement for new major development to assess the viability of decentralised energy and also the inclusion of text to suggest that alternative options can be proposed if 'it is demonstrated that a better alternative for reducing carbon emissions for the development can be achieved or it is not technically possible'. Whilst support the inclusion of the Allowable Solutions requirements we feel it appropriate, however, to highlight that we are waiting for the government to publish its consultation paper on allowable solutions and confirm the final policy. Once this policy guidance is produced, will examine how this could be applied to Whinthorpe in accordance with the Building Regulations timetable. Would also be happy to engage in these discussions. Support the principle of decentralised energy provided that it presents the most commercially and technically viable solution to reducing carbon emissions which is typically the case within high density, mixed use urban</p>	1337/17293	Halifax Estates

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>redevelopment.</p> <p>Objection –concerned about the requirement for new residential development to provide the infrastructure for future connection to decentralised energy networks. This would appear to be an unreasonable cost to development if this solution has been discounted in favour of an alternative. Would recommend the following changes: A (i) – Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development. New residential development of 10 dwellings or more and non-residential development (of 1000m² or more) will be required to produce a Sustainability and Sustainable Energy Statement to demonstrate that the following minimum standards of construction (or other equivalent standard) are achieved, unless it can be demonstrated that they are not feasible or viable. A (i) sub-bullet 4 – Major Non-residential Developments: BREEAM Excellent–Major Non-residential Developments: BREEAM Very Good and, where viable, BREEAM Excellent. Paragraph C – District Heating and Combined Heat and Power Networks to be reworded as follows: For all allocated new development and residential development of 10 dwellings or more, and non residential development (of 1000m² or more) gross external floor space the Sustainable Energy Statement will assess the viability of integrating decentralised energy systems. Alternative solutions can be proposed should this not be commercially and technically viable and/ or if alternative solutions will result in similar levels of carbon emission savings. C. iv - We also request that bullet point iv. be deleted from the policy because it represents an unreasonable commercial implication if decentralised energy has been discounted.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Comment- ensuring that homes and communities are both energy efficient and resilient to the climate change challenges facing our built environment is one of the essential ingredients to the long term success of the local plan. Adherence to a general performance level of the code for sustainable homes is not considered fundamental in this regard. However the actual as built performance of the homes with respect to their energy demands (or lack of them) and durability against fluctuations in climates is. The setting of appropriate standards in these areas around external fabric performance and the ability to generate electricity/heat to sustain the home is where the policy focus should be.</p> <p>Objection – combined effect of the requirements of CC2 will create significant viability issues for residential development within York and should be deleted. As noted elsewhere a thorough viability assessment of the cumulative impact of local plan policies and obligations has not been undertaken. However given that the affordable housing requirement together with open space and education contributions already</p>	<p>1346/17312</p> <p>1514/17486</p>	<p>Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust</p> <p>Monks Cross North Consortium</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>puts some development at risk it appears unlikely the plan could sustain such requirements. The plan does not provide any justification for setting a threshold of 10 homes or more for the implementation of the district heating requirements. The Council have provided no justification for the threshold of 10 homes, or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government’s national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The plan does not provide an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and raise into question the deliverability of the whole plan. Recommended that this policy be deleted.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Objection - recognise the importance of sustainable design and construction and the need to minimise resource consumption. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to adopt national sustainability standards (para. 95). The currently drafted policy is more onerous than national standards. Trust that future iterations of the Local Plan will reflect national standards and hence not be more onerous than the NPPF.</p>	<p>1523/17511</p>	<p>Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd</p>
	<p>Objection - following the Government’s review “Red tape Challenge”, the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes is identified as duplication within existing regulations and standards. There were identified as providing a burden to the housing industry both in time and costs, particularly the cost in the administration and data collection. Additionally, the requirements of the draft policy exceed those set at the national level. This is contradictory to the NPPF. Setting standards that go beyond Building Regulations is also contrary to the findings of the majority of the members of the Standards Working Group that produced the report “A Review of Local Standards for the Delivery of New Homes”. The report states (p17) that, “...it appears unnecessary to set any standards beyond Building Regulations, assuming the current proposals to achieve zero carbon homes are maintained.” Development using a fabric first approach provides in-built measures for improving energy efficiency that are guaranteed to reduce the buildings energy demand over its lifetime. Limiting the dwellings in-built energy demand through high quality design and material specifications provides long-term energy reduction at the site. The use of renewable technology tackles the source of energy provision rather than energy demand. The fabric approach prevents the potential situation where maintenance and replacement or repair of on-site renewables</p>	<p>1661/9954</p>	<p>Linden Homes</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>does not occur and consequently the subsequent CO₂ savings (throughout the lifetime of the technology) can not be guaranteed. Paragraph Aii of Policy CC2 includes a requirement to connect to a CHP scheme. This may not prove cost effective not only for the developer, but prevents a change of energy supplier for residential occupiers. As such this affects the commercial viability for schemes requiring this technology. Paragraph B of the policy deals with consequential improvements to existing buildings. The proposals require savings beyond Building Regulations, however in accordance with the Government’s statements above, this should be unnecessary. In any event, there is no indication in the policy as to the extent of measures beyond part L which the Council would seek.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Objection- Code level 4 should be a minimum building standard not a general benchmark. Believes any new development should be built to code level 5/6 to establish the technology for zero carbon development and ensure York’s new houses are genuinely ‘fit for the future’ . Ditto the proposed BREEAM ratings in policy CC2 (also 20.14) which should be ‘Excellent’ (and where achievable, ‘Outstanding’) regardless of the size of non-residential developments.</p>	<p>1665/12974</p>	<p>York Environment Forum</p>
	<p>Objection - object to Policy CC2 which presents a large number of fundamental concerns which will inevitably prevent the level of housing growth required over the plan period. Part A i) of the policy requires all new development to produce a Sustainability and Sustainable Energy Statement. The responsibility of setting out what supporting information is required to accompany a planning application lies with the statutory national information requirements published by the Government and the local list published by the Local Planning Authority. This part of the policy should therefore be deleted. Object to Part A i) of the policy requiring residential development to meet as a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and a number of BREEAM ratings depending on the scale of development proposed. There is no evidence base to demonstrate that such requirements have been tested alongside all other policy requirements and that to implement such requirements would not render residential schemes unviable. The Affordable Housing Viability Study (AHVS) published in 2010 confirms in Chapter 5 that appraisals assume that all dwellings will be built to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. Paragraph 5.5 of the AHVS states that the study has not pursued Level 4 because there is no certainty that these higher levels will in fact be imposed. Given that the AHVS has only tested Level 3, the Local Plan is proposing uncertain targets which are unlikely to be feasible alongside all other policy requirements. Especially as the affordable housing requirement together with open</p>	<p>1668/15045</p>	<p>Barratt & David Wilson Homes</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>space and education contributions alone puts some development in York at risk. It is therefore highly likely that such a requirement would make a large number of schemes unviable. Requests that the requirement for all new residential development to meet as a minimum Level 4 should be deleted. Part A ii) of the policy requires all major development to make provision of and connection of infrastructure to a network for an existing or proposed Combined Heat and Power Station or District Heating Network. Whilst there has been a Yorkshire and Humber Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Capacity Study (2011) and a Renewable Energy Strategic Viability Study (2010), not aware of any evidence which has tested the cost implications of this alongside all other policy requirements to ensure that such requirements are viable across York. Aware ware that the latter of the two studies advices that CHP and District Heating should be explored on several of York’s key development opportunities thus implying that it may not be viable or feasible to do so on just these two key sites, let alone any other major development sites in York. Also note that the clause at the end of Part A ii) only applies to scenarios where it is “not technically possible”. Requests that the clause also applies to instances where it is also not viable to do so. The supporting text in paragraph 20.23 for this policy says that the Local Plan needs a positive strategy to encourage the opportunities to pursue CHP on all major development sites, subject to technical and financial viability. Therefore it says it should be encouraged as opposed to a requirement, plus it says that it should also be subject to technical and financial viability. The latter is clearly lacking from part A ii) of the policy. Part A iii) of the policy is unclear, lacks clarity and there is an insufficient amount of supporting text to explain the policy in more detail. A clear definition of ‘allowable solutions’ is necessary and it is unclear as to where this requirement has been derived from. Part B appears to overlap with part A ii) regarding the connection of new development with district heating and combined heat and power networks. We refer to our comments above setting out our concerns that to implement such requirements without testing all of the cumulative policy impacts from the local plan on the viability of development renders such a policy unsound.</p>		
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	<p>Objection – Code level 4 will come through building regulations and should not be brought in through this policy as it can affect viability of sites. Part C sets requirements in relation to District Heating and CHPs. This policy requirement is fundamentally unsound, there is no evidence to show that this can be delivered and it is likely to impact on viability significantly.</p>	1705/9796	Gladman Developments
	<p>Objection – new 2013 building regulations are considerably more onerous than the</p>	1785/9870	Jones Lang LaSalle

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	2010 regulations and have raised the bar on the sustainability requirements of new buildings. A requirement achieve further savings on top of these new requirements is neither realistic nor viable.		(LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	Comment – agrees that the +10% saving should be applied to major developments and that it would be easier for developers to implement if the council required level 5 for major development instead of the +10%. Agrees that all development should have to meet VREEAM very good or excellent. Agrees that homeowners undertaking some improvements to the energy efficiency of the existing house as part of alterations of extension applications is reasonable. Thinks it should be both defined as a % of the total build costs and defined as an improvement to EPC level. Would rather have a professional complete an EPC for a fee.	2846/7572	
	Comment – generally supporting coupled with a degree of scepticism with regard to the need for such an elaborate policy.	3356/8593	
	Comment – emphasis on sustainable development is about being carbon neutral. Policy is good but appears to ignore the equally important area of water conservation. Developers should be encouraged to include water conservation measures into any new development. Macro level measures could include water storage to control water surface runoff. Reed beds or similar to process sewerage would be a bonus. Micro level measures would facilitate use of grey water within dwellings for washing etc. The sustainability plan contains details about CHP systems but nothing about encouraging solar PV systems as an integral part of the properties.	4305/11178	
	Comment – agree that as residents install extensions etc they must improve the energy efficiency of the rest of the dwelling. Preferred options for the requirement to be a percentage of the extension building cost.	5124/12238	
	Support - of setting targets at CSH Level 4 or equivalent, recognising higher standards may not be achieved unless developer led. Support relying on 2010 Building Regulations for carbon savings until proposed 2013 Building Regulations are implemented. Comment - in response to question 20.4, for extensions or alterations to existing residential buildings supportive of the idea of consequential improvements that require home owners to undertake energy efficiency improvements to the existing house as part of the planning permission. However before such a policy is adopted it needs to be fully explained and evaluated or the costs say for older or listed properties could be prohibitive.	5178/12371	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	Objection - recognise the importance of sustainable design and construction and the need to minimise resource consumption. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to adopt national sustainability standards (paragraph 95). The currently drafted policy is more onerous than national standards. Trust that future iterations of the Local Plan will reflect national standards and hence not be more onerous than the NPPF.	5245/14341	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – no need to limit district heating systems to new developments, there is much local expertise in biomass, get Drax, local universities and firms on board to install some biomass boilers to reduce emissions. Help boost the local economy by mitigating fuel poverty and allowing households generally to spend less of their income on bills. Should aspire to have all developments, commercial and residential, meet the BREEAM excellent standards.	5419/14716	
	Support – securing sites for renewable energy.	5509/14890	
	Comment – any residential owners should do what is possible to improve energy efficiency it if will be offset by reductions in energy bills.	5674/13373	
	Comment – for developments over a certain size could eco-energy measures be mandated (such as ground source heat pumps at housing developments, or solar panels on roofs of retail buildings?).	5754/13599	
	Comment – pleased there are plans to reduce energy consumption in York. There should be robust conditions placed on any developments so that real energy efficiency is built into all new buildings and that this is not just a token effort.	5851/15096	
	Comment – building super green houses is all very well but there should be a relaxation in the regulations in order to bring the costs down.	5900/15212	
	Comment – consideration should be given to passive housing because of the very low energy requirements. In the case of Social Housing, or Council Housing, additional money invested in passive housing could be recouped in rents spread out over a longer period of time. Passive housing could therefore be considered for these forms of social housing, which would offer their tenants lower heating bills, amongst the other benefits of fresh air and avoidance of damp. Rooftop gardens and vegetable growing should be considered, reducing pressure on urban drainage system and cooling the city in summer.	6132/15569	
	Comment – a coherent Local Plan capable of delivering the energy transition to a low carbon future is absolutely vital to York. Local Plan must seek to empower local actors including the local authority, to take control of energy supply through the creation of local energy alliances. City must prepare an energy retrofitting plan for the whole building stock; ensure that new neighbourhood are 100% renewable. Whilst provision	6137/15588	

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>to expand district heating and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) in clause C of policy CC2 are welcomed, it cannot be enough to require networks to CHP heating and/or cooling to be incorporated into new residential developments, not will the piecemeal creation of micro CHP networks deliver the volume of dwelling heated by district heating that the city needs. Creation of a district heat network should be included in a broader strategic vision that includes public transport provision and waste management. Clear that simply setting targets, with a set of opt outs if those targets can be argued to be unreasonable, will not deliver sufficient change within the timescales that are required. City needs to set itself clear and demanding goals then take some of the investment risks in return for some of the profit. Will involve working in partnership with energy companies and property development companies to create the infrastructure changes that are required to deliver the energy transition to a low carbon future. For too long York has flattered itself that the challenges it faces are unique because of the historic character of York’s city centre. Renovation of such historic buildings should not be dismissed as undesirable or impossible and the Local Plan should require the Council to show new leadership on transforming the energy efficiency of its historic buildings. As 20.15 of the Local Plan Preferred options notes, 80% of the buildings that will be standing in 2050 in York have already been built, it’s therefore vital that ambitious targets for insulation, energy efficiency and use of renewable energy are incorporated into plans for the renovation of existing buildings. This must apply not only to post-war buildings but also historic buildings. Replacing single glazing with bespoke double glazing should be a minimum standard for all historic buildings. York’s high number of listed and historic buildings mean that local craftsmen will be able to develop a real expertise in such work which can bring new jobs to the city.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Objection - Policy CC2 requires that planning applications for major non-residential developments to meet a minimum standard of Bream ‘Excellent’. The requirement for major non-residential development should not exceed Building Regulations requirements. This needs to be considered alongside other design criteria. The NPPF paragraph 173 states that Local Planning Authorities should not impose policy burdens which threaten viability. This needs to be reflected upon in the Local Plan. The NPPF paragraph 95, bullet 3 states that setting a local requirement for a building’s sustainability should be consistent with the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy and adopt national standards.</p>	<p>6159/15660</p>	<p>Pegasus Group</p>

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued	<p>Objection – combined effect of the requirements of CC2 will create significant viability issues for residential development within York and should be deleted. As noted elsewhere a thorough viability assessment of the cumulative impact of local plan policies and obligations has not been undertaken. However given that the affordable housing requirement together with open space and education contributions already puts some development at risk it appears unlikely the plan could sustain such requirements. The plan does not provide any justification for setting a threshold of 10 homes or more for the implementation of the district heating requirements. The plan provides no justification for the threshold of 10 homes, or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government’s national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The plan has not provided an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and raise into question the deliverability of the whole plan. Recommended that this policy be deleted.</p>	6351/17641	Gladedale Estates
	<p>Comment – support aspirations of policy. However, given the national goal of zero net Carbon residential build by 2016, the adoption of the target of the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 throughout the timescale of the Plan is inadequate. It should be replaced by Level 6 with effect from 2016 at the latest.</p> <p>Section A – New Development</p> <p>i) from end of first sentence remove ‘unless it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable’. This should be as central a feature at the size of the rooms and details of fittings! Amend bullets points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Build Residential Developments: Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5-6***** - - Conversions of existing buildings and changes of use to residential for two or more dwellings, to achieve BREEAM Excellent unless constrained by the building being listed or in a conservation areas - Major and new minor non-residential developments: BREEAM excellent/outstanding <p>ii) Delete final words ‘or it is not technically possible’. If it is not technically possible then a better alternative will have to be found.</p>	6518/16430	York Green Party

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>iii) In the second sentence replace the word 'explore' with 'find and implement' Support policy of excluding 'Allowable Solutions' The idea of 'Allowable Solutions' for those aspects of Carbon Reduction which cannot be built into a given development needs further clarification if it is to avoid the pitfalls of the many 'Carbon Offset' schemes which have subsequently been shown to have failed in their stated aims. This policy will only work effectively if the various 'get out' clauses are removed. There is no justification for them given the situation we face with respect to climate change and energy supply.</p> <p>Section B Existing dwellings – support this approach Section C District Heating</p> <p>Delete at the end 'unless it is technically not feasible or viable.' Careful consideration needs to be given to suitable locations for district heating operated by biomass burners to take account of potential impact on air quality, allowing for factors such as location down wind from an AQMA, in a hollow or sheltered location. This may mean giving preference to locating the plant in a particular part of the site or working with an adjoining site to create a larger network with a more efficient burner.</p> <p>A robust policy is needed here in order to deliver new housing stock that is fit for the lifetime of the Plan and many years after that. If a developer can demonstrate excessive additional costs to meeting high standards of sustainability, then there should be some recourse to an amount of Government subsidy to support this. However, research is indicating that the cots of sustainable building is not high and can be recouped from the additional value in the dwellings in terms of reduced running costs. The council should make this kind of evidence available to prospective developers in support of its policies.</p>		
<p>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design And Construction Continued</p>	<p>Objection – concerned with section B of the policy. Given the tight timescales involved in determining planning applications it is likely that such improvements would be sought by condition. Unless a condition fairly and reasonably relates to the development to be permitted it will be ultra vires and at risk of being struck down at appeal. Fail to see how such a requirement would fairly and reasonably relate to the development. Note that the policy will be subject of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) but how is it going to define 'reasonable and proportionate'. The Council deals with over 1000 householder planning applications per annum. Also concerned that conditions would be deemed to be unreasonable and unduly onerous as they would have financial implications for the applicant. It is also the case that permitted development rights allow a multitude of house extensions to proceed</p>	<p>6520/16492</p>	<p>City Of York Council Development Management</p>

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	without planning permission without any requirement improve the energy rating of the existing dwelling. Can the requirements of the policy be applied consistently and fairly across the district?		
Para 20.11	Comment – hope that the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will include and encourage passivehaus and that this technology will be considered to form at least some of the house in all of the proposed new sustainable developments.	1665/12973	York Environment Forum
Para 20.13	Objection - these percentage uplift costs for achieving code level 4 have been incorrectly estimated as it has been incorrectly assumed that compliance with the next or forthcoming building regulations requirements and code level 4 mandatory requirements would be the same. As set out above this is not the case and therefore the uplift costs 3%-6% do not reflect the total costs but rather underestimate the additional costs this will put on new development.	434/16587	Associated British Foods plc
Para 20.18	Support – welcome the statement that ‘a flexible approach maybe applied when dealing with listed buildings in conservation areas’.	1665/12975	York Environment Forum
Para 20.20 – 20.23	Support – Welcome and support proposals for Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and District Heating in new developments. Agree with statement that ‘the local plan needs a positive strategy to encourage the opportunities to pursue CHP on all major development sites’.	1665/12976	York Environment Forum

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 20.01	Support - the provision of generic local criteria/locations to guide renewable and low carbon energy development. Support setting targets at CSH Level 4. Support relying on 2012 Building Regulations for carbon savings until proposed 2013 Building Regulations are implemented.	59/12674	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection - the plan does not provide any justification for the contention that large developments should contribute to an additional 10% reduction in CO2 omissions on top of the other requirements. The plan provides no evidence this can be achieved or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government's national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The Plan does not provide an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and raise into question the deliverability of the whole plan.	145/13876	Home Builders Federation
	Support - agree with the preferred approach to renewable and low carbon energy development, code for sustainable homes and building regulations.	188/13955	
	Support - the preferred approach should be undertaken.	943/16966	
	Support - the approach to Climate Change in the Local Plan.	1337/17294	Halifax Estates
	Support - the provision of generic local criteria /locations to guide renewable and low carbon energy development. Support setting targets at CSH Level 4 or equivalent, recognising higher standards may not be achieved unless developer led. Support relying on 2010 Building Regulations for carbon savings until proposed 2013 Building Regulations are implemented. For extensions or alterations to existing residential buildings I support the idea of consequential improvements that require home owners to undertake energy efficiency improvements to the existing house as part of the planning permission. However before such a policy is adopted it needs to be fully explained and evaluated or the costs say for older or listed properties could be prohibitive.	1457/17429	
	Support – approach, particularly with regard to need for a much more proactive approach to planning for renewable energy.	1665/12977	York Environment Forum
	Objection - Option 3 is not the best option has it potentially blights the whole of York's green belt. A combination of options 1 and 4 could ensure that any development take place well away from residential areas and does not impact on city views. Sites where	5767/13644	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	planning applications have already been rejected (Hagg wood) should not be proposed.		
Question 20.02	Objection - Option A should be followed with a +10% savings for all developments applied.	529/16691	
	Objection - the plan does not provide any justification for the contention that large developments should contribute to an additional 10% reduction in CO2 omissions on top of the other requirements. The plan provides no evidence this can be achieved or the cost implications of implementation. The cumulative impact of these and other requirements and obligations are likely to seriously jeopardise site viability. The Government’s national standards for construction are set out within the Building Regulations. The plan does not provide an adequate justification for departing from these standards. The viability assessment indicates the cumulative impacts of a limited number of policies and obligations contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options would seriously compromise viability in certain locations. The inclusion of additional standards and thresholds will further compound the viability issues and raise into question the deliverability of the whole plan.	673/16856	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
	Objection - Option A should be followed with a +10% savings for all developments applied.	835/16915	
	Objection - the 10% saving should be applied.	943/16967	
	Comment - do not believe that an additional +10% energy saving should be applied to major developments as the requirement for Code Level 4 alone is considerable and significantly beyond the current Building Regulations (2010) and the proposed 2013 iteration of the regulations. Once the requirement of the Building Regulations exceeds the corresponding energy requirement for Code for Sustainable Homes then we would recommend that Building Regulations is adopted as the main local mechanism to secure carbon emission reductions. Do not believe that Code level 5 is appropriate for major development because this is a significant additional cost and technical constraint that will challenge the viability of delivery. Would welcome the opportunity to discuss how the strategic aims of Policy CC2 can be applied to Whinthorpe (ST15).	1337/17295	Halifax Estates
	Comment - do not think that a 10% saving should be required, nor should level 5 be applied. The policy should remain as currently drafted requiring a minimum of level 4. Anything above this should be an aspiration rather than a minimum requirement.	1785/9871	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
Question 20.03	Comment - BREEAM excellent should be met.	529/16692	
	Comment - BREEAM excellent should be met	835/16916	
	Comment - in relation to commercial development the BREEAM excellent standard should be adopted.	943/16968	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 20.03 Continued	Objection - do not believe that all development should have to meet BREEAM Very Good or Excellent. This is because for minor development (less than 1000m ²) it is not always possible to meet this requirement, particularly if this development is a refurbishment. We do believe that major development should commit to BREEAM Very Good with an aspiration for Excellent. It is highly likely that the BREEAM standard will be updated during the life of the Local Plan with the possibility that a BREEAM Excellent rating under the current guidance (BREEAM 2011 New Construction) becomes considerably more challenging under future guidance. It is important therefore that the Policy text includes a clause for viability and technical assessment.	1337/17296	Halifax Estates
	Comment - the achievement of BREEAM 'excellent' as a minimum for all major non residential development is not realistic. It is suggested that the policy working read a minimum BREEAM; very good requirement with an aspiration to achieve excellent.	1785/9872	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
Question 20.04	Comment - for extensions or alterations to existing residential buildings we support the idea of consequential improvements. However, before such a policy is adopted, it needs to be fully explained and evaluated or the costs say for older or listed properties could be prohibitive.	59/12675	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support - the preferred approach to consequential improvements, amended to take account of improvement to designated assets i.e. listed buildings.	188/13956	
	Comment - it is not reasonable to have to address improvements to the unaltered part of the home.	529/16693	
	Comment - it is not reasonable to have to address improvements to the unaltered part of the home.	835/16917	
	Comment - it is reasonable to require that home owners undertake some improvements to the energy efficiency of the existing house as part of the planning permission for extensions or alternations to the property. The method for calculation of the extent of works the homeowner has to undertake would be fairest if it is defined as an improvement in the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) level as it is outcome related.	1109/17213	
	Comment - for extensions or alterations to existing residential buildings supportive of the idea of consequential improvements that require home owners to undertake energy efficiency improvements to the existing house as part of the planning permission. However before such a policy is adopted it needs to be fully explained and evaluated or the costs say for older or listed properties could be prohibitive.	1457/17430	
	Comment - 'Consequential improvements' for homeowners applying for extensions and alterations: suspect these homeowners will feel unfairly penalised by the extra costs	1665/12978	York Environment Forum

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 20: Climate Change Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	involved for the extra works. Are there not more attractive offers that could be presented to incentivise all residents to take actions to improve the energy fabric of their homes?		
Question 20.04 Continued	Comment - It is reasonable to require that home owners undertake some improvements to the energy efficiency of the existing house as part of the planning permission for extensions or alternations to the property. The method for calculation of the extent of works the homeowner has to undertake should be defined as an improvement in the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) level. Would rather have a professional complete an EPC for a fee.	2416/6682	