

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 26: Delivery and Monitoring**

**April 2014**

**Section 26: Delivery & Monitoring**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	Objection – would strongly recommend that the following target is also included for Policy EQ3: Land Contamination: ‘no pollutants being released into local watercourses from developers remediating land contamination.’ Further details provided in rep.	3/11637	Environment Agency
	Objection – the plan should detail a mechanism that gives the lowest units of local democracy (like parish councils) a meaningful role in monitoring the delivery of the Plan perhaps in the form of an Audit committee.	59/12680	Dunnington Parish Council
	Objection – section 26.16 talks about risks and contingencies in delivering the plan. Adequate staffing within CYC to mitigate these risks should be mentioned.	88/12818	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Comment – suggest that policies on implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 contributions are finalised, on the assumption that central Government funding will not be available. This is a reasonable position to adopt, as without such a resolution development may not take place, and the Plan rejected on examination as being undeliverable. The viability question is well covered in paragraphs 2.1 – 2.23. Para 2.12 – before development takes place is admirable, the ‘get out’ clause ‘as far as is reasonably practicable’ is insufficiently prescriptive and could be used by developers. The paragraph should be re-written stating that local policies will not permit development without adequate infrastructure being in place. Paragraphs 3.9 – 3.11 – the presumption that S106 contributions will be sufficient to cover strategic infrastructure costs is fanciful. Many of the contributions are far too low to be considered as contributing to strategic infrastructure. Paragraph 4.12 – the proposed major housing developments on Greenfield sites will require major infrastructure investment in transport in advance of development, no indication that a fallback position has been prepared if funding cannot be secured, which is highly likely. Paragraphs 4.30 – 4.35 – affordable housing need to 2016 is approx. 4000 units, averaged at 20% this equates to 20000 new build units which is totally unrealistic. The approach could well be dismissed out-of-hand at examination as being undeliverable. ST8 and ST14 will require major sewerage infrastructure as the system is already overloaded. Is it realistic to expect housing developers to contribute to strategic off-site works without increasing house prices to an unviable level?	103/12866	York Tomorrow
	Comment – there should be constant vigilance in implementing the Plan i.e. by ensuring delivery times and schedules and monitoring the progress undertaken, thus maintaining adequate control over the Plan.	943/16978	
	Objection – the Plan should detail a mechanism that gives the lowest units of local democracy (like Parish Councils) a meaningful role in monitoring the delivery of the	1457/17436	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 26: Delivery and Monitoring**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	Plan perhaps in the form of an Audit committee.		
<b>General Continued</b>	Objection – the Delivery and Monitoring Table in the Plan does not align with some of the Plan policies. For example – there is no target to ensure that the sites listed on pages 108 to 111 of the Plan are brought forward in line with the estimated phasing indicated.	1668/15048	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Comment – the Plan is wide ranging, covering a multitude of amenities for locals and visitors alike. However, there is no mention of how this is all to be paid for or by whom.	2009/600	
	Objection – the targets in the Plan seem very optimistic.	2416/6688	
	Comment – it is hoped that there will be great improvements in monitoring and delivery. There are several developments with historic S106 conditions that are still unresolved.	4819/14312	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection – the Plan should detail a mechanism that gives the lowest units of local democracy (like Parish Councils) a meaningful role in monitoring the delivery of the Plan perhaps in the form of an Audit committee.	5178/12460	
<b>Para 26.01</b>	Comment – this section states 'York's Local Plan has been prepared by the Council but it is the spatial expression of the Without Walls Partnership's Strategy for York'. What qualifications and authority does Without Walls Partnership have for setting York's strategy? What does 'spatial expression' mean?	5667/13340	
<b>Para 26.03</b>	Comment – dismayed that only one sentence has been written about private developers. Fear that if the large/established housing developers are used they will deliver the minimum requirements – soulless buildings and streets devoid of character. Has any thought been given to house building co-operatives and social enterprises?	4771/14271	
<b>Para 26.04</b>	Comment – little has been mentioned about the planning application process. For a fully transparent process to take place, please ensure that independent officials and councillors sit on these planning committees.	4771/14272	
<b>Para 26.18</b>	Objection – prefer to see explicit support within Section 26 of the Plan that the Annual Monitoring Report will be the mechanism for monitoring the effects of policies. Recommend the following sentence be added to the monitoring part of Section 26: 'The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will report on how the policies contained in the Local Plan are being progressed.' Would also recommend the following sentence be added to paragraph 26.18: 'When new and updated evidence, for example on housing need becomes available, the Council will automatically review its housing needs' (this wording will ensure an automatic review of housing needs takes place, without leaving	659/15094	Persimmon Homes

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 26: Delivery and Monitoring**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	it up to the Council to decide on whether or not to review housing needs). However, concerned by a suggested 'Managed Release' mechanism being introduced, through the AMR process, if housing provision was 20% higher than that planned for, as stated at paragraph 10.9 of Chapter 10 in the Local Plan.		