

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>97 Airfield Business Park</b>	Comment – various development sites proposed are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. The Council is currently working with the Highways Agency and the City of York Council to assess the cumulative impact of both Authorities’ Local Plan development aspirations on the interchange. It is therefore important that the modified/additional sites, in particular, are likely to have an impact on the interchange: Site 97, ST7, ST15, SF3, 811, 802, 815, 22, 747, 794. These sites in particular, should therefore be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18960	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – proposed site extends into an area of Green Belt and is inappropriate development. There are no special circumstances attached to this site which would warrant the breaching of Green Belt status. The proposal, if adopted, would increase the size of the present Airfield Industrial site by 200%. This is a huge increase and totally without justification, as there is no proven need for extra industrial development here. Proposed site would have huge adverse effect on B1228. Extra traffic generated would cause chaos. The road bridge over the River Derwent is narrow and humped back. As with the other proposed sites in Elvington, any kind of development can only add to the strain on the existing infrastructure which is already at breaking point.	34/19142	Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council
	Objection –opposed to the scale of the proposed development. The increased number of HGV movements would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre, which is already recognised as excessive for safe use by children walking and cycling to school. If through HGV traffic was banned from the village centre (as in all neighbouring villages) then a major objection to this development would have been overcome. The Parish Council supports additional land being allocated for industrial use at the Airfield Industrial Estate to allow employment opportunities – but only if it is proportionate.	61/18831	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection – consideration should be made for improving the public rights of way network in this area as part of any consent.	91/19620	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Objection- oppose the designation as an employment site, presumably this is felt to be appropriate alongside the Whinthorpe development. Whilst there is logic to adding employment opportunities close to the development, this is outweighed by over development and urbanisation of the area the two sites together would constitute overwhelming Elvington.	386/18900	York Green Party
	Objection – the size of this proposal is excessive for the location. There would be a loss of amenity in the village. The road network is inadequate. The site encroaches onto a site of importance for nature. There needs to be a buffer zone.	657/23779	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion of the site in the local plan.	943/20515	
	Objection- no consideration has been given to the infrastructure of the village and its	1008/18206	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surroundings. More factories may lead to more employment but there is an unmentioned cost to this far as Elvington is concerned. There is already a surfeit of HGV's and other traffic speeding through the village. The new speed limits are largely ignored. Crossing the road and cycling on the road are dangerous.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2. If all the new sites are used, this will nearly double the size of the village. The infrastructure we have will not be able to cope. The road to Elvington from York is in a bad state already. It is used by a lot of traffic and many large lorries.	1152/26942	
	Objection- concern regarding the heavy lorry traffic, plus the safeguarding of Green Belt land at this time.	1175/18212	
	Comment- due to its location, the site may have an impact on the strategic road network and would therefore be of interest to the Agency.	1264/18586	Highways Agency
	Objection- residents and community representatives have expressed grave concerns over existing traffic and congestion issues through the village. There is fear that this development will increase HGV traffic in the village and worsen the existing safety risk to residents and children. When considered alongside other proposals in the village, the overall scale of development is disproportionate to its size.	1355/18610	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – unattractive proposition to the market. Not well related to the strategic highway network.	1512/20575	Tangent Properties
	Objection- site proposal is disproportionate in scale to meet future business needs within the Local Plan period. It should be scaled back. Several units on the existing developed part of the estate are currently vacant, indicating that supply already exceeds demand. The proposal is over-aspirational. The whole of the site lies centrally on the Elvington Tillmire Biodiversity Corridor which is of national importance for the preservation of wildlife. The land is a haven for a broad range of species. A recent poll of Elvington residents indicates 90% opposition to the scale of this development.	1666/20440	
	Objection – destruction of the Green Belt, some of which is currently in agricultural use. This is inappropriate development of the Green Belt. Transport network of roads are not designed to cope with the large volumes of traffic this development would bring. It would fail to cope. The infrastructure is so insufficient there is significant increase in the risk of road traffic accidents. Would significantly increase the drainage problems for the village. Sewerage facilities are at capacity already. Increase risk of flooding due to rush of surface water. Area is rich in flora and fauna. Will significantly impact on the privacy and amenity of the surrounding households, reducing quality of life. The addition of B2 uses is not suitable for the location which paves the way for more noisy and intrusive uses.	1667/23796	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Support- the archaeological potential of this site is considered low to moderate. Detailed comments provided regarding flooding and archaeology, see response.	1674/18813	William Birch & Sons
	Objection- this site lies almost immediately south of the existing airfield, which is a Brownfield site. Removing this site alongside site 815 and allocating land on the airfield would make best use of previously developed land, serviced land and protect open countryside from encroachment and remove the need to take undeveloped land out of the Green Belt.	1736/18520	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection- although it is good to develop the Business park, too much development will not be good for the community. Concern regarding traffic through the village, pedestrian and especially children’s safety and poor roads. The environment needs protecting.	2658/22253	
	Objection- this site does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17936	
	Objection- concern regarding the lack of plans to develop schools, the medical practice, sewerage, surface water drainage and traffic flow. The country is under great pressure as a nation to provide food and green energy all of which needs Green Belt land. Building on Brownfield sites must be exhausted first. The essential character of the village will be destroyed for ever and it will just become another expanding small town.	2720/17787	
	Objection – the B1228 is already heavily congested. Additional HGV traffic will be dangerous for pedestrians and cause additional pollution. Lack of engagement with the local community. No attempt to try and build a consensus with the village community.	3031/20704	
	Objection - the proposed allocation is an increase of nearly 200%. This is excessive for such a location. A 1ha site has already been allocated for expansion of the Elvington Industrial Estate. If this is combined with what is already left to develop at the existing Airfield Business Park, this is sufficient for the life of the Local Plan based on the previous growth rate at the industrial estates. The proposed allocation could generate a nuisance to local residents and local businesses including the Air museum. The Road network into Elvington is already inadequate for such a scale of development. The narrow B road is the only way to reach the site. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak times. As Elvington has a very poor bus service, the majority of workers at the park will need a private vehicle. A weight limit would also be necessary on Sutton Bridge due to the increased HGV activity the proposals would surely bring. The foul drainage system is already at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife and plants, which will be affected by any further development at the site. There would need to be buffer zones to protect the wildlife from further development. The proposed allocation takes up previous agricultural land within the Green Belt and is inappropriate development.	3046/21964	
	Objection- development would result in loss of the Green Belt, which would have an adverse impact on wildlife and environmental impact. Development is too large and will put increased	3063/22265	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pressure on the road network. Heavy traffic through the village needs to be reduced, not increased.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – this road is very busy and this would make it more dangerous. This would adversely affect the approach to the village. There is no infrastructure to support this.	3108/23851	
	Objection – concern regarding the state of the B1228 and its ability to take more heavy traffic. There is already a couple of haulage firms based there, which cause noise and disruption through the village if they turn right out of the industrial estate. The road through the village is narrow in parts and dangerous if two HGVs meet going in opposite directions. The suitability of the road would have to be looked at carefully and the road may have to be improved.	3113/22270	
	Objection – there would be an increase of HGVs which is dangerous.	3135/23862	
	Objection- question raised whether there is a need, there are currently empty units on the industrial estate and elsewhere in the York region. There is no evidence of need.	3220/23875	
	Comment – do not object in principle to the expansion but consider that the land to be taken out of the Green Belt should be at the most half of the suggested areas. Major concern is the increase in heavy goods vehicles on the already busy B1228.	3532/23905	
	Objection- an increase of nearly 200% is excessive for such a location. A 1ha site has already been allocated and if you combine this with what is already left to develop at the existing Airfield park this is sufficient for the life of the local plan. The proposal takes up previous agricultural land within the Greenbelt. The road network to Elvington is inadequate for the scale of development. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak times, the bus service is poor and there are no other forms of transport. A weight limit would also need to be introduced on Sutton Bridge due to increased HGV activity to avoid disturbance to residents. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife, as such buffer zones are required as a minimum to protect wildlife from development.	3598/23920	
	Objection – there is still room on the existing site. Lorries already cause a lot of congestion. The junction is not safe due to reduced vision. Pavements in the village are narrow and lorries pass very close. The bridge is not designed to take the weight of HGVs. This is Green Belt land and a haven for butterflies and dragonflies.	3909/23937	
	Objection – current site is unsuitable due to road infrastructure. Access to the proposed site is limited which would increase traffic on Halifax Way and Elvington Lane. This could lead to an increase in accidents due to limited points for overtaking. Roads are in poor condition, improvement would increase cost of road maintenance. The number of vehicles would increase, causing lack of parking spaces and blocked access. A Traffic Impact Assessment showed that there were adequate parking spaces but had doubts whether more could be accommodated.	5146/22370	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Sustainable transport options are limited at this site. There are a number of commercial properties available in Dunnington and Wheldrake. The proposed boundaries would double the size of the area so the take up of such units would be unsustainable. Development would alter the character of the area and undermine the understanding of the role it played in World War 2. The local area is rural and full of wildlife which needs protecting. The sites should be safeguarded. It could lead to additional noise pollution with increases in deliveries, noise from machinery and disposal and creation of waste.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – site is not appropriate for a factory. It is Green Belt land. Flooding would be more likely. Biodiversity would be greatly affected. Land size is too large. All previous development has been on Brownfield land.	5153/22386	
	Objection- these proposals are excessive in this rural location. The overall effect is to further industrialise this area. The expansion would bring the current moderate separation of the Airfield and the village even closer. Such creeping destruction of the Greenbelt is contrary to Green Belt policy. There are major transport implications with this proposal.	5235/23993	
	Objection –too much development (both residential and industrial) is being proposed for Elvington, which is a small rural community. The scale of the allocation seems excessive for such a location in a rural setting. The existing business park covers some 8 hectares (19.7 acres) and although well-developed, there is still some land within its existing boundaries which has not yet been developed. The proposed allocation of a further 8.4ha would double the current size, and is simply excessive for such a location. A 1ha site has already been allocated for expansion of the Elvington Industrial Estate. Adding this to the amount of land that has not yet been developed at the existing Airfield Business Park, these two areas should be sufficient for the life of the Local Plan based on the previous growth rate at the industrial estates. The addition of B2 uses could generate a nuisance to local businesses including the Air museum as well as to local residents. If even part of this proposed extension goes ahead, it should also be limited to B1 and B8. Traffic congestion is already an issue at peak periods. Since Elvington has a very poor bus service and no other possible form of public transport, most workers at the park would need a private vehicle as Elvington is too far out of York and the B1228 too unsafe for most workers to consider cycling. Another key consideration is the local infrastructure. The foul drainage system in Elvington is at capacity. The scale of the proposed allocation will cause problems going forward unless significant investment is made first to prevent problems before they happen. Part of the site is a haven for butterflies, dragonflies and a wide variety of flora and fauna which will be detrimentally affected by any further development at the site. Buffer zones should be created to protect the wildlife from further development.	5259/20065	
	Objection- Elvington Lane is narrow and in places has a terrible surface. There have been many	5284/18384	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accidents on that lane and there are no facilities for cyclists or pedestrians. There is so much Brownfield land at the airfield which should be developed first. Unless an amendment to the Local Plan is made to indicate how infrastructure is to be improved and maintained, this development should not go ahead.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – this proposal is excessive in this location. This is previous agricultural land and Green Belt. The road network is inadequate. Traffic is already heavy. The bridge would need a weight limit. Infrastructure is already struggling with traffic levels.	5423/24016	
	Objection- the scale of the allocation is excessive for this site. There is already a problem with the volume of traffic, traffic congestion and HGV's already causing a huge risk driving through the village. Sutton Bridge would require a weight limit due to the HGV increase. The foul drainage system is at capacity and the proposed development uses up land within the Greenbelt which is classed as 'inappropriate development'.	5439/24025	
	Objection – the village deserves to retain its status. Infrastructure, schools, sewerage, roads or doctors are all at capacity. Green belt land. Disproportionate development would alter the character and nature of the village. Dangerous roads. No reason to site Gypsy and Travellers site in Elvington. The village is not equipped to handle an influx of potentially transient residents. Neither the local employment opportunities, nor the infrastructure. Is it a totally unsuitable site.	5450/21816	
	Objection- the Airfield Business Park already generates vast amounts of extra traffic to and from it. The amount of HGVs using it and the chemical works has increased significantly over the years. The road surface is already suffering.	5535/18010	
	Objection- the Airfield Business Park already generates vast amounts of extra traffic to and from it. The amount of HGVs using it and the chemical works has increased significantly over the years. The road surface is already suffering.	5536/18015	
	Objection- the B1228 that runs through the village is already very busy at peak periods and this will further increase the volume of traffic. This is already a concern at current volumes especially as speed restrictions are not always observed which poses a risk to residents. Development of these sites should be in proportion to the residential element of the village and not cause problems for the village/community. Some of the land is Green Belt and should remain so.	5571/20757	
	Objection- the B1228 that runs through the village is already very busy at peak periods and this will further increase the volume of traffic. This is already a concern at current volumes especially as speed restrictions are not always observed which poses a risk to residents. Development of these sites should be in proportion to the residential element of the village and not cause problems for the village/community. Some of the land is Green Belt and should	5572/20763	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	remain so.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – this development will create an increase in traffic and an increase in noise. An increase in the number of HGVs passing through the village will be an increased safety risk to residents. There is no need for the extensions as there are empty properties on the three existing industrial estates at Elvington. Removing land from the green belt may lead to potential loss of rural farming communities.	5738/20867	
	Objection – the scale of the allocation seems excessive. Some of the existing units on the site are not occupied, so there is no reason for additional land to be made available for development. The current roads around Elvington are inadequate for the scale of the development. More HGVs on the road from York and through the village would pose a real danger. A ban on HGVs through the village could help. The increased traffic caused by workers getting to and from the estate would cause heavy congestion at this side of the city. Elvington’s drainage system is at capacity and unless significant investment is made prior to development the scale of the proposal will cause problems. A small amount of residential and industrial development could be sustainable, though almost doubling the size of an industrial site within a rural setting such as this is inappropriate.	5741/20871	
	Objection – development will significantly increase the size of the business park which is not proportionate or reasonable. It has already been proposed that this land be extended and developed. This proposal would mean that there is sufficient land and development in line with the plan. Removing land from the Green Belt is not appropriate. The site would accommodate general industry which could lead to complaints by residents in the village. There is one main road in and out of Elvington and this road is not suitable for an increase in traffic volume. Traffic is already a problem at rush hour. Transport links are extremely poor with limited bus services to and from York. Drainage system is full. Development would also affect the wildlife in the area.	5842/22390	
	Objection- several considerations need taking into account if further developments are to go ahead such as medical, education, sewage, health and safety and Land acts. Barn owl populations in the area are well known and these would be threatened if further development takes place. If such a proposal goes through it would be a grave mistake, leading to the ruination of a perfectly nice village both from a buildings and wildlife perspective. Proposals should be on Brownfield sites.	6036/19225	
	Objection- brownfield sites should be used for industrial development, not Greenfield land used for agriculture. Traffic through Elvington is already very heavy and to add to it would be hazardous. The road would need widening and straightening which would be expensive. The sewage system is already at capacity and already drains get blocked in the winter.	6196/18022	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection –strongly opposed to any developments within the Elvington radius.	6281/21033	
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- the airfield is well developed and still has land to be developed. It doesn't need an increase of 200%. This is excessive for this location. Green belt land should be kept as Green Belt. The road network into Elvington can't cope with the traffic. The drainage system in Elvington is at full capacity. Part of this proposed site is a haven for wild life. This is protected so the proposed development would go through this haven.	8313/24091	
	Objection – demand is extremely limited on this site. There is already sufficient land for the foreseeable future. The scale is inappropriate. The site is in the Green Belt. There is limited public transport. HGVs already cause significant problems in the village.	9258/24097	
	Objection- B1228 already very busy and in a poor state of repair. Will increase HGV traffic in village – safety risk to residents, especially children.	9265/22414	
	Objection- Elvington is a village not a town, which has no infrastructure to support any of the proposals, with no guarantee that any of the necessary infrastructure will follow these developments.	9278/18038	
	Objection- development will increase HGV traffic in the village. Concern about small children, pensioners and family pets. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the residents in the village.	9283/19447	
	Objection- the B1228 is already very busy and in poor state of repair and poorly maintained. It will increase HGV traffic in the village. There is a safety risk to residents. Any development should be proportionate to residential size of the village.	9436/18458	
	Objection- before any development CYC must introduce an HGV weight limit as HGVs already present a safety hazard. Not against a proportionate increase in the size of the business park, however combined proposals for both 97 and 815 amount to tripling the size, which is unrealistic. Neither Grimston Bar nor the B1227 could safely accommodate this amount of additional traffic. Assuming business current usage density on existing industrial sites there would be more business properties than residential properties, turning Elvington into a business park with some residential accommodation.	9441/19109	
	Objection – the allocation of this site is an increase of 200% which is very excessive. There will be loss of Green Belt land which is inappropriate development. There will be an increase in traffic on the nearby roads, which are already very busy. There will be an increase in HGV's in the area. There will be more fumes in the area creating more pollution, which is already bad. The drainage system is already at full capacity. Part of the site is a haven for butterflies, dragonflies, and a variety of flora and fauna which will be affected by further development. There will be extra noise to local residents and businesses. Elvington has a very poor bus service and as there is no other form of transport in the area a lot of the workers will be using	9448/19448	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	private vehicles.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – this is previous agricultural land in the Green Belt. The road network is inadequate for this development. Traffic congestion is already bad. There is a poor bus service. Sutton bridge will require a weight limit. Part of the site hosts a wide variety of flora and fauna.	9462/24125	
	Objection – see survey 2. The proposed plan will double the size of the village and result in the over development of Elvington.	9470/22423	
	Objection- the proposal is unwelcome, unsuitable and unnecessary. The existing site still has land to be developed. With this proposal and other proposals in the village, this could result in a 200% increase in size which is excessive in a rural local. The proposal takes up agricultural land in the Green Belt and therefore is inappropriate development. Part of this site provides a green corridor and is haven for fauna and flora. Any inclusion of this will require a buffer zone. The addition of B2 uses on the site could create a nuisance like noise which would adversely affect local residents and businesses. Public transport is poor. Elvington has narrow roads and traffic congestion is already bad. The foul drainage system is already at capacity.	9473/18491	
	Objection- the site would represent an almost 200% increase in the business park which is excessive for its location. The land is Green Belt and therefore is not in the best interests of the environment. The flora and fauna on this site is diverse and is a haven for butterflies and dragonflies. Public transport to this site is limited. The road network leading to this site is already inadequate and further traffic would add to the problem.	9476/18731	
	Objection – this will increase HGV traffic and the roads are not suitable.	9484/18747	
	Objection- the sewage is already at capacity.	9501/18656	
	Objection- the proposal would increase the number of HGVs through the village and the widths of roads are already a great danger.	9518/18692	
	Objection- development would increase traffic congestion and disruption to the centre of Elvington. There are safety concerns due to increased commercial traffic, and there are infrastructure concerns.	9528/22431	
	Object – village infrastructure already strained. School is full. Village centre is dangerous with parked and speeding traffic. Roads are overburdened.	9556/19083	
	Comment - industrial development seems inevitable. Goods could be created but the bigger problem is the traffic.	9602/24148	
Objection- the proposal for this site and others in the village would be an increase of nearly 200% which is excessive in this location. The allocation takes up agricultural land within the Green Belt which is inappropriate development. Development would result in an increase in vehicle access and the main road could not cope with this. Traffic is already a problem and the single lane bridge over the River Derwent was not constructed to handle larger vehicles. The	9640/22465		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	foul drainage system is at capacity in Elvington and part of the site is a haven for wildlife and a wide range of flora and fauna which will be affected by further development at the site. Buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect this wildlife.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- the B1228 is already a very busy road and there is often congestion and parking problems in the village. The road surface is poor due to the heavy traffic and an increase in traffic will only exacerbate these problems.	9647/19318	
	Objection- the inclusion of B2 uses could bring heavy industry to the area which is inappropriate. It could create a nuisance to local residents and businesses. Doubling the size of the business park would put pressure on the network of roads and would increase the volume of heavy vehicles flowing through the village. The expansion is disproportionate in size and would create road safety issues.	9667/19452	
	Objection- development will increase traffic. There is a listed property on Main Street which already shakes with HGVs passing. There have been pets killed on the road. This is meant to be a sleepy village not a motorway stop for HGVs.	9670/20134	
	Objection- land is Green Belt and should be kept as agricultural land.. Concern that the character of York will be changed by surrounding the city with industrial sites which will further increase traffic on the roads. Public transport is poor.	9726/20199	
	Objection – scale of proposals is unnecessary at the edge of a small rural village. Land and buildings continue to be available on the existing business park despite being smaller than the new proposal and having been under development for 20 years. Transport infrastructure is inadequate.	9743/26344	
	Comment- the industrial estate could be developed if development was restricted to B1 and if heavy goods traffic is banned from using the route through the centre of the village.	9776/21676	
	Objection - opposed to the proposed industrial estate development. Concerns revolve around road traffic issues, especially around the doctor’s surgery, school and village green. Further development can only aggravate safety concerns exponentially. The increased HGV traffic also raises issues concerning noise and fume pollution together with attendant damage to the road. Elvington is only a small village and an increased Industrial Estate Development will change the character of the village beyond recognition. Traffic leading into those sites may also increase congestion, as additional land will be required to support employment opportunities.	9778/20231	
	Objection – developments in Elvington will be disproportionate for a small village. There will be too much encroachment on to Green Belt land. No account seems to have been taken as to the affect these plans will have on the wildlife of this area. At Sites 97 and 815 development needs to be proportionate for the size of the village. The B1228 is already a busy road and its state of repair is lamentable and is not suitable for even more HGV traffic unless it is upgraded. HGV	9791/20251	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	traffic should be restricted through the village for safety purposes if the plans proceed. The road through the village is too narrow for HGVs.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- the scale of the proposal is out of keeping with the rural area and would generate significant amounts of traffic including large vehicles. Any future development should include measures to either redirect traffic from the estate via Grimston Bar, and ban it fro the village, or there should be a 20 mph speed limit introduced. The site lies within a designated corridor of biodiversity. There is land on the airfield designated as a Site of Importance to Local Conservation. The area to the north is a haven for wildlife and this should be protected from development.	9798/20266	
	Objection- support the site in principle however the B1228 cannot cope with HGVs through the village and the proposed site should be appropriate t the residential size of the village.	9812/19328	
	Objection – support in principle the proposed development for employment, however the B1228 cannot cope with HGVs through the village, the A1079 Hull Road is more suited to HGVs. The proposed site should be appropriate to the residential size of the village.	9813/20272	
	Objection- this is excessive for a business park sites in a rural location. The proposal will increase HGV traffic significantly and increase the safety risk to residents especially children as the traffic passes through the village. There would need to be a ban in place for HGV traffic as there is in neighbouring villages if this expansion occurs. The whole airfield is within a designated wildlife corridor. There is land on the airfield designated as conservation areas and the green belt land adjacent to these areas is botanically rich with wildlife and insects. Buffer zones around the designated conservation sites should be considered and set up. The scale of the proposed development would cause problems with drainage and the foul drainage system is at capacity.	9814/24183	
	Objection – the road network and public transport are inadequate to deal with extra traffic. Weight limit needed for the bridge.	9823/20277	
	Objection –removal of Green Belt land must constitute inappropriate development as it will have a negative impact on availability of agricultural and livestock farming land. Wildlife habitat of fields and hedgerows will be destroyed and the loss will be irreversible. The existing drainage has absolutely no further capacity to support any development at all. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support proposed. There would be an inevitable increase in traffic volume and more HGVs on the B1228. The result would be congestion at the school, through the village and at the Derwent bridge. Recent weight restrictions on the bridge have been almost impossible to police/enforce. Vehicles driving through the village already pose a clear road safety risk, especially in the village centre and by the school. This risk can only increase if further if commercial/industrial development takes place. The scale of the proposed development is	9824/20283	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	completely disproportionate to the amount of existing land for commercial land and which is not yet fully developed. Industrial development here is not appropriate at this location. There is already an additional site (ref E9) which has been allocated for expansion, at the Elvington Industrial Estate.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- there will be a problem with transport if development occurs. The B1228 is inadequate and there are existing infrastructure issues. It will result in the loss of Green Belt land, the wildlife havens and development will impact on the village. There are many business/office units in the centre of York that are empty, therefore this development is not needed.	9831/22065	
	Objection- the proposed development is a doubling of the existing Business Park, where there is still land availability. This is excessive for a rural location. The existing Business Park is deemed to be B1 & B8, whereas the allocation includes for B2 general industrial. This would be an over intensification of the site and not in keeping with the rural location of the Park. The allocation will take up previous agricultural land and could destroy valuable habitats for butterflies, dragonflies, and a wide variety of other flora and fauna. At a minimum, buffer zones are required to protect the wildlife from development.	9833/24234	
	Objection – the B1228 is very busy already. The road is not suitable for an increase in HGVs. They should be banned through the village.	9847/24189	
	Objection- the B1228 is already very busy at peak times. The road is not suitable for an increase in HGV and other traffic. HGV's should be banned through the village.	9848/24194	
	Objection - currently the industrial estates are far enough on the outskirts so as not to impose on village life in terms of noise, pollution, safety and appearance.	9861/24266	
	Objection- already traffic holdups occur every day and HGV's are still crossing the Sutton Bridge. If the industrial estate grows much more Elvington would lose its village feel.	9873/24205	
	Objection – this site appears large and out of context with the current site. It takes land out of the greenbelt. Transport in and out of the village is limited. The main road is already busy. Drainage is a problem in the village. This will destroy the natural habitat for flora, fauna and insects.	9884/24318	
	Objection- this development is an inappropriate size and further erosion of Green Belt land. This allocation would increase this industrial development by 200% which is wholly inappropriate for this rural location. The existing land is far from fully developed and another 1ha has also been allocated for expansion. The proposal is inappropriate as it will remove Green Belt land bringing further traffic and pollution to an area ill prepared to cope. Elvington has a poor bus service and no other public transport meaning commuters to go with the increased business and commercial traffic resulting in increased congestion.	9900/24341	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – the village cannot sustain anymore large scale industrial development. The main B1228 road is totally inadequate for present traffic. The HGV and large agricultural vehicles are unsuitable on this rural road. Development will only increase the risk to Sutton Bridge which was designed for horse and cart. East Riding of Yorkshire Council have recognised that Sutton upon Derwent is a special rural village and is to be safeguarded from certain development in their Local Plan. Elvington is a special rural village and should be maintained as such. Elvington should be treated with sympathetic vision not as an extension of the City of York.	9904/24346	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal.	9916/24366	
	Objection- Elvington has already catered for employment with both Elvington Industrial Estate, Laveracks Estate and the existing Airfield Estate. Any future expansion of the industrial areas will be disproportionate for the size of the village turning it from residential to industrial. HGV's already cause congestion. Any more development would exacerbate this causing possible safety risks to residents. The already busy B1228 would have to accommodate even more traffic, particularly HGV's.	9917/24371	
	Objection – development will have deeply adverse effect on the area and on the quality of life for existing residents. Little thought given to the infrastructure implications. The B1228 is already a busy road, will become significantly more dangerous and congested particularly in the centre of the village.	9930/24427	
	Objection – this site will encourage large HGVs passing along the B1228 and Sutton Bridge. There should be a cycle path to Grimston Bar. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	9937/24478	
	Objection- the proposal uses land within the greenbelt therefore is inappropriate development. A 1ha site has already been allocated for the expansion of Elvington Industrial Estate, this land along with land lying empty and still to be developed at the existing Airfield Business Park is sufficient for the life of the Local Plan based on previous growth rates. Traffic congestion on nearby roads is already bad and part of the site is inhabited with a wide variety of flora and fauna.	9943/24486	
	Objection- proposed site would take up Green Belt agricultural land and therefore should not be used as a primary development site. The road through Elvington is already overloaded with large HGV lorries, proposal would increase traffic considerably causing major disturbance to residents. Both Hagg bridge and Sutton bridge were not built to cope with the size and weight of these vehicles. Further demands on an already overstretched infrastructure would be unsustainable.	9944/20310	
	Objection – this site will encourage large HGVs passing along the B1228 and Sutton Bridge. There should be a cycle path to Grimston Bar. Any development should be proportionate to the	9950/24494	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	size of the village.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – local people would not be buying the houses due to the employment reduction by the Council.	9961/21121	
	Objection – site is way too big and needs to be reduced in size. Development should be restricted to minimum levels to protect wildlife.	10001/20342	
	Objection- there is no perceived need for this expansion as there are a number of units available at each of the industrial estates in the village. This is inappropriate use of Green Belt land. The road system is already over saturated and further traffic will cause safety and pollution issues.	10044/24401	
	Objection- this together with the proposal for 815 is unacceptable as it removes land from the Green Belt and would mean an increase of 200% which is excessive for a rural location. There is land left to develop at the existing airfield as well as the additional 1ha site already allocated for expansion. There are existing traffic and road issues with HGVs, further development would increase these. The development should be proportional to the residential size of Elvington. The site is within the designated corridor No5 Elvington Tillmire under York Biodiversity Action Plan for life. There is also other land on the airfield as designated Sites of Importance to Local Conservation. The land adjacent to the site is rich with fauna and flora, these should be retained as buffer zones to ensure their function as havens. The foul drainage system is at capacity.	10047/21123	
	Objection- to the inclusion of B2 uses on this site, but do not object to the extension of the estate. The change of use to include this will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife in the area. Could lead to a growth in pollution levels with an increase in traffic. Removing land from Greenbelt and adding B2 uses is adding insult to injury.	10058/24426	
	Objection- the B1228 is already very busy and in extremely poor condition which would only be made worse by additional traffic, especially HGVs. There will be an increase in HGV traffic through the village, and the village is not able to cope with this. Any development should be in proportion to the size of the village and any development should be on Brownfield land not on Green Belt.	10072/24441	
	Objection- the B1228 is already very busy and in extremely poor condition which would only be made worse by additional traffic, especially HGVs. There will be an increase in HGV traffic through the village, and the village is not able to cope with this. Any development should be in proportion to the size of the village and any development should be on Brownfield land not on Green Belt.	10073/24446	
	Objection – this is within the Tillmire corridor green zone. The river Derwent and Lower Derwent valley is nationally important for wildlife and requiring management to reduce diffuse	10074/24452	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pollution and improve water quality.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- the large scale development of this site would be well over 200% of the current size which is not proportional. There are currently empty units on the industrial site. There is already a 1ha area for expansion at the Elvington Industrial Estate. This proposal would take land out of the Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate. There would be a loss of amenity as the proposed allocation is for B1, B2 and B8 when the existing occupiers are B1 and B8. The addition of B2 uses could generate nuisance. The road network is insufficient and there is a poor bus service. Another concern is sewage. Part of the proposed site is a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna, which will be affected by development.	10076/24532	
	Objection- the site takes up agricultural land within the Green Belt and is inappropriate development. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna which will be affected by development. The existing business park extends 8ha and there is still land to be developed. The proposals would result in an increase of nearly 200% which is excessive. A 1ha site has already been allocated for expansion. The sewage drainage system is at capacity. The road network is inadequate for the scale of development. A weight limit would be required on Sutton Bridge due to increased HGV activity.	10077/19349	
	Objection- the drainage system is already at capacity. The proposal could almost double the size of the park with the consequence of increased traffic to an already busy infrastructure. The loss of Green Belt is inappropriate for a rural village. The inclusion of B2 use on this site could cause nuisance to local villagers.	10079/20348	
	Objection – scale is inappropriately large. There will be a loss of Green Belt. Loss of amenity to residents. Traffic congestion is already bad. A poor public transport service. The drainage system in the village is at capacity. Biodiversity will be affected.	10095/25819	
	Objection – the B1228 is already very busy with high HGV movement. Further development should result in a HGV ban through the village. The size of this development would be disproportionate to the village.	10109/25835	
	Objection – the scale of this seems excessive. Road through Elvington is already congested and too heavy for a rural road. Detrimental impact on air pollution and increase road traffic accidents. Village needs a weight restriction. This land is in the Green Belt, development will impact the environment and reduce the habitat for wildlife.	10119/25849	
	Objection – the infrastructure is not capable of supporting this development. The road is already excessively busy. More traffic will result in more risks to the villages and children.	10125/25857	
	Objection- to increase the current site is totally unsustainable in such a small village. Public transport system is very poor. More industry means more HGVs which should not be allowed to go through the village as the road is very narrow and HGVs have caused a lot of	10143/20435	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	noise/vibrations/cracks when they drive past. Development should be in keeping with the size of the village and restricted to light goods vehicles. The sewage works is already over capacity. Taking land out of the Green Belt is inappropriate and the biodiversity of the area needs to be taken into account.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – scale of proposal is inappropriately large. There will be a loss of Green Belt. Loss of amenity to residents. Traffic congestion is already bad. A poor public transport service. The drainage system in the village is at capacity. Biodiversity will be affected.	10164/26001	
	Objection – the B1228 is very busy already. The road is not suitable for an increase in HGVs. They should be banned through the village.	10169/24199	
	Objection- opposed to the size of the land being proposed and the increase in the number of HGVs on the B1228. There is already a recognized danger to children both walking and cycling to school.	10175/19375	
	Objection- to safeguard the Green Belt should be the primary aim of the Council. There are plenty of unused areas in brown field sites and the city centre.	10176/19380	
	Support – development will bring employment opportunities to the village and surrounding area. The extension is proportionate to the size of the village and has no negative impact on the culture of the village. Has slight concerns about the increase in traffic.	10197/21138	
	Objection – development would mean the park could almost double in size and would constitute a loss of Green Belt land. B2 use would cause nuisance to local villagers	10210/20357	
	Objection – development would cause too much traffic for the roads. Road safety becoming a major issue. Need of major infrastructure.	10211/21169	
	Objection – the village is very aware of the pressure that developments of the last four decades has put upon the village and its environment. This village is becoming a dormitory settlement. These proposals will only destroy what remains of its natural character. The increase in population has not yet brought any improvement to the infrastructure. The growth in traffic has severely damaged the environment. To ignore the greenbelt offends villagers, upsets wildlife habitats, and destroys the village status.	10246/26006	
	Objection – area proposed is too large. Traffic would increase, increasing risk to children.	10283/21271	
	Objection – HGV’s should be banned from passing through the village.	10286/21278	
	Objection – current proposals are excessive. The amount of land proposed is out of proportion with the rest of the village. Infrastructure would need to be addressed.	10288/21287	
	Objection – proposal is in Green Belt land. Roads are extremely busy. Drainage is at capacity. Village and local business could be affected by noise and pollution.	10289/21288	
	Objection – development would have an adverse effect on local primary school and road network.	10290/21293	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – current population and size is sufficient. Traffic at current level is adequate. Noise and air pollution currently an issue. Water and sewerage at capacity.	10293/21301	
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- the village has an ever increasing amount of through traffic. Any sizeable development will add to this serious problem. The B1228 is already deteriorating from the increase in traffic, particularly heavy wagons from the industrial estates. the infrastructure for waste water would not cope.	10329/26017	
	Objection - an increase in the number and nature of the businesses working on the site will mean facing increased congestion on the narrow B1228, which is the only road providing access. People working on the new businesses would need their own transport, which would add to the congestion. This can be particularly acute for vehicles going to and from the site from the east, where have to navigate the road past the school, village centre and Derwent Bridge. Elvington’s road communications would not support business development on this site to the extent envisage in the proposals.	10382/21858	
	Objection – development would increase traffic congestion into the village, specifically HGV’s and increase safety specifically at school corner at corner into green.	10445/22527	
	Objection – development is inappropriate as the B1228 is already busy at peak times. It will increase HGV traffic, a safety risk to residents, especially children. HGV’s should be banned as in all neighbouring villages if plans proceed. Development should be proportionate to the village.	10446/22533	
	Objection- the extension would double the size of the existing park. Elvington is a rural village with several industrial parks which means the number of HGVs passing through is high, presenting a risk to pedestrians. This development would not only remove this land from the Green Belt but significantly increase the existing traffic problem. The proposed development is adjacent to areas that are havens for wildlife. Development would put these areas at risk.	10453/22559	
	Objection- concern regarding the amount of HGV traffic that will be increased into the village, this poses a risk to children. HGVs should not be using the village as a route to the motorway when there is easy access via the a64. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	10456/22090	
	Objection- the proposed allocations in Elvington is an increase of nearly 200% which is far too excessive for such a location. The proposal takes up previous agricultural land within the Green Belt and such is inappropriate development. The road system could not cope with an increase in the volume of larger vehicles. The foul drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna which will be affected by any development.	10459/22568	
	Objection- concern regarding the increase of heavy traffic on an already busy road that is in a desperate need of resurfacing. Appreciate the need for some development and the creation of	10464/22104	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	jobs. HGV access should be stopped through the village. Concern regarding the lack of proper infrastructure including the roads. If development occurs a new link road should be put onto the A64. There are some restrictions in this area due to the wildlife presence.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- Elvington has a special character and community that would be greatly diminished or destroyed by development. The village community would be changed into that of a commuter settlement. Development would have an adverse effect on wildlife. Additional pressure on local amenities such as drainage and sewerage could be catastrophic. Development would pose further road safety issues and congestion around the school and village green.	10479/22610	
	Objection- the already busy and dangerous B1228 would be further compromised by additional HGV traffic, putting further risk to our vulnerable children and adults/ unless a separate access road could be built to link the site to the ring road the expansion would be unacceptable to the village. Employment opportunities must be considered but concern regarding the cost of this to the character and size of the village.	10484/22628	
	Objection- proposal extends to nearly 20 acres which is too excessive for the location. A site this size would mean an increase in vehicle access and the main road wouldn't cope with this volume, will create traffic hazard. Traffic is already a big problem, pavements are very narrow in parts and crossing and accessing the main road is hazardous. Foul drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is abundant in wildlife, buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect it from further development.	10488/22638	
	Objection- this alongside other proposals in the village amount to an increase of nearly 200% which is far too excessive in this location. The proposal takes up agricultural land within the green Belt which is inappropriate development. The main road would not be able to cope with this volume of traffic, especially larger vehicles. The single lane bridge over the River Derwent was not constructed to handle larger vehicles. Pavements are very narrow in parts and crossing and accessing the main road is very hazardous. The foul drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna which will be affected by development. Buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect the wildlife from further development.	10489/22645	
	Objection – see survey 2. Strongly oppose the extent of the development proposed for Elvington. Will utterly change the character and make up of a rural village. Local services, schools and infrastructure will not be able to cope with such a demand.	10521/27000	
	Objection – development poses an increased safety risk to children. Current road is unsafe for cyclists due to HGV's and narrow pavements make it hazardous for pedestrians. There are no adequate infrastructure proposals. HGV's should be banned if proposal goes ahead. Inadequate consultation has been made. Parish Council does not support the plan.	10524/21319	
	Objection- the Green Belt should not be compromised and any development in Elvington must	10542/22758	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	consider the B1228 which is already overrun with HGVs, farm vehicles and tankers.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- this proposal represents a significant increase in commercial land use around the airfield, estimates put it at around 200%. This represents a major change to the character of the area. Elvington's attractive character has been acknowledged in an Inspectors report in 1992/1993. The current development in Elvington co-exists reasonably well but an increase in industrial/commercial activity will have a detrimental effect on the village and surroundings. Development would result in significant extra loading on the B1228 which is already at capacity, and extra traffic will have a degradation on Sutton ridge and quality of life in the village. The land is currently Green Belt and there is no justification to take it out.	10543/19197	
	Objection – traffic would be dangerous. Children involved in near misses in current level of traffic. HGV's should be banned. Development needs to be proportional to the size of the village.	10581/22777	
	Objection – the airfield is well developed and there is still land to be developed. There is no need for this extension. The road network cannot cope with this and noise and pollution will be increased. The drainage system is at capacity. This site is a haven for wildlife.	10597/26100	
	Objection – the airfield is well developed. There is no need for an increase of nearly 200%. This is inappropriate in the greenbelt. The road network cannot cope with more traffic, noise and pollution. The drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife. Elvington should remain a small village.	10608/26105	
	Objection – inappropriately developed with loss of green belt land. Foul drainage system at capacity.	10632/20412	
	Objection –the proposed site allocation would mean a 200% increase which is excessive for this location. This is Green Belt land and inappropriate for development. Increase in vehicle access and the main road could not cope. Turning traffic will create a hazard. The single lane bridge was not constructed to handle larger vehicles. It has been strengthened several times. The drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for flora and fauna, as such buffer zones are required to protect wildlife.	10635/20420	
	Objection – development would result in an increase in vehicle access and the main road could not cope. Turning traffic will create a hazard. The single lane bridge was not constructed to handle larger vehicles. It has been strengthened several times. The drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for flora and fauna. Buffer zones are required to protect wildlife.	10641/19727	
	Objection – before further development of the industrial estate, Elvington village should be bypassed and the lane upgraded to a main road with cycling facilities. All HGV's should be banned from passing through the village as the road is not wide enough to accommodate the	10649/19740	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	monstrous vehicles.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- this will increase HGV traffic in the village and the B1228 is already very busy.	10669/19606	
	Objection – HGV traffic will increase.	10670/19764	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope. More frequent power cuts. Green belt land would be spoilt forever. People of the village were supposed to get an allotment on the site.	10683/19796	
	Objection – road network into Elvington is inadequate for the scale of development, narrow B roads being the only method of reaching the site. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak periods without the possible near 200% increase in the size of the Park, Elvington has a very poor bus service and no other form of public transport, a majority of workers at the park will need a private vehicle. A weight limit would also be required on Sutton Bridge due to the increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to the local residents. Proposed allocation takes up previous agricultural land within the Green Belt and is “inappropriate development” Part of the site is a haven for a wide variety of flora & fauna. Buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect the wildlife from further development.	10697/19822	
	Objection – there are far too many new houses planned. Too much land will be taken from Green Belt.	10702/19835	Elvington Action Group
	Objection- the success of the business park is to be applauded, however any extensions should safeguard Elvington village so that access is readily available but heavy traffic is re-directed to major roads.	10710/19850	
	Objection – there is not sufficient infrastructure around and in the village for any plans on the scale intended. The village doesn’t have a regular bus service, has land that floods, insufficient drainage, no road infrastructure, a tiny village shop, no post office and one public house.	10724/19879	
	Objection – support employment opportunities, but HGV traffic through the village needs to be assessed.	10745/19941	
	Object – increase in traffic. Increase in noise. No road infrastructure. Industrial estates have empty premises. Green belt land will lead to loss of rural farming.	10756/19981	
	Objection – currently traffic flow through Elvington is very busy. There are already far too many HGV’s thundering through the village. Roads are not capable of sustaining current traffic flow and it can be dangerous for pedestrians on the footpath. A new development at the Airfield Business Park would surely increase the amount of traffic, particularly HGV’s, increasing the likelihood of accidents.	10766/20009	
Objection- Elvington is a rural village and already hosts industrial estates, many of which are empty. Increasing industrial development will bring additional traffic to an already busy road that is inappropriate. The B1228 is already dangerous. Industrial traffic should not be permitted where it is dangerous to do so. There have been numerous occasions where buildings and	10816/21358		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	property have been damaged as a result of industrial traffic.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- there are currently 3 no. industrial sites in the village. Further extension of these sites is possible but not on this scale. The scale of proposals for Elvington is out of all proportion. The volume of traffic, particularly heavy goods, is very substantial. The scale of proposed development would multiply such traffic movements by 100% which is unacceptable. Elvington Lane currently appears unsuitable for existing HGV movements. Monitoring of HGVs on Wheldrake Lane with regard to weight limits simply does not happen. Development should be proportionate to the needs of the location. The need for such developments need to be proved.	10842/21402	
	Objection- there are currently 3 no. industrial sites in the village. Further extension of these sites is possible but not on this scale. The volume of traffic, particularly HGVs is already substantial. The scale of proposed development would multiply such traffic movements by 100% which is unacceptable. Elvington Lane currently appears unsuitable for existing HGV movements. Monitoring of HGVs on Wheldrake Lane with regard to weight limits simply does not happen. Development should be proportionate to the needs of the location. The need for such developments need to be proved.	10845/21408	
	Objection- the volume of domestic and commercial traffic is already leading to heavy congestion daily. Further development of Elvington Industrial Estate would add to this congestion and increase the volume of traffic through the village. Greater volume of traffic will add to noise and air pollution, and will result in road safety issues.	10876/25879	
	Objection- it is good to develop the business park, but too much will not be good for the community. Main concerns are traffic through the village, safety of children walking to school, and the need to protect the environment for local wildlife. If there was a proposal to bypass the village and have a direct road access to the a64- that could be supported.	10892/21502	
	Objection- there has been a significant increase in haulage vehicles on the B1228 and further development of this site would generate extra traffic particularly haulage and delivery vehicles. Previous planning applications at the airfield site have been rejected because of the potential significant traffic generation on a B road, therefore the same principle should be applied regarding this proposal. Development would warrant the transport department to consider the benefits of a comprehensive co-ordinated transport strategy to create accesses to the a64. This would reduce traffic problems.	10895/21506	
	Objection- the B1228 through the village is already busy at peak times. An increased number of HGVs passing through the village is a major concern. If access to the village by HGVs could be restricted this would overcome this major concern.	10896/21509	
	Objection - see survey 2. The business park as it is at the moment is nearly 20 acres consisting	10898/21513	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of B1 and B8 uses. The proposal is for an almost 200% expansion which is totally excessive and unsustainable for the surrounding area. The proposed addition of B2 uses which is general industrial would have a huge impact on the surrounding area. The impact on traffic congestion, danger and nuisance would be huge. the road network is limited and not appropriate for this scale of development. Public transport is poor. It would be essential to have a weight limit on the bridge and prevent HGVs going through the village of Elvington. The proposal is disproportionate, excessive and dangerous.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- development will result in the village being swamped disproportionately to its present size and will increase traffic especially HGVs with resulting noise and safety problems. Correct planning should address the character, setting, need and wildlife.	10936/21585	
	Objection- the village is already in danger of losing its distinctive character and that further development would destroy that which should be preserved. The character of the village and the lifestyle bought into by current residents will be lost forever.	10953/21611	
	Comment – see survey 2. Should take into account the increase in traffic it will create and noise it will generate.	11160/27015	
	Objection- development would result in the loss of Green Belt at this site. The size of the development when combined with the existing estate and the proposed additional land in proposal 815 is far more than local transport and infrastructure could cope with. The increase in traffic caused by this scale of development would undo the recent improvements at Grimston Bar.	11169/21661	
	Objection – road network cannot cope with extra traffic.	11216/21912	
	Objection- it is more appropriate to utilise Brownfield sites and sites with appropriate supporting infrastructure. Concern regarding the loss of Green Belt land and the suitability of the immediate road network and the likely impact of any growth in heavy goods vehicle traffic. Traffic through the village is already considerable and contains a significant amount of HGV traffic, a particular danger due to the village primary school and the number of children who walk to school.	11217/22108	
	Objection – already heavily congested roads. Increased risk of accidents. Development should be proportional to the size of the village.	11218/22831	
	Objection- the B1228 is already heavily congested and the village does not want further traffic. The existing road through the village is already dangerous, particularly for school children walking to and from school. More traffic would increase the risk of a serious accident. Most local village have banned HGV traffic. This proposal will increase it. Any development should be proportional to the existing size of the village.	11313/22864	
	Objection- already a site has been allocated for development which is sufficient for the life of	11367/22225	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the Local Plan. Clifton Moor has numerous office buildings and industrial buildings empty and up for let or sale. The B1228 is already a busy congested road and any further heavy vehicles would impact on this greatly. Houses shake now when heavy vehicles pass by. This is a wonderful home for butterflies, dragonflies and a wide variety of flora and fauna which will be hugely affected. Plus the noise and pollution effect this will also have from the proposed development. The drainage/sewerage system is at full capacity now.		
<b>97 Airfield Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection- there are already two large industrial estates on the edge of the village, both of which have empty premises. Building more industrial units must increase the amount of traffic on the B1228, a badly maintained road on which HGVs and general traffic travelling at motorway speeds mix with numerous cyclists and pedestrians. The traffic around the school at each end of the day is a nightmare. Elvington is a rural village, it is not appropriate to turn it into a business park.	11382/22912	
	Objection – development will have a detrimental effect on the village. Extra traffic will cause greater hazards. The land earmarked has a large variety of wildlife.	11385/21916	
	Objection- the increased number of HGV movements would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre. If through HGV traffic was banned from the village then a major objection to this development would have been overcome. Support additional land for industrial uses at the Airfield only if it is proportionate. The development at the scale proposed would change the whole character of the village.	11399/22940	
	Comment- support further development of the industrial estate as it would provide more local jobs and benefit the local economy, subject to development being restricted to B1, and heavy good vehicles being banned from using the route through the centre of the village.	11419/21672	
	Objection – this is inappropriate use of Green Belt land. There will be more traffic created, especially HGVs on the already busy Elvington/York road.	11646/26120	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development at Site 97.	Petition 5	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>125 Morrell House Elderly Persons Home</b>	Support- the development of this site provided full consultation is given to all intended parties.	943/20507	
	Objection- this site does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17927	
	Objection- concern regarding where will the elderly residents go if this site is developed.	3588/23915	
	Objection- there is a great shortcoming of care home availability, especially those suffering from dementia/Alzheimer’s disease. The Council need to acknowledge that there is an ageing population and as such the need for care home provision is going to increase.	3799/22041	
	Objection- hugely concerned about the impact on our infrastructure. Drainage, telecoms, water supply and most importantly transport.	10765/20006	
<b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick</b>	Comment- there should be a mandatory minimum 20m landscape buffer zone along Haxby Road. Increase the housing density.	45/18797	York Environment Forum
	Objection- this site has a value of general open space and provides green infrastructure value. It offers a sense of openness. Development would be detrimental to the open space division between New Earswick and Huntington and would need to be protected. The site is currently used as recreational open space. The proposed site may have access difficulties. The parish is already subject to increasing traffic congestion. The ‘continuing care home’ development on the West side of Haxby Road already has its own transport problems. Concerned that the last rural green site of any size in the Parish could be swallowed by proposed development. The site should be declared Green Belt in the Local Plan and as such the development application could be considered premature.	72/18097	New Earswick Parish Council
	Comment- this site requires an open space to break any development from the Public Right of Way to Huntington and an off road cycle route from this path down to New Earswick, also an eastern area of open space to provide a path to the Foss, not just blanket building.	91/19618	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Objection –it forms part of the open land that helps separate Huntington from New Earswick and it contributes to the landscape setting of New Earswick. This area also adjoins the edge of the model village’s Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay ‘special attention’ to ‘the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance’ of its Conservation Areas. The plan will need to evaluate whether or not the loss of this open area and its subsequent development would be likely to harm any elements which contribute towards the special character and setting of the historic city. Secondly, it will be necessary to evaluate the contribution of this open area to the setting of the Conservation Area and the impact that its loss and subsequent development might have upon its significance. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is still considered appropriate to allocate the site for development, the Local Plan	238/18157	English Heritage



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	should make it clear that development proposals in this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area are not harmed.		
<b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b>	Comment – would like to see this area landscaped as much as possible with a nature reserve and a village green with a maypole if possible.	718/19174	
	Support – agree with the recommendation to include the site for residential development within the local plan.	943/20508	
	Objection – object to development of this greenfield site. It is a valuable open space, well used for recreation. Should be allowed to remain a habitat for bats and wild flowers. The more houses you build, the more demands there will be on housing land and on medical/hospital services, education and producing more traffic congestion. Air pollution, already bad, will exceed tolerable levels. Radical thinking is required to identify an area outside York where land is available to site a new community. The topography of York does not allow space for indefinite enlargement. Rivers and bridges are constraints to more development. A level area where a garden city can be planned from the start, may offer a release from traffic jams, and a healthy lifestyle for generations of citizens to come.	1272/19181	York Natural Environment Trust
	Objection – residents and Parish Council concerned about this site. Parish Council have previously requested that this site be designated as common land. Planning Inspector at the time stated it retains 'a visual importance because of its position immediately adjacent to New Earswick. Views across it and of it are so significant in this context as to merit protection'. It is not clear from the Further Sites document whether the history of the site, including both the comments of the Inspector and the very clear opposition of the community in a previous poll, have been taken into account in bringing this site forward. If not, these factors should be taken into account before this proposal is allowed to progress any further.	1355/18603	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection- the site may flood.	1897/17883	
	Objection – the fields are clearly needed to soak up water which otherwise would flood housing. Loss of attractive areas would be sad for people and wildlife. The A1237 will not be able to absorb the heavy extra traffic. Doubtful that local services could cope.	2277/23805	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17928	
Objection – evidence evades the general issue of the impact on the area of the A1237 and on local transport infrastructure that is already under severe pressure. Would also bring greater use of the shops in the village centres and cause further road congestion in the village centres and car parking issues. A sustainable integrated transport plan needs to be in place before planning permission is given for development. Scale of development is far too large for the likely level of new employment. Many of the services, facilities and infrastructures that would	3256/23884		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be required are not under the control of the Council.		
<b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- this provides a much needed "strategic green space" in an otherwise built up area and is used by dog walkers and children to play. Where will the dogs and children go if this site is lost.	3588/23917	
	Objection- this provides a much needed strategic green space used by dogs and children in a built up area.	3588/23917	
	Objection – This area of open land has been used as an open recreational area. It might be thought that there is plenty of alternative land. This area is good for dog walkers and the like. Before building right up to the school some consideration of future needs should take place – for example space for extra school buildings (or community buildings associated with education), playing fields.	5605/20780	
	Objection – fails to see concerns in technical officer assessment, there is plenty of road length and space alongside the road to compensate a large roundabout if it is necessary. However, concerned that the revised boundary does not preserve the sense of openness on Haxby road which has been identified as a key element of the open space.	5826/20918	
	Objection- strongly disagree with the building of yet more housing in the Huntington/New Earswick area. There is a large area on the Old Vickers site which has been derelict for some years and a brownfield site that would be more suitable for housing. The old school field may look unused but it still popular area. Increasingly there are fewer areas in the local vicinity for people to walk and enjoy the open air as well as fewer habitats for wildlife. The development will increase the pressure on local schools, drainage and surface water. The Council need to seriously look at the impact of more traffic on the Ring Road. The site is adjacent Joseph Rowntree school and extra traffic will present a real danger to the safety of the school children. Careful thought should be given to the long term benefit of leaving open spaces rather than as a short term fix to the housing situation.	5892/24057	
	Support – fully support the Council’s proposed allocation and will support the allocation at an Examination in Public if necessary. Comment - the boundaries of proposed development allocations should reflect the actual areas to be developed, rather than development areas plus green infrastructure. Since the original representations were submitted, it has been confirmed in discussions with the Council’s Ecology Officer that the nature conservation interest of the site could be safeguarded by retaining areas of unimproved grassland, preferably in association with the tree belt. The eastern boundary of the potential residential development site as shown in the FSC broadly follows a 'building line' established by recent extensions to the Joseph Rowntree School to the north and by existing development to the south. It is anticipated that the balance of the	6383/18572 6383/26403	Jennifer Hubbard, on behalf of The Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>originally proposed site will be retained as open recreational/amenity/nature conservation space, and by excluding these 'green' areas from the proposed housing allocation, the Council is adopting an approach which has been advocated elsewhere – namely that the boundaries of proposed development allocations should reflect the actual areas to be developed, rather than development areas plus green infrastructure. Because the site is integral to New Earswick, it is helpful to set out that the site will be developed by the Trust for a wide mix of house types and tenures. The Trust will retain social housing within the development and the present mix of housing (15% private housing, 11% shared ownership and 74% rented) will be replicated on the site. The indicative number of dwellings for the site is 118, which would also reflect the density and character of residential developments in the vicinity. Development is anticipated to take place in years 4-5 of the Local Plan. Land sales receipts will cross subsidise the affordable housing to the degree required. The site name referred to (the Old School Playing Field) is a local designation which has grown through use, rather than an official title. In order to avoid an implication that the site should be treated as a past or current playing field, have been asked to request that the site be referred to hereafter as 'Land to the north of Willow Bank and to the east of Haxby Road, New Earswick'.</p>		
<p><b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – site is one of the green lungs that York needs to avoid over development and urban sprawl. Previous applications to build on this land have been refused or withdrawn due to the character of New Earswick village. The site is popular with local people as a recreational space. This is an important area for nature conservation, retaining the ecology is important. Serious concerns about access. Further housing development could lead to congestion, especially for HGVs wanting to access the A1237. Rebuilding of Joseph Rowntree Secondary School to be set back from the road giving a more open aspect, this proposal would destroy this effect. Further developments are already planning in the area. Site should be retained as green belt.</p>	<p>6513/18549</p>	<p>Huntington and New Earswick Councillors</p>
	<p>Objection – oppose the use of further green belt land. Brownfield first policy should be applied. Development of green belt sites is unnecessary and damaging.</p>	<p>6516/20316</p>	<p>Liberal Democrat Group</p>
	<p>Objection – there is a great need for some kind of green space as a lung of the village. Local residents need it for recreational purposes. There is a swampy area which will be a hazard for building. The Haxby road is a very crowded road, which is difficult to cross. More building in the village will worsen the air quality.</p>	<p>9292/18042</p>	
	<p>Objection – this is used as a play area by numerous local residents, it is a haven for walkers with views across to Huntington Church. It provides open space for nature and local residents and should be cherished. More development will add to the traffic on the already busy Haxby Road.</p>	<p>9293/18043</p>	
	<p>Objection – field is extensively used by dog walkers and others and it s vital green lunch in the</p>	<p>9296/18046</p>	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	area. Questions the affect it would have on traffic into Haxby Road, and the drainage and surface water problems already seen. Previous schemes rejected what has changed.		
<b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – to building of 118 houses. Field frequently flooded and unsuitable for development. It appears to soak up rain from other development in the area and will cause flooding in land already occupied.	9352/17880	
	Objection – site is not appropriate for housing development. The increase in traffic and ensuing pollution in the area, would be detrimental to the village. This is a well used an vital open space for the local population which New Earswick needs to retain	9378/18423	
	Support – site currently only used for a few dog walkers. Field should be used for much needed housing. New residents would have access to local shops and community facilities. Only concern is that the number of houses may be slightly too high. The site should include family sized homes with reasonable sized gardens to fit the rest of the village.	9711/20170	
	Objection- one of the principal concerns relates to excessive traffic which already occurs. The ring road and the roundabout at the top of Haxby Road is totally inadequate now for the volume of traffic using it. How will the road system cope with extra development. The site proposed is one of the few open space lungs in the area for al the usual suburban recreational activities. Applications for this site have been refused in the past and as such it does not make sense why the area is not being considered as Green Belt.	9945/24489	
	Support – more housing is needed. Site mainly used for dog exercise, other residents never use it. New housing will allow negotiation with developers to improve facilities.	10254/21237	
	Objection – few remaining areas of open land in the village. Particularly valuable to residents of the retirement home, who use it to go for short walks. Traffic would increase in density. Site is regularly flooded.	10271/21262	
	Support – the UK is short of housing. Green field sites have to be sacrificed. Using this site for mixed housing will restore the balance of the village to a mixed age community, in line with the original premise of the Rowntree family. New Earswick has many green spaces anyway. We owe it to those in need to provide housing to enlarge and enrich our community. The site should be used to alleviate the housing crisis.	10402/22491	
	Objection –there is no suitable access to the main Haxby –York road. The present roundabout is totally unable to cope with any increase in traffic flow. The addition of exit traffic from 118 dwellings would be unsustainable. As well as the normal traffic flow to the ring road, the area around the site has to cope with some 1,200 pupils plus staff of the secondary school daily creating a surge in population and traffic. Some 49 children plus staff arrive and depart from Little Acorns Nursery between 7.30am and 6.00pm. The elderly residents of Hartrigg Oaks already take risks in crossing the road south of the roundabout which would become even more	10431/10995	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	risky were this development given approval. The site is an attractive green space well used by families, children, walkers and dog-walkers. The view across the field provides welcome relief to the houses which line the road to Haxby. There are only two small grocers' shops and a chip shop in the tiny shopping terrace in New Earswick. The technical officers say that the "site area should be amended to follow the line of the existing school building". This suggests that the ordinary boundary will be so far from the road that very few houses can be placed on the reduced site. The only ones built will be those at highest risk of flooding.		
<b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- would be loosing green space villagers use every day. Green spaces should be within easy access for all people to encourage regular exercise. Extra cars that this housing development would bring would come out on a bend on Haxby Road which is already busy at times and congested at peak times. The increase in noise pollution is extremely worrying.	10495/22660	
	Objection – when Hartrigg Oaks was built, green space was lost and the field in question was then allowed as space for exercising dogs and general walking. It is used a great deal for the exercising of dogs. Other fields are at the other end of the village and get very waterlogged for much of the year. Access to the site would make it more dangerous for the old people at Hartrigg Oaks and for the school children. Roads would need to be widened and already there is a long 'tailback' to get onto the outer ring road at busy times. Facilities in the village are not intended for a big influx of people, as there are few shops and the doctors surgery is a small one.	10663/19600	
	Objection – this area is well used by people going for walks with children or pets. The elderly residents need space which is safe to walk in. Extra housing would result in more traffic. Haxby road is already very busy. More buses would be needed. More doctors would also be needed.	10749/26115	
	Objection- proposed developments to the north of York (Clifton Haxby New Earswick Strensall) Will put an intolerable strain on our already overstretched services particularly transport. The ring road must be duelled in its entirety before any development takes place. Also a cycle route is needed between Wigginton and Clifton Moor.	10854/21451	
	Objection– traffic is heavy already, the increase caused by development would produce a risk of accident or injury. Development would remove the only public space for exercise, recreation and dog walking purposes.	10907/21546	
	Objection – Haxby Road is not a particularly wide road at the point where traffic will emerge from the proposed site. It is already subject to traffic congestion. The additional traffic generated by development on this site will make the existing problems significantly worse. It will exacerbate problems leaving Hartrigg Oaks by car, which can already be difficult, and make it more hazardous for school children and other pedestrians walking and cycling into New Earswick. The proposed site is a valuable green open space between Huntington and New Earswick, used for recreation and dog walking, and providing a visual link between the two	11245/22838	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>communities. There is no other similar facility of significant size in the immediate vicinity. Any proposed development should therefore include open areas to replace some of the recreational open space the old school playing field currently provides. Ideally any development should be set back from the road, and match the building lines of the adjacent school and housing. Applications for development on this site have been rejected in the past. The site has value to the community as green open space, and ought to form part of the green belt in the Local Plan.</p>		
<p><b>182 Old School Playing Field, New Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – last remaining open space North of the village available for open activities.</p>	<p>11398/22939</p>	
	<p>Objection – building on the green belt land would destroy the villages’ reputation. Village has a lot of traffic. Congested at peak times. Difficulty crossing roads. Risk of losing wildlife.</p>	<p>11407/22951</p>	
<p><b>183 Land to the North of Escrick</b></p>	<p>Comment – Escrick is a Designated Service Village (DSV) in the Selby Core Strategy Local Plan (Policy SP2). Selby District Council envisages, in principle, that some development may be appropriate in Escrick to meet part of the District’s objectively assessed housing need. However in Selby District, Escrick is constrained by the defined York Green Belt. In York’s area, Escrick is constrained by the Draft Green Belt. Selby is considering a review of the Green Belt and this may be done in advance of any allocations in order to ensure any allocation is appropriate in terms of the Green Belt. Any proposals for additional growth needs to be thoroughly jointly assessed to ensure that these numbers are proportionate, reasonable, and the village and its services can cope with such a level of growth. There is currently a Legal Challenge to the District’s Core Strategy concerning the designation of Escrick as a DSV. It may be a high risk strategy to rely on Escrick’s current DSV status to propose sites for residential development as this status may change following the result of this challenge. SDC would welcome further discussion to clarify a number of matters, therefore Selby District Council is not objecting to this site, but is reserving its position pending further information and discussion.</p>	<p>9/18557</p>	<p>Selby District Council</p>
	<p>Comment- before the proposed site is confirmed, important that there is clarity and agreement with Selby District Council as to how the proposed allocation is to relate to the villages designated Service Village Status and role with the Selby Local Plan Core Strategy.</p>	<p>11/18706</p>	<p>North Yorkshire County Council</p>
	<p>Objection – support the views of the residents (own survey undertaken) and does not object to some additional housing but the quantity of houses should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of services, about 10- 20% increase or 75 dwellings for the joint allocation of both councils. Any new dwellings should meet the needs of Escrick and it would be unsustainable for York to meet its own needs by leapfrogging the green belt. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	<p>18/18894</p>	<p>Escrick Parish Council</p>
	<p>Objection – the site is particularly unsustainable. Fulford already has insufficient capacity to</p>	<p>20/23757</p>	<p>Stillingfleet</p>

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cope with peak traffic even without the proposed development at Germany Beck. There can be no measure appropriate to deal with inevitable increase of traffic flow through Fulford which will cause growing congestion, stationary traffic and increased pollution for all local residents. Proposals for Site 183 alongside ST22 (Germany Beck) should be refused.		Parish Council
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – loss of 6.1ha of agricultural land. This is virtually a landlocked site, with accesses to local and urban services problematic. It should not be taken forward. Officer comments should be red not amber.	45/18770	York Environment Forum
	Support – Council is generally in favour of the proposals, but has a number of concerns which should be addressed before plans are finalised and development commences. Concerns to be addressed include the junction from Mine Road to A19, hazardous junctions turning right onto the Mine Road when travelling northbound on the A19 and similarly vehicles exiting the Mine Road to turn right heading to York. Parish Council believes that a roundabout at this junction would significantly improve safety, along with a pedestrian (pelican) crossing near the bus stop on the A19 in Deighton village, to improve safety for those travelling on foot. We would like to request that the Highways Department look into the issue of safety in light of the Parish Council’s concerns. Concern regarding use of good agricultural land – need to consider environmental impact upon future generations. Council believes that Peel Environmental, just a short distance down the road, could reasonable export some energy to the site to provide a much more environmentally friendly solution than the suggested bank of photovoltaic panels on nearby fields. District heating has been shown to work in many areas.	58/27506	Deighton Parish Council
	Objection- This site requires a green corridor from the old North Selby Mine road to link with the footpath to Crabtree Farm, not just blanket building.	91/19619	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Objection – the relationship of York to its surrounding settlements is one of the elements which contribute to the special character of the City. This relationship relates to not simply the distance between the settlements, but also the size of the villages themselves and the fact that they are free-standing defined settlements. In the Inspectors Report of the York Green Belt Local Plan, it stated ‘many of the villages... have an attractive and special character which is worth preserving not only for their own sake, but because of their physical relationship with York itself. The setting of York within an area of open countryside, containing a number of attractive villages is itself an important aspect of the special character of York’. Development of this site would reduce the separation between the main built up area of Escrick and Deighton to less than 650metres. The site also adjoins the boundary of the Escrick Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay ‘special attention’ to ‘the desirability of preserving or	238/18158	English Heritage

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	enhancing the character or appearance' of its Conservation Areas. The plan will need to evaluate whether or not the loss of this open area and its subsequent development would be likely to harm any elements which contribute towards the special character and setting of the historic city. It will be necessary to evaluate the contribution of this open area to the setting of the Conservation Area and the impact that its loss and subsequent development might have upon its significance. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is still considered appropriate to allocate the site, the Local Plan should make it clear that development proposals in this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area are not harmed.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – to all sites in the Further Consultation which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, and where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.	544/20484	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion of the site in the local plan.	943/20509	
	Objection – amount of land proposed for housing in York is unrealistically high. This site is particularly unsustainable, as the A19 through Fulford has insufficient capacity to cope with peak traffic and without any development commencing yet at Germany Beck the traffic is tailed back at times in the morning to Fulford Interchange and in the evening to the Inner Ring Road at Fawcett Street. There can be no measure appropriate to achieve increased traffic flow through Fulford. The two proposals for Escrick should be refused.	1050/19178	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Comment – due to the location of the site it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage, however will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from the Council before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18584	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Comment – it is not clear from the FSC documentation whether the residents of Escrick have been consulted, since the majority of them reside outside the City of York boundaries. From recent emails received from residents and Parish Councillors in Escrick, it does not seem to be the case. The Council should not progress this proposal until it is satisfied that a thorough and active consultation with the community has taken place. The proposal should not be considered in isolation. Its potential impact on traffic levels on the already congested A19 must be considered alongside potential impact of the 'safeguarded' land directly to the north and the impact of 5000 new homes at Whinthorpe. No explanation is given as to how increased vehicle movements will be tackled and there is no indication given as to how Council will obtain the already much needed investment to upgrade the A19 to cope with current traffic levels, let alone the additional vehicles that will come in the future.	1355/18604	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection- this site does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17929	
	Objection – see survey 4. Roads are too congested already – without further building, esp A19 Selby-York Road	3864/27310	
	Objection- the land is Green Belt and is just outside the extreme boundary of CYC. Escrick will become a community divided in two halves with one under CYC and the other under Selby DC. The site is separated by a lack of access to the rest of the village which will create a segregated community. It is on a dangerous route to the local school down the A19. Economic expansion and employment in North Yorkshire and York is not growing at a rate to warrant this. There will be an impact on traffic and on amenities and services. Selby Council are also planning buildings thus altering the village feel and character.	5285/24000	
	Objection– Brownfield first policy should be applied and development of these Green Belt sites is unnecessary and damaging. The site removes the last Green Belt area in the village and has been opposed by residents before.	6516/20317	
	Objection-the proposal to build hundreds of houses in the Green Belt around Deighton/Escrick is tantamount to ridiculous.	9310/18390	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – concerned about impact of traffic on A19. Proposed development will be 'appendage' to village. Residents and young families unlikely to attempt to walk into the village due to large lorries passing. School, surgery and shop cannot handle large influx of new residents. This development will not be part of the village which belongs in Selby DC not York. York has never considered Escrick for potential development as it lies outside its administrative boundary. Surely the development at Germany Beck and Whinthorpe New Village would suffice, as economic expansion is not growing at a rate to warrant outlying development.</p>	9487/18752	
	<p>Objection- need new housing and if that is to be, this is the best site however with only 370 houses in Escrick, another 150 is maximum and developers should be responsible for the cost of all infrastructure. There is no need for a major development. Traffic is already at gridlock and it already takes three quarters of an hour to get to York at peak times. Germany Beck and Whinthorpe will make this worse plus the new Selby Developments. There will also be a substantial impact on amenities: school, shops and surgery. Housing within York, but really an 'Escrick Problem' which may be worsened by planned development in Selby.</p>	9512/22427	
	<p>Objection- this is fundamentally undemocratic as the proposal is being made by a council for which Escrick residents cannot vote therefore have no input into the election of Councillors whose decisions may have a major impact on lives. There are already horrendous traffic problems and these will be exacerbated. The Anaerobic digester facility is not an ideal neighbour for the proposed new houses. There are no public facilities for the new housing. This proposal is simply unworkable.</p>	9553/24140	
	<p>Objection – proposed development will increase the village by two thirds which is outrageous as there is no infrastructure to carry anything. School and medical facilities will be inundated and will not be able to cope with such influxes. Will also create traffic chaos and possible gridlock due to Germany Beck and Whinthorpe and the Anaerobic digester. Any new housing south of Selby and any new housing in the York area should be on Brownfield sites in the York area and not in Green Belt areas.</p>	9673/21952	
	<p>Objection – the A19 between Escrick and York is already congested and with the development at Germany Beck, travel into York and vice versa would be more difficult. The proposal to build 150 houses outside the village boundary would mean 25% of the village would be controlled by York and 75% controlled by Selby. Different rate conditions would apply. With regard to schooling, Escrick catchment area means children can go to Fulford. Would these arrangements still apply? Concern whether general amenities such as sewage and bin collection would be completed by two Councils. Before any development takes place, the boundary line must be made clear and what ever is decided residents must have a vote. A small development would be accepted provided that there is a need which has yet to be established.</p>	9674/20142	Escrick Village Support Group

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection- very concerned about the proposed plan to build 250 new homes North of the village. The village amenities cannot cope with such an influx of people. Roads are now saturated with traffic and the out sewage system does not cope now. Village way of life will change forever. CYC have already passed an Anaerobic Digester facility near this site which will increase the traffic to a totally unacceptable level.	9675/19507	
	Objection- traffic on the A19 is already a problem. Schools, shops, surgery, drains cannot cope with so many more houses. Selby also has plans for development at Escrick.	9676/19509	
	Objection- over the past 20 years there have been many developments and infilling. All have been absorbed but infrastructure has not been included, all have used the existing services. If Escrick is to have any more development, serious consideration should be given to: traffic, flooding, drainage, provision of school places, the implications of the proposed Anaerobic digester, provision of additional health services and recreational facilities, new residents employment and the needs of the residents.	9677/18497	
	Objection – strongly opposed to this housing development because it will have a severely negative impact on local amenities, services and the road traffic network. There are already trucks and lorries travelling to and from the planned Anaerobic digester facility. Extra road traffic on the A19 from other proposed housing developments, such as Germany Beck at Fulford. The primary school and doctor’s surgery at Escrick cannot cope with the influx of new residents from 250 new houses who will be using the same amenities and service as the rest of the village.	9678/19511	
	Objection – it would be an appendage to Escrick, yet under a different authority, and as such would only harm and complicate the present ambience of the village. It would overload present services and destroy the present balance achieved between rural and village community. There is no need to build this number of houses, especially on agricultural land, which presently produces food. Recent surveys show that we will be struggling to produce enough crops to feed ourselves in years to come. Existing services will be inadequate to cope with it and it will affect the present catchment area of schools. Who would finance all the additional services necessary? The A19 is already under great strain and development would result in thousands more cars and lorries using the road.	9682/22470	
	Objection- the extra housing will increase the traffic on the A19, which is already difficult and is going to be worse anyway because of York’s decision for the anaerobic digester. Traffic to York from elsewhere should be directed along York West instead of A19.	9691/19523	
	Objection – the A19 can’t cope now with the level of traffic passing through Escrick. School children and pedestrians walking along the pavement everyday are in danger of this high speed traffic going well above the speed limit. The proposed development will add an extra 100 – 500	9695/20144	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	vehicles passing the village each day. The local schools are already limited to the amount of pupils they can accept each year. Any of the proposed sites would be a disaster as the schools couldn't cope and the village and community feeling will diminish.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the development as it would create a divided community, the present amenities (medical facilities, the infants' and juniors' school and the sewage works) would be inadequate, traffic on the A19 is already highly congested with still more traffic to be added and children walking to school would be in danger on the A19.	9699/20147	
	Objection – the 250 proposed new houses on this site will put unacceptable strain on the social and commercial facilities in the village maintained by Selby DC. The inevitable increase in traffic in and around the village would greatly aggravate what is already an intolerable load on the A19. Pedestrians already face great risk when trying to cross to the surgery, the pharmacy and the church, as well as the only bus stop.	9702/20152	
	Objection – there is no need for an extra 20,000 new homes in the City. Opposed to the site due to concerns regarding the A19 Infrastructure, the impact on the village (few/ small amenities would not be able to cope and it would not be safe for children), and the impact on Green Belt Land.	9722/22476	
	Objection – immediate plan would add 128 houses to Escrick which would increase the village by a third. Selby also has plans to add to this village which would change the village completely and have a massive impact on traffic and services. There is a danger of Escrick merging into Deighton, which would cause an odd situation regarding the village (being part York and part Selby). Planning to build houses on Green Belt land on York's boundary appears cynical and opportunistic.	9723/20190	
	Objection – opposed to the development as there is no need for this volume of houses in this rural area, prime agricultural land will be lost to this proposed development, the proposed development will have access to the A19 via a road that has been earmarked to carry up to 70-80 and existing services in Escrick village are not sufficient to cope with the proposed development. Will York City Council provide the finances to upgrade these services.	9724/20192	
	Objection – there should not be the need for this development, population growth of 0.7% should be capable of being met from brownfield sites. Development will add further traffic congestion. Will overload the village of Escrick's infrastructure. It is an imposition by York on Escrick, unwanted or needed and lacks any community cohesion with Selby District Council. Likely to mean that Fulford School will no longer be able to accommodate Escrick children which will undermine the attractiveness of the village.	9741/26157	
	Objection – there is no need for any further housing in Escrick and the proposed site is immediately next to Selby District Council boundary, which will create a split village. North	9746/20204	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Yorkshire and York are not growing at a rate to warrant this. The public sector, Aviva, Network Rail are all downsizing. Concern regarding traffic, the A19 is already overcrowded and is becoming a major bottleneck and more vehicles from Escrick will further increase this. Concern regarding amenities. Brownfield sites should be used first.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – York has already proposed in excess of 20,000 new homes in its area within 2013 Local Plan. Economic expansion within the area is not growing at a rate to warrant and there will not be enough employment opportunities within the area. There will be an impact on the main arterial road network which will affect Escrick directly. There will be an impact on amenities and services including the need for a larger school, children will be at risk walking to school, the amenities in the village would not be capable of coping with such large increase in housing.	9753/22955	
	Objection- question the need to build 150/200 homes in a marginal location close to the York boundary when York are planning 20,000 new homes within their boundary. Escrick is within Selby Council and plans are being developed by Selby for 50-1000 homes in the Escrick boundary. Escrick currently comprises 317 homes so the addition of 200-300 more will change the character of the village entirely. The location intended by York will to have direct access to the village. Traffic can be heavy already. The Anaerobic digester and Tomato growing facility will add traffic, noise and pollution. Facilities are already limited (school, doctors service). Questioning where all the people will work. Houses are already available within Escrick. The large new estate will be an appendage to the existing village.	9754/19709	
	Objection – proposals to develop land north of Escrick are misguided for several reasons. Understand that YCC is required to exhaust existing Brownfield sites for development prior to embarking upon schemes in other areas, particularly Green Belt areas. It does not make sense to develop land on the south side of York from which the access into the city is via A19. Surely the focus should be on land on other arterial roads served by the improved park and ride sites. The A19 in Escrick is already extremely busy and there are frequent accidents/near misses. The proposed developments would add significantly to these dangers. The A19 is very busy to cross for pedestrians and would become busier. Escrick CE Primary School would not be able to cope with the influx of pupils. The doctor’s surgery is not designed to serve a village of the projected size. It makes sense for York CC to develop housing in areas that are not on the absolute fringe of its boundaries. It is damaging for the village to be split between two local authorities, with neighbours receiving different services and paying different rates of council tax.	9785/20242	
	Objection – further development in this area will cause excessive traffic build up and delays leading to gridlock on the A19. These proposed developments will have a deleterious effect, impacting local amenities and services, such as school, shop, post office, surgery and Fulford	9795/20259	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	School catchment area and affect the nature of Escrick village.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection - opposed to the allocation of this site. It is village is primarily in Selby authority and is an unsustainable location to meet York's needs. It is greenbelt land. The proposal is too large and will put too much strain on the village infrastructure. The proposal is some distance from the centre of the village and amenities. The site will be near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. This site has been previously rejected for development. Access is questionable and there is no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Community consultation of whole village undertaken by Escrick Parish Council showed that many residents supported some additional housing but it was emphasised by most that the quantity of houses developed should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of service. Detailed comments provided, see response.	9800/26348	
	Objection - Escrick is not within the York County Council boundaries. Most major employers in York are downsizing. Employment in Leeds is growing but not at a rate requiring growth in the commuter belt. The proposed development will impact the main arterial road network within a 10 mile radius of Escrick village. The A19 will become a major bottleneck. The environmental impact of these large numbers of vehicles would be significant. Getting out of the village onto the A19 is bad enough already. The village school would need to be extended and other amenities in the village, i.e. the shop, the post office, doctor's surgery, would not be able to cope. The feel of the village would change dramatically as the community is divided by the new developments which would feel like an 'appendage' to the existing community.	9855/20288	
	Objection- there is no need for such a major development site like this. The level of housing already planned in York is in excess of 40,000. The A19 is already gridlocked and this will only get worse with other developments nearby. Any development will have a significant negative impact on local amenities, service and the community. The current amenities such as school, surgery and sewage facility cannot support the increase in housing. As the houses are in York boundary rather than Selby, it will result in a split local community and a split in who pays for what as the new houses gain the benefits of being in York city boundary but also gets the benefit of service paid for by Selby council.	9869/22961	
	Support- support the Council's current proposals as sustainable, viable and deliverable. Objection- further evidence submitted to persuade the Council of the numerous planning and wider public benefits of allocating the whole of the site. Detailed comments provided, see response.	9885/26145 9885/18513	Linden Homes & Escrick Park Estate
	Objection- scale of proposed development is significant and will impact adversely on traffic flow on the A19. No justification for a development of this size. York's population growth was under 10% over the last 10 years, yet this proposal is looking to add around 50% to the village	9891/20304	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing stock. Escrick school and surgery will not be able to cope with such a development in the short term. The proposed development will have no road connection with Escrick and looks as though it will in effect be separate but at the same time causing traffic issues and putting pressure on local services.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection- a development of this size is not necessary in this area. It will be too large for the existing village services and road network. The employment growth in the York area is unlikely to warrant the proposed 20,000 new homes in villages in addition to the 20,000 new homes already proposed. The A19 is already at a standstill. Selby are also submitting proposals for new houses in the village as Escrick falls under Selby DC. The congestion, safety and pollution concerns raised by the extra traffic created by this raft of development should be taken into account before reaching any decisions. Escrick is a village not a suburb of York and as such has an identity and community. The surgery, school, post office and shop plus the village hall are not of a standard to deal with such a massive increase in population. The residents of Escrick are within Selby District Council and as the proposed new development will be York CC this will not help with the integration of communities.	9894/24337	
	Objection- scale of proposed development is significant and will impact adversely on traffic flow on the A19. No justification for a development of this size. York's population growth was under 10% over the last 10 years, yet this proposal is looking to add around 50% to the village housing stock. Escrick school and surgery will not be able to cope with such a development in the short term. The proposed development will have no road connection with Escrick and looks as though it will in effect be separate but at the same time causing traffic issues and putting pressure on local services.	9903/20307	
	Objection- Selby District Council has put forward plans for new housing (100 houses) in a more suitable location to the east of the village, away from the busy A19. The site proposed by York council takes no account of the danger and additional traffic on the A19. The village of Escrick itself is within Selby District and has no links with York other than as a nearby village and the proposal of 250 homes would be too many for such a small village to incorporate- small school, lack of amenities etc.	9960/24506	
	Objection – the proposed development will increase the village by more than 60%. Additional traffic onto the A19 will increase congestion and grid lock. Concern regarding if there are any plans to increase the size of the village school and medical facilities. There are existing problems with the drainage in the village.	9995/21955	
	Objection - opposed to the allocation of this site. It is village is primarily in Selby authority and is an unsustainable location to meet York's needs. It is greenbelt land. The proposal is too large and will put too much strain on the village infrastructure. The proposal is some distance from	10005/18559	Dower Chase and Dower park residents group

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the centre of the village and amenities. The site will be near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. This site has been previously rejected for development. Access is questionable and there is no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Community consultation of whole village undertaken by Escrick Parish Council showed that many residents supported some additional housing but it was emphasised by most that the quantity of houses developed should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of service. Detailed comments provided, see response.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – this is Green Belt land when Brownfield land is available. It is on the extreme boundary of CYC authority. Escrick will become a divided community with Selby. There is a lack of access to the site. The A19 will become busier and more hazardous. There is no need for expansion on this scale. The school will need to be expanded. Selby are planning to build houses at the other side of the village, thus radically altering the village feel and character.	10026/25975	
	Support- these proposals will require an amendment to the boundary of the Green Belt as proposed in the Preferred Options and should lead to the whole of the built up area of the village north of the York/Selby boundary plus the proposed new allocations being excluded from the Green Belt.	10027/22963	
	Support- this site seems a suitable area for building some much needed housing in the area. Development will inject some much needed new blood into Escrick and will stimulate growth in local infrastructure. It will help secure facilities such as the Post Office by increasing demand and viability. There will be a need to liaise with NYCC to ensure the primary school has capacity and that road junctions are able to cope with increased traffic.	10059/24429	
	Objection- this site lies within the York Green Belt. York’s setting must continue to be protected. This proposal is out of scale and overdevelopment. The number of houses would effectively triple the size of the village. The A19 is already very busy during the day, an increase of that proposed would add to the traffic pressures.	10061/24431	
	Objection – development needs to be proportional. There are better locations more central to the village which can be used. This site has been rejected previously. There is no safe access to the village amenities. The infrastructure is over run. Brownfield sites should be considered first. The A19 is simply too busy. The village should expand at a pace that allows infrastructure to be improved gradually.	10085/25800	
	Objection – this is agricultural land. The proposals made by Selby for other parts of the village need to housing demands placed on a village this size. Development will overburden the infrastructure and roads. It would make the roads increasingly dangerous. A development here is unsustainable and unpractical. It will ruin what is regarded a beautiful village.	10086/25801	
	Objection – this would totally swamp a small rural village. The village could not cope with all	10087/25802	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the additional traffic. The school does not have the capacity for more children. It should be the responsibility of the council to protect the natural beauty of York's rural villages.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – development will add traffic to the already congested roads. Roads are also already dangerous. Sites should be considered nearer the city centre where the jobs are.	10088/25803	
	Objection – York has already proposed in excess of 20,000 new homes in its area within 2013 Local Plan. Economic expansion within the area is not growing at a rate to warrant and there will not be enough employment opportunities within the area. There is no need to increase the size of the village by over 50%. There will be a likelihood of causing crisis for the provision of local services and infrastructure. There will be an impact on the main arterial road network which will affect Escrick directly. There also will be an impact on amenities and services including the need for a larger school, children will be at risk walking to school, the amenities in the village would not be capable of coping with such large increase in housing.	10118/22957	
	Objection – the A19 already is heavily congested. It will be made worse with an Anaerobic digester also proposed. The road is used by HGVs. Peoples safety is put at risk crossing the road to catch buses. More houses will impact on this.	10142/25912	
	Comment – some expansion is necessary but should be appropriately managed with appropriate infrastructure provision planned into developments. New homes should reflect the size and affordability elsewhere in the village, retaining the character and diversity of the village. There should be an end to infill in the existing footprint of the village.	10149/25915	
	Comment –whilst the school presently has the physical capacity to accommodate a small increase in pupil number, any significant increase in role as a result of a large housing development could only occur with financial help from a Local Authority. Support would be required for changes to the school's building and infrastructure to accommodate increased number. This would require CYC to liaise with NYCC to ensure the school received adequate financial backing to fulfil required changes.	10179/18886	Escrick Church of England Primary School
	Objection – strongly object to proposals to build on land. The village is within Selby DC and is already expected to expand within Selby's Local Plan. Such a huge increase could double the size of the village and the existing amenities and services (i.e. school, surgery, shop) would not be able to cope. Traffic on the A19 is already very nearly gridlocked. With new developments planned for Germany Beck and the anaerobic digester at the old mine site, this can only get worse. New housing within York CC could never become part of the existing village as it is under a different council. It would end up as a new village tacked on to the original. Concern regarding the Green Belt.	10192/21961	
	Object- the residents do not want this huge increase in housing to the village. The amenities of the village, school, surgery, village hall, post office and shop could not cope with an increase in	10236/21222	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing. The traffic increase to the A19 would make it worse. If Selby decide to build as well, the village would no longer be a village and would be split between York and Selby.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – whilst not opposed to sensible development the plan to build 250 homes seems excessive given that it is proposed to build 20,000 homes in the York area. The development would almost double the size of the village. The existing village is in Selby District Council whilst the new homes would be in York District. Traffic on the A19 is already high and the addition of possibly 350 cars from the new development plus traffic from the proposed anaerobic digester facility, 700 homes at Germany Beck, and Whinthorpe new village near Elvington, could make the A19 more dangerous and virtually inaccessible at peak times. Present amenities in the village are not sufficiently robust to cope with the influx of residents. The school would almost have to double in size and the surgery is already working at full capacity. It seems illogical to build what is in effect a new small village on to an existing one with each being in a different council area. The proposed development would change the whole character of the village to the detriment of the present inhabitants.	10242/22070	
	Objection – economic expansion and employment in North Yorkshire and York is not growing at a rate that requires this influx of housing. The impact of traffic on the A19, which is already busy especially driving into Fulford and York, will be a nightmare. The primary school would have to provide new classrooms and assembly hall. There is a safety issue with children walking along busy roads – parents would probably elect to drive the children to school causing parking problems in Carr Lane and Main Street in Escrick. The surgery is working hard to cope with the present demands of patients in Escrick and surrounding villages.	10243/22072	
	Comment- the infrastructure must be in place to support the new houses without affecting the lives of existing residents. There is not enough agricultural land to meet our future food needs for the country. Concern there is brownfield land that hasn't been identified.	10244/21231	
	Objection – there is the potential to be severe strain on local services. If expansion must happen there should be no more than 37 houses in total, for Selby and York together so it is a 10% increase of the village.	10340/26033	
	Objection- concerned the development is not necessary as the development at Germany Beck and Whinthorpe is going ahead. Selby is also considering development on Green Belt farm land in the village. Selby has already seen growth and expansion of new housing sites. Concern regarding traffic volume and pedestrian safety. Consideration should be given to the increase of heavy vehicles from the Anaerobic digester. Development would change the 'feel' of the village and could result in a decrease of property.	10346/26041	
	Objection – the plans create too many issues and not enough benefits. The A19 is frequently gridlocked. There will be a strain on the existing facilities. The village is spit down the middle	10359/26052	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	between York and Selby authorities. Development for York should stay within the A64 boundaries and not encroach into the countryside.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – no land should be used for housing development. The whole dynamics of the village will be ruined and the infrastructure will be destroyed. The A19 is already horrendously busy and more development will make this worse.	10362/26056	
	Objection – York should develop within the ring road. More development will cause the A19 to be gridlocked. The village would lose its identity. There will be excessive strain on village facilities. The division of houses between authorities will cause problems for the Parish Council. There is no advantage for Escrick residents.	10363/26057	
	Objection – the Anaerobic digester facility is on the same access road as this proposal. The A19 is already heavily congested. The infrastructure cannot cope with additional housing.	10367/26063	
	Objection – this site is at the extent of the York boundary and in the area of the anaerobic digester facility. The A19 already struggles to cope with the level of traffic at certain times of the day. The infrastructure cannot cope at present. Development should be carried out by Selby, not York.	10368/26064	
	Objection – this proposal will increase the volume of traffic causing gridlock. Escrick is currently populated by a preponderance of elderly people. There is minimal infrastructure, as a consequence a car or buses are essential to travel to York or Selby. With Germany Beck being developed there is be no capacity at Fulford School for children from Escrick.	10370/26066	
	Objection- the proposed scheme is too big for the village and will destroy the character of the village. Concern regarding the impact the scheme will have on the already overloaded A19, and the impact on the local environment and existing village amenities. Considering the size of the proposal and the fact it is being built on Green Belt land, the level of communication has been poor. Concern that the proposal is from CYC and Escrick is located at the very edge of their administrative boundary gives little confidence views will be taken seriously.	10393/22487	
	Objection – A19 cannot carry more traffic. Escrick residents struggle to enter and leave the village. There will be more houses built at Fulford and Barlby, the Anaerobic digester will increase traffic, noise and pollution. Village amenities will need improving. Village will be totally altered. Escrick is Selby District Council, development is York CC, and this would split the village. If houses are built in this area we need a bypass urgently.	10404/22493	
	Objection – the development will change the character of the village and will stretch amenities to bursting point. A burden will be placed on the primary school. It may affect the catchment area of Fulford School. The surgery may not be able to cope. It will increase congestion on the A19. Escrick is Selby DC. Is it realistic to expect seamless integration of planning, amenities, costs and services if CYC develop this land? The local plan is misguided.	10408/22500	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – the development will change the character of the village and will stretch amenities to bursting point. A burden will be placed on the primary school. It may affect the catchment area of Fulford School. The surgery may not be able to cope. It will increase congestion on the A19. Escrick is Selby District Council. Is it realistic to expect seamless integration of planning, amenities, costs and services if CYC develop this land. The local plan is misguided.</p>	10409/22502	
	<p>Objection – no need for a major development in Escrick. Economic expansion and employment is not growing at a rate to warrant this. Traffic congestion. Environmental impact of these new large volumes of traffic and danger for pedestrians. Full school. Insufficient amenities. Effects in community cohesion.</p>	10523/22708	
	<p>Objection- opposed to the development as it would impact upon amenities and services, especially schools. The feel of the village would change dramatically. There would be impacts on traffic, especially on the A19. The environmental impact of these new large volumes of traffic could be significant.</p>	10525/22710	
	<p>Objection – Escrick is not in York City Council yet Escrick is Selby District Council, this could affect community cohesion. Economic expansion, employment in North Yorkshire and York is not growing enough to warrant this. Most major employers are downsizing. Employment in Leeds is growing, but not enough to require commuter belt growth around York. Impact of traffic on A19. A number of proposed developments will impact on the road network within 10 mile radius of Escrick. A19 will become a major bottleneck. The school will need to be expanded. Children could be at risk from volume of traffic when walking to school. Local amenities will struggle with increased population. Fulford School catchment area could be affected.. The feel of the village could change. The new development feeling like an appendage to the existing community.</p>	10526/22712	
	<p>Objection- opposed to the development of this size due concern regarding the need of such a development. Escrick is not in the City of York Council and is only just in the extreme boundary of CYC. Economic expansion and employment in North Yorkshire and York is not growing at a rate to warrant this. The proposed development will impact on traffic, especially on the A19. There will be an impact on amenities and services, the feel of the village would change dramatically as the community is divided by new developments, which would feel like an appendage to the existing community.</p>	10739/19929	
	<p>Object – size of development inappropriate to the size of the village. Character will be lost. Roads are exceedingly busy. Major inflow onto the A19 will only make things worse. Roads are currently a hazard for pedestrians, who need to cross to get to key village amenities.</p>	10744/19936	
	<p>Objection – see survey 3.</p>	11203/27238	
	<p>Objection – see survey 3.</p>	11212/27241	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 3.	11213/27243	
	Objection – see survey 3. Totally opposed to more development on the A19. The A19 already has more traffic on it than it can cope with and there are already daily traffic jams at peak times. Local services could not sustain any further development.	11224/27246	
	Objection – see survey 3. A19 is bad enough without a 15 acre housing development.	11319/27281	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11320/27283	
	Objection – see survey 3. There is great concern regarding increased use of the A19, south of York, ie Escrick, North Selby Mine, Germany Beck. The Council seems to plan to make only logical route into York into several miles of stationery traffic.	11321/27286	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11322/27289	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11324/27292	
	Objection – no need for a major development due to current economic and population growth. Concern regarding grid locked roads, especially the A19. There will be an increase in local pollution and risk of accidents. Major housing development will have a significant negative impact on local amenities, service and community.	11386/22923	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal to build on Green Belt land when there are numerous Brownfield sites available. Escrick is right on the edge of the CYC boundary and most of the village is in Selby District Council. As such there will be a divisive impact and affect community cohesion. Current amenities could not withstand such a large development. The primary school already at bursting point. Development will have a devastating effect upon property values. There is already gridlock on the roads and there is no demand for homes in rural sites.	11390/22927	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane</b>	Comment – aware that a number of protected species are present in the area north of Stockton Lane. The combination of ridge and furrow grassland and numerous field ponds will make the presence of water vole, Great Crested Newts and other amphibians very likely. Mitigation will be required and also work to ensure habitat can be connected up for meta-populations.	42/18918	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – loss of agricultural land 5.9ha. Development would adversely affect the gradual transition from suburban sprawl to open country and destroy the view across open fields to the A64. Access to services is poor, leading to increased car use along Stockton lane, already a commuter run with high traffic levels at high speeds at peak times. Maximum acceptable development could be from the cul-de-sac off Greenfield Park Drive limited to the strip of land immediately behind the church. Amend Boundary	45/18796	York Environment Forum
	Objection - this increase of over and above the 1,800 dwellings envisaged on Site ST7 in the Preferred Options leads to a new total approaching 2,500 dwellings and results in almost two and a half times as many dwellings as presently exist in the whole of the Heworth Without parish area. Notably vague on how any development of land north of Stockton lane will be served by or integrated into existing transport links. The A64 is at capacity at the point where it passes within reach of any development east of Metcalfe Lane. Existing local roads are already congested, and mainly comprising narrow estate roads are not adequate for the volume of traffic envisaged by developments on this scale. This parcel of land was last assessed and rejected in June 2013 prior to the release of the Preferred Options. It is included among Valuable Areas of the Green Belt because it maintains the pattern of historic Green Wedges and contributes to the invaluable impression of a historic city situated within and approached through a varied sequence of rural settings. Proposed developers of the site argue that larger strategic sites already included in the Preferred Options are unlikely to deliver the number and density of dwellings required by the plan within the required timeframe and that further land should be identified to fill the void. They also argue that the land is not sufficiently important to merit exclusion for these reasons. The proposed developers also make claims about the proximity of necessary infrastructure which are simply incorrect. The nearest primary school has not had any spare places in recent years and is unlikely to have spare places in the foreseeable future and the nearest secondary school within the requisite distance is due to close in Summer 2014. The nearest GP surgery has closed and is being developed for housing. Additional traffic using Stockton lane for access to York to other areas is likely to be substantial and will add to the already lengthening queues at the Stockton Lane/ Malton Road junction as well as increasing traffic into Murton and Holtby. The SFRA has played no part in the housing proposals. Detailed comments provided, see response.	65/18567	Heworth Without Parish Council
	Objection – this site forms part of a Green Wedge centred on Monk Stray which penetrates from the open countryside into the heart of the built-up area of the City. With the southern expansion	238/18159	English Heritage

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of Monks Cross, the development of this area would significantly reduce the width of the wedge at this point. The allocation and development of this area, therefore seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City.		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Support – the site represents an accessible and sustainable location. Confirms that the site is viable and deliverable. There are no technical constraints. Extensive evidence base prepared to support delivery of the site. The vision for the site adheres to the wider visions of the city’s growth within the Local Plan. Detailed information submitted. Please see response.	451/18933	Linden Homes North and Miller Homes
	Objection – site 187 alongside ST7 will cause major transport problems. Until new roads (including the dualling of the A64) and a further river crossing is built there will be gridlock.	702/18107	
	Support – agree with recommendation for inclusion of this site in the plan.	943/20510	
	Support – see survey 1	973/26357	
	Comment- in principle the site is suitable for some housing. The documents that have been prepared by Linden Homes however give a very misleading impression of the how the site can be serviced by existing local facilities.	1207/23793	
	Comment – due to the location of the site it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18585	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Objection – why do we need these houses and who are they for. Tarmac 200+ acres of green belt will reduce drainage; this could lead to more flooding. Where is the water supply coming from and where will sewage go. What plans are there for schools, medical facilities, roads and transport. Will mean 4000+ cars who will mainly use Stockton Lane to access the city centre, this road is already congested at rush hours, particularly at junction with Malton Road. Queues will result in inefficient driving and more fuel burn. Not everyone can cycle or walk into town. Extra cars will generate extra 2000+ journeys into and out of city aggravating pollution. Urban sprawl will destroy atmosphere of old, historic city, making it less attractive to tourists. As little industry most incomers will use the city as a dormitory. No confidence in ability to tie up all the unintended consequences of such large building programme to the east of the city. Modest house building on brown field sites is approved of but not the destruction of the way of life of the citizens.	1355/18605	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – this development is totally inappropriate in the first place being on the greenbelt, house numbers should be reduced to 1,300. This area supports a mass of wildlife that goes unseen by the city dweller. The doctor’s surgery has closed, the secondary school has closed, the	1903/17776	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	primary school is over subscribed. The bus service is poor. There is also very little open space for children to play. Surrounding fields always floods after heavy rain.		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 1	1934/26362	
	Objection – shops, schools and medical facilities have been shut recently. Government encourages a target of 60% of new buildings on Brownfield sites. Land should be protected. Serious erosion of the green belt.	1946/20455	
	Objection – see survey 1	2052/26369	
	Objection – see survey 1. The land is prone to flooding.	2416/20586	
	Objection – see survey 1	2470/26375	
	Objection – see survey 1	2599/26378	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny. Traffic flow on the outer ring road is a problem now.	2681/17931	
	Objection- this land has been previously rejected for development as it was Green Belt. There is a lack of infrastructure to support new development.	2686/24457	
	Objection – would eat into greenbelt as well as causing much extra traffic on what is already a very busy road. It is short sighted to take more land out of food production	2765/20603	
	Objection – see survey 1. Opposed to use of green belt land	2994/18265	
	Objection – see survey 1	4287/26384	
	Objection – see survey 1	4738/26387	
	Objection – see survey 1	5371/26391	
	Objection – see survey 1	5901/26393	
	Objection – opposed to the site. No right to build on green belt land and use future generation’s inheritance. All brownfield sites must be used first, including empty properties.	6516/20318	
	Objection- this plot is to be more densely allocated than site 183 (165 dwellings on a 5.9ha site). Traffic from the new development would only increase congestion further. Residents living off Stockton Lane need a car to get to the nearest supermarket. The local shops cannot cater for residents who prefer to do a weekly shop. There is not a family doctor within walking distance for many of the local residents. There is only one local primary school and the nearest secondary school at Burnholme is set to close completely next year. This all makes for more people having to get into their cars again adding to congestion. This new potential site has previously been considered as unsuitable for development and as the local infrastructure has reduced further since then.	7168/24081	
Objection – see survey 1	7236/26396		
Objection- the site is highly questionable in size and location. Past planning proposals have been	7251/24082		



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	turned down on the basis it is Green belt, if it was Green belt then why not now. The daily journey entering and exiting Stockton Lane and other roads is becoming a nightmare. The drains in the area seem much undersized and infrastructure in the area seems wholly inadequate to expansion. No objection to building on brownfield sites i.e. the impending closure and demolition of Burnholme School.		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 1. Stockton Lane is a busy road – would like to see road bumps or other traffic calming measures put in place.	7253/26400	
	Objection – see survey 1	7255/26406	
	Objection – see survey 1. The target proposed by the council for housing overall in the Local Plan is in excess of the assessment of housing need as estimated by Arup in their survey prepared for the City Council. Opposed to the use of green belt land for this development. Planning permission has been refused for the land surrounding Christ Church to the north of Stockton Lane in the past on the grounds of protecting the green belt. Lack of infrastructure. The additional traffic generated by the development of housing on this scale would lead to congestion on the existing road network. The new developments at Monk’s Cross are already putting pressure on the Malton road. One local secondary School – Burnholme College has recently been closed. Local primary schools in Heworth Without are already full to capacity.	7258/21084	
	Objection – see survey 1	7260/26410	
	Objection – see survey 1. Clear from detailed assessment of submissions by the developers that both this site and ST7 are not needed together. The authority must make a decision on whether it needs either, which there is clearly no evidence for, and if so which. Detailed comments provided, please see response.	7297/18032	
	Objection – no proper public transport system. There is no secondary school. There are no leisure facilities for young people. Infrastructure could not cope.	7313/18708	Clr Nigel Ayre, on behalf of Heworth Without ward
	Objection – see survey 1	7346/26414	
	Objection- the proposal is excessive; it is designated green belt and should remain so.	7379/24084	
	Objection – see survey 1	7389/26416	
	Objection – see survey 1	7417/26419	
Objection – see survey 1	7424/26422		
Objection – together with other proposals in the area would place a ridiculous strain on the infrastructure. How would the ring road cope when it can’t cope now. More infrastructure issues need to be addressed: drainage, schooling, healthcare, public transport and jobs. The size of the proposed developments seems out of all proportion to the need.	7432/22063		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 1. Unhappy with the proposals for the housing on land north of Stockton Lane.	7436/26426	
	Objection – see survey 1	7437/26429	
	Objection – already a very busy road, traffic would increase dramatically. The lane is not built for large volumes of traffic. The land is green belt, protected against such schemes as the one being proposed. Moved to the area as it is a nice and quiet place to live. Don't want a high development down the road causing traffic noise and congestion and crime increase (which is bad enough), losing the peace and tranquillity of the beautiful fields proposed to be built on.	9253/17815	
	Objection – see survey 1. Already a very busy road, traffic would increase dramatically. The lane is not built for large volumes of traffic. Land is green belt and is protected. Will cause traffic noise and congestion and increases in crime.	9256/17816	
	Objection – this is not a good use of land.	9261/17822	Warman Homes Ltd
	Objection – strongly disagree with the proposal to develop this area. Stockton Lane is getting busier and busier, cars parking along Stockton Lane and Algarth Road already cause significant difficulty in accessing Algarth Rise. There are brownfield sites in York which could be built on before Greenfield sites. Ask the local doctors about the pollution levels in York, asthma and chest problems are common. Why make York bigger and have more people, the infrastructure can't take it.	9335/18063	
	Objection – will create further pollution, traffic and additional cost to services. This is a really valued green space which is very much appreciated by all residents as we are fast losing green spaces. York has poor air quality and the last thing we need is additional pollution be it air, light or noise. Please consider using brownfield sites around the town, surely these could be brought into being and given purpose. York is fast losing its charms and the more we put in it the more we lose.	9354/18066	
	Objection – rather than build more homes on green belt why not set aside areas as community gardens, wildlife projects for schools, park areas for children, grow small woodlands or even create more allotment areas. More could be done to make natural habitats more accessible particularly given loss caused by developments such as Vanguard. The water levels on Monk Stray seems naturally high so any additional non porous surfaces from new roads or housing will give surface water fewer soakaway areas. Local services seem already stretched – GP, Hempland Primary School is full, failure to provide full recycle collection to existing residents. Understand housing levels need to increase to support future generations, but the immediate (20 years) way forward must be the better use of existing accommodation and brownfield sites. York should not become an urban sprawl.	9355/18068	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – concerned over what seems a highly questionable size and location. Reliable informed that past planning proposals have been turned down on the basis that it is green belt which begs the question if it was green belt then why not now. The daily journey entering and exiting Stockton Lane is becoming a nightmare as it is let alone with further development. Is an access from the A64 suggested. The drains in the area also seem much undersized. No problem with brownfield development, the impending closure/demolition of Burnholme school is an ideal site for development as is the former gas works on Heworth Green. More favourable than building on green fields. The size and basis of this development and others in York seem to be based on aspirational grounds and not the actual needs of the York residents.	9382/17777	
	Objection – traffic problems will occur. Facilities are nil in this ward – no GP, no secondary school, no frequent bus service, no shopping areas. Develop this area and they will cause disaster.	9639/18080	
	Support – see survey 1 and survey 6.	9697/26434	
	Objection – see survey 1. Concern about the impact it will have on road safety on Stockton Lane. Increase in traffic would reduce the rate of traffic flow on an important route into the city.	9704/20156	
	Objection - the current volume of traffic on Stockton Lane is already an issue with local residents. Inappropriate urban sprawl would destroy the open nature of the ward. The City's infrastructure is struggling to cope with today's current demands. Green belt land should be protected for future generations.	9787/20246	
	Objection – the proposed development will cause major upset to many areas within Heworth Without. Neither Hempland nor Heworth primary school could cope with the extra children. The roads in and around Heworth are already clogged and this semi-rural ward would be swamped and destroyed forever. The limited facilities that are here will be stretched to the limit.	9796/20261	
	Objection- the proposal is short sighted. What is wrong with building houses on the Old Clifton Aerodrome where there is plenty of room.	9834/24236	
	Objection- the view from the flats opposite will cease and as such will decrease in value. The bus service is already full and the number 11 regularly does not turn up. The school facilities are full, where will children go. New schools are needed. Stockton Lane is already a busy road and more development will cause more traffic to be pushed onto Malton Road. Doctor's surgeries are full now, there is only one post office, there are few local shops and only two chemists and one library alongside a lack of other facilities.	9846/24252	
	Objection- the plans mean development is sprawling along Stockton Lane to the extent that there will be no distinction between York and Stockton on the Forest. Object to plans to build on the green belt that is so precious and gives York that extra special feeling. If the plans are approved considerably fewer houses should be built. In addition to the green space at Monks	9909/24352	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Stray, the developers should include a landscaped development like Rowntree Park. Proper footpaths and cycleways should be built to link developments to that part of the Monk Stray (between Toby Carvery and the Malton Road roundabout) and the Monk Stray should be maintained to the same standard as the stray nearest to York.		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection- opposed to the loss of green belt in an already densely populated residential area. The infrastructure is already struggling, drainage and local road network.	10054/24417	
	Objection – this proposal impacts the current Green Belt, but also on the current infrastructure supporting this area. Until transport issues are resolved effectively then any further residential development in the Stockton Lane area, together with Metcalfe Lane should be avoided. In addition, serious consideration must be given to the following potential issues before any residential development in the area takes place: improving roundabout junction at Malton Road/Stockton Lane/ Heworth Green; public transport routes from Stockton Lane area into York; drainage and other utilities; schools; and local small retail facilities.	10122/19469	
	Objection – lack of infrastructures and local services in the area. Green Belt protected. Destruction of the semi-rural character of the area. Oversubscribed schools. No local GP service, small shops or supermarkets. Increase of traffic down Stockton lane.	10132/20349	
	Objection- the road is too narrow presently owing to increased traffic. The foul and surface water drainage would be severely overloaded and require major investment. There are sufficient Brownfield sites to develop without incursions into the Green Belt.	10174/19374	
	Objection – see survey 1. Alteration of the landscape and the whole character of the ward. Protect the natural habitat for wildlife. Increase of traffic.	10203/21152	
	Objection – the land is in the green belt. The land is still used for agricultural use. Cattle still graze on this land. The site is in or very close to the flood plane and there is already highway drainage problems and difficulties.	10215/21176	
	Comment – it is estimated that an average of 145 vehicles per hour will be added to the Stockton Lane traffic load. Inbound queuing for access to the Malton Road roundabout is already a problem at peak times. It will get increasingly worse. The plans should demonstrate what highway works and traffic management measures are proposed to address this.	10360/26053	
	Objection – site was originally rejected from consultation as not suitable for development. The site is on greenbelt land, and further development would further erode the Greenfield areas of the city. Feels the local facilities are already in short supply, and would not sustain further development.	10438/19411	
	Objection – infrastructure already struggling and cannot support an additional 165 houses. Local primary schools are full, the local secondary school has been closed and the nearest ones are oversubscribed. Local GP is busy. Local roads are already a problem, no capacity for additional	10496/22662	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cars. The land is subject to flooding. Pond in adjacent field supports much of the local wildlife. The land is greenbelt and important part of the semi rural character of the local area. Land designated as greenbelt should be protected from development.		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – development will exacerbate the existing traffic problems. The primary school is over subscribed, and there is no secondary school	10499/22667	
	Objection – already serious traffic congestion. The problem would increase with new development, and would effect the environment, air quality and traffic safety. No traffic calming measures near church and nursery. Road infrastructure is not good enough for current use. Only one primary school. Actions may be illegal.	10517/22698	
	Objection- could cause traffic and parking problems at Childs nursery and bus stops in between.	10518/22699	
	Objection – infrastructure is too weak to cope with added pressure. There are drainage issues, and susceptible to flood. No local secondary school. Hospital won't be able to cope with increase in population. Public transport has been removed rather than expanded.	10534/22740	
	Objection – opposed to the loss of greenbelt for housing. If accepted, what assurances are there that no future applications will be made on the playing fields, a valuable resource to the local community. Majority of people drive to work. Roads are already congested. There is a high water table and no apparent land drainage. Huge capital investment is required to provide sewerage and drainage. No indication of impact on schools.	10539/22745	
	Objection – there will be a loss of light due to open fields being replaced by a housing estate. There will be a loss of privacy, as new houses would overlook existing ones. It would result in a loss of visual amenity. It would result in a negative impact on highway safety on roads used by children. It would result in an increase in traffic on an already busy road. There would be an increase in noise and disturbance. There will be an increase in traffic fumes. There will be a large loss of trees. Road access will cause problems for new and existing residents. It is a greenbelt land. Brownfield sites should be developed.	10547/22762	
	Objection – this site has poor public transport on evenings and weekends and no access to off road cycle routes. Whilst road networks are not noted as part of the initial assessment it feeds into existing heavily congested areas at the junction of Heworth Green/ Malton Road towards town or Malton Road/Hop Grove Lane towards A64. The area is no longer served by a 'local' secondary school. No local access to shops except for route via congested areas for supermarkets or via residential areas towards Bad Bargain Lane.	10591/22803	
	Objection – the site has poor public transport on evenings and weekends. No access to off road cycle routes. Feeds into an existing heavily congested area. The area is no longer served by a local secondary school. No local access to shops excepts for route via congested areas for supermarkets.	10667/19760	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to use of Greenfield site. Does not see why the Council is seeking to redefine this long established green belt. There are many available brownfield sites that should be developed before Greenfield sites. There is a very high water table. The site is home to wildlife. Proposals refused in the 1970s on the grounds of no satisfactory means of access, unlikely that foul drainage facilities were available or satisfactory surface water drainage. These reasons for refusal are still valid. Local infrastructure is already under strain. Concern at how the forecast calculation of proposed housing need has been made.	10721/19875	
	Objection- Heworth Without is a semi-rural ward and the character of the area would be irreversibly damaged if any of the surrounding Green Belt land is built on. Green belt should not be built on at any costs. If housing is needed, then all brown field sites should be used first. The area also does not have the infrastructure to support the number of houses proposed, schools in the area are at capacity. York can not support that number of extra people with employment. Drainage would be an issue. A significant increase in standing water in gardens since developments have been built behind Stockton Lane, even though drainage systems have been built with those particular developments.	10746/19942	
	Objection – traffic has increased already to an unacceptable level. Would change the character of the area. Opposed to use of greenbelt.	10809/20665	
	Objection- opposed to the proposed housing development on Stockton Lane.	10833/21384	
	Objection - character of the area would be destroyed forever. How can increasing an area by 1.5 times be justified. If need to houses, build on brownfield sites there are plenty of those. No infrastructure to support development. No secondary school, oversubscribed primary school, appalling bus service and only one shop. How can the roads take it. Who wants these houses. People who work in Leeds wanting to live there as it will be an easy commute which will clog up the roads even more. There are no extra jobs or any new industry in York. Picking to build in this area but not in areas where they are Labour councillors.	10853/21448	
	Objection – opposed to use of greenbelt. Inappropriate as no facilities for schools, no GPs, no shopping areas and the traffic is bad and the local bus service not very good.	10868/21482	
	Objection – the infrastructure is too weak to sustain more housing. The Metcalfe lane area has drainage issues and is likely to flood. Access to Stockton lane will severely impact on traffic in the area. There is no nearby secondary school and primary schools are at capacity. Public transport has been reduced in the evenings.	10874/25877	
	Objection – inadequate existing facilities in the ward. Increase in bottlenecks of traffic. Type of housing and timescales major concern for the established and quiet neighbourhood.	10911/21555	
	Objection - opposed to the proposed use of Greenbelt land in the Heworth Without area.	10928/21571	
	Objection – see survey 1	11237/26440	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 1 and survey 6	11238/26443	
	Objection – see survey 1	11239/26446	
	Objection – see survey 1	11240/26449	
	Objection – see survey 1	11242/26454	
	Objection – see survey 6. The whole new development on Stockton Lane and Derwenthorpe will put extra pressure on Stockton Lane traffic and schools in the area.	11243/26845	
	Objection – see survey 6. Heavy traffic on Stockton Lane and the small school Hempland will never take all the extra children.	11244/26850	
	Objection – see survey 1	11256/26458	
	Objection – see survey 1	11258/26461	
	Objection – see survey 1	11260/26464	
	Objection – see survey 1	11261/26467	
	Objection – see survey 1	11262/26470	
	Objection – see survey 1	11263/26472	
	Objection – see survey 1	11264/26504	
	Objection – see survey 1	11265/26506	
	Objection – see survey 1	11266/26510	
	Objection – see survey 1	11267/26513	
	Objection – see survey 1	11268/26516	
	Objection – see survey 1	11269/26520	
	Objection – see survey 1	11271/26524	
	Objection – see survey 1. Stockton Lane is a busy road. Realise houses must be built, but not for second homes. Number should be lowered and traffic lights should be put at Stockton Lane / Malton Road junction to cope with increase.	11272/26526	
	Objection – see survey 1	11273/26528	
	Objection – see survey 1	11274/26531	
	Objection – see survey 1	11275/26534	
	Objection – see survey 1. Woodlands Grove is the 'rat run' from Stockton Lane to Malton Road. Most cars speed down the road.	11276/26537	
	Objection – see survey 1	11277/26540	
	Objection – see survey 1	11278/26543	
	Objection – see survey 1	11279/26546	
	Support – see survey 1.	11280/26549	
Object – Stockton Lane can't cope with all the traffic, speed issues etc. Green belt should stay	11280/26551		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	green belt. Concerns for wildlife, crime etc. Houses facing the fields would decrease in value – will we be compensated for all the noise?		
<b>187 Land to the North of Stockton Lane (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 1	11281/26553	
	Support – see survey 1	11282/26556	
	Objection – see survey 1	11284/26560	
	Support – see survey 1	11285/26563	
	Objection – see survey 1. Proposed density of housing on Stockton Lane next to church too great	11287/26587	
	Objection – see survey 6	11289/26854	
	Objection – see survey 6	11291/26857	
	Objection – see survey 6	11292/26860	
	Support – see survey 1 and survey 6	11294/26589	
	Objection – see survey 1. Seems sad to take up Green Belt off Stockton Lane when there is an area off Layerthorpe which is semi-industrial and near the City Centre.	11298/26593	
	Objection – see survey 1	11299/26596	
	Objection – see survey 1	11300/26599	
	Objection – see survey 1	11301/26602	
	Objection – see survey 1	11302/26606	
	Objection – see survey 1	11303/26729	
	Objection – see survey 1	11304/26732	
	Objection – see survey 1	11305/26734	
	Objection – see survey 1. No proper access, overload Stockton Lane with traffic. Local amenities, schools etc would not cope. Why should we give up part of our green county land when other options are available.	11307/26738	
	Objection – see survey 1	11309/26742	
	Objection – see survey 1	11310/26745	
Objection – see survey 1	11311/26750		
Objection – see survey 1. The traffic is already at a high level with long delays at the roundabout. House shakes with the traffic, will get worse. Effect on wildlife will be massive. Pollution will increase. Drains and sewers would need to be increased. York should not be losing greenfield sites.	11312/26753		
Objection- if accepted worried if more proposals will appear to build on playing fields. Number of homes proposed is in excess. Would cause increase in traffic, cycle lanes would not meet additional 2000 plus households travel needs. High water table with no apparent land drainage means following rain there is a surface of water on the sports pitches. Problems with sewage	Petition 4		



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	system. Should invest in sewage and water system before any further development.		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>298 Sites at Connaught Court</b>	Comment – pleased to see part of the site is designated for greenspace. Also note that site access is located within flood zone 1.	3/18858	Environment Agency
	Objection – the 2008 Conservation Area Appraisal identified the historic parkland as a landscape setting for the Connaught Court building and as a strategic gap that maintains the separation of Fulford village from the main urban area of York. Development of any of the remaining open space within the Park would therefore undermine the central reasons for extending the conservation area to include the whole of the site. The site was considered in the initial call for sites and was not recommended for allocation. There is no evidence that any circumstances have occurred that would justify the change in the technical officer’s opinion from a decision not to allocate the site for housing to the site now passing the technical officer assessment. Detailed comments provided, see response.	62/19154	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – this site lies within the boundary of the Fulford Village Conservation Area and adjoins the cartilage of The Cottage (a Grade II listed building). The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay ‘special attention’ to ‘the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance’ of its Conservation Areas. Secondly, There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that ‘special regard’ should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural interest which they possess. Before allocating this area, there would need to be some evaluation of the contribution that this open area makes to the character of this part of the Conservation Area and the impact that its loss and subsequent development would have upon its significance. There would also need to be an evaluation of the contribution that this open area makes to the setting of the Listed Building and the impact which its loss and subsequent development would be likely to have upon that aspect of its significance. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is still considered appropriate to allocate this site for development, the Local Plan should make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute t the significance of these designated heritage assets are not harmed.	238/18160	English Heritage
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion of this site in the Local Plan.	943/20511	
	Comment – surveys distributed to all residents in Fulford, but no opinions expressed about proposed developments at Connaught Court. However, many residents expressed general concerns about development on flood plains. Urge Council to be incredibly cautious when progressing this development, due to its close proximity to	1355/18606	Julian Sturdy MP

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the river. Any development that is pursued should be mitigated with flood defences and measures to manage the flood risk in the area.		
<b>298 Sites at Connaught Court (continued)</b>	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17932	
	Objection – Morrell House, site ref. 125, and Connaught Court, site ref. 298, are identified as "to include the site for residential development. The Council must acknowledge there is an ageing population. The need of care home provision is going to increase not decrease. Support should be given to elderly persons who have contributed to the economy throughout their lives.	3799/22042	
	Objection – this will create unsustainable traffic and create urban sprawl.	5436/24020	
	Objection – does not agree with technical officer comments on this site. Confusing to assign the same site reference to the amalgamated sites (Site 298 in Further Sites Consultation main Document) as the reduced areas shown on site 298 (Appendix 2). Detailed comments provided, see response.	9337/18402	Fulford Friends
	Objection – opposed to the allocation on grounds of historic character, flood zone, green field, landfill site (potential contamination), air quality, bats. Development would have a huge effect on wildlife.	9431/18446	
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane</b>	Objection – do not support this site as a potential expansion to ST2. Owner of this piece of land has no intention of developing his garden and has questioned why it has been included. This piece of land has therefore not met the requirement to consult with land owners before allocating it for housing.	71/18976	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection –do not support this site as a potential expansion to ST2. Owner of this piece of land has no intention of developing his garden and has questioned why it has been included. This piece of land has therefore not met the requirement to consult with land owners before allocating it for housing.	78/19014	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – open land provided elsewhere to replace this sports ground. The proper course of action would be to return this site to agriculture. At present there is an open, countryside feel to the site on entering York on the A59 and when walking along Millfield Lane. To preserve these desirable attributes, if this site was built on, landscaping would need to be to a much greater depth and cleverly structured to simulate these attributes and continuous along Millfield Lane as well as Boroughbridge Road.	122/18815	Knapton Lane Residents Association
	Objection – see survey 13	901/26163	
	Objection – see survey 13	956/26168	
Support – agree with the recommendation for the inclusion of this site in the local	943/20512		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	plan.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – need of detailed revision at the overall need for so many houses, the density and lack of real open green space.	1324/20574	
	Comment – addition of the Old Vinery site makes the strategic greenspace that has been added to the adjoining site ST2 seem almost without purpose.	1355/18607	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – see survey 13	1582/23688	
	Objection – see survey 13	1597/26177	
	Objection – see survey 13	2009/22997	
	Objection – see survey 13	2603/26185	
	Objection – see survey 13	2607/26188	
	Objection- the transport infrastructure, shops, schools, medical centre and other facilities are already overstretched and cannot cope with such radical developments. Gridlock is a reoccurring problem on the A59, A1237 and other roads in the area. Before considering development, there should be a way of banning cars from central York.	2550/23813	
	Objection - traffic flow on the outer ring road is a problem now and access to Clifton Moor and Monks Cross is difficult. Congestion on the A1237 cuts Poppleton village off for emergency vehicles. School, doctors and the hospital are over loaded. Broadband service is slow and unacceptable, this should be upgraded. The drainage issues in Poppleton need addressing. The greenbelt should be preserved and Brownfield sites used. Preserving rural suburbs should be given priority.	2681/17933	
	Objection – see survey 13	2874/26191	
	Objection – see survey 13	2880/26196	
	Objection- residents of the area have already suffered with the new Park and Ride’s endless roadworks and now over 4000 houses are proposed to be built in the area. The village will no longer be that but an extension of Boroughbridge Road. There is not the capacity with the overstretched schools, shops and doctors. Traffic will increase further and the identity of the place will be lost.	2888/23828	
	Objection – roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable. The plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans.	2893/20688	
Objection – see survey 13	3043/26199		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection- the number of properties which the Council are trying to build has become ridiculous and will alter the nature and ambiance of a lovely village. At the moment it takes days to get a doctors appointment so with well over a thousand new properties it will probably take over a week. There would be a large change in the schools performance with the influx of large numbers of children and the roads will suffer.	3248/23878	
	Objection – see survey 13	3278/26204	
	Objection – at present some sites around Poppleton that have been started are under utilised/ not able to be let, therefore still not developed to their full potential because of this. Traffic situation around and outer ring road. Clients are not able to get in or out the offices, going elsewhere.	3378/22308	
	Objection – see survey 13	3481/26211	
	Objection – see survey 13	3502/26216	
	Comment – see survey 13. People have to be housed so there is nothing wrong in using the Boroughbridge Road are provided extra schools and medical facilities are provided. Also, a new link road would need to be provided, but to connect where, I don't know. There are already enough cars on Boroughbridge Road.	3507/26221	
	Objection – see survey 13	3565/26226	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3577/21993	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3596/22008	
	Support – see survey 13	3628/26231	
	Objection – see survey 13	3735/26236	
	Objection – see survey 13	3747/26241	
	Objection – concern regarding the over development of land generally and encroachment on/removal of land from the green belt and destruction of the green corridor. Development would be detrimental to the heritage of York. Rural routes should be protected. Development of a residential, industrial and/or retail nature would destroy valuable arable agricultural land, green belt and the green corridor. Extensive residential development will cause coalescence of communities, destroying the individual character. Infill of commercial/semi industrial land which will be detrimental to the valuable wildlife and heritage of the area. There is inadequate infrastructure to support high volume development. Brownfield sites in and around	4726/22330	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the York should be developed first. Vacant retail units in the city centre and around the periphery. Still undeveloped plots of land at business parks for needs to expand employment opportunities. Alternative use for unoccupied business or other units.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection- opposed to this development on the grounds the site is Green Belt land and will contribute to the appearance of urban sprawl.	5408/24008	
	Objection – previously used as a site for development, it should not appear in further site consultation. Privately owned land and the owner has not been consulted. It impacts on ST2 Civil Service Sports Ground and due to the coalescence effect of the development boundary between the city outskirts and the rural villages, the site should be removed.	5686/20808	
	Objection – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full and the GP is full to capacity. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5704/20814	
	Objection – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full and the GP is full to capacity. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5705/20830	
	Objection – the existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the government. Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt which is essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York. The houses on Northfield Lane vibrate with the HGV traffic and this will increase with further use. Original building restrictions on use and opening times are not being adhered to and an extension to the business park will be unbearable to live with. Negotiating areas around the green	5735/20849	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>where there are no footpaths is already difficult and will be worse with the additional traffic caused. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full and the GP is full to capacity. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses. The extent of this development is excessive. The number should be reduced. This land forms part of the green belt corridor which is essential to preserve Poppleton as a village and not a suburb of York.</p>		
<p><b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in this area are already under great strain and facilities must be provided. The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate these additional families.</p>	5817/20901	
	<p>Objection - the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided.</p>	5852/20940	
	<p>Objection - the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided.</p>	5882/22407	
	<p>Objection – see survey 13</p>	5950/26245	
	<p>Objection – the Green belt must be preserved. Traffic already at a standstill. Utility services and local facilities are at risk of being overburdened.</p>	6050/20999	
	<p>Objection – see survey 13. The development of Boroughbridge Road / British Sugar – using Green Belt land is totally inappropriate. Is the Old Manor School to be re-opened. Boroughbridge Road development out of proportion with last 2 years of development.</p>	6190/26247	
	<p>Objection – see survey 13</p>	6203/26251	
	<p>Objection – see survey 13. New housing would normally reflect the local need. It would appear the Council are imposing the scheme against our wishes. The inadequate road system will not cope with the large increase in traffic which would follow the housing development.</p>	6425/26256	
	<p>Objection – the land is home to a large amount of wildlife.</p>	8553/21100	
	<p>Objection – the scale of the proposed housing planned on Green Belt is an outrage. Lack of consideration given to Brownfield sites and to the additional strain on the already overloaded traffic and general infrastructure, including schools and hospitals. There needs to be a better understanding of the connections between jobs and houses. There is a risk that those that can afford, will simply commute to their jobs in</p>	9331/18394	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	other cities. Residents were previously assured that the Civil Service Sports Ground would remain for sports facilities, the Olympics made keeping healthy more popular, and this decision to allocate opposes the trend. The traffic down Poppleton Road and Boroughbridge Road is already appalling now, even with the Park and Ride.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – the infrastructure cannot take further development. All Brownfield sites should be used first before considering Green Belt land. At a review some years ago the planning Inspector recommended that the site remain in recreational uses. There is not sufficient strategic greenspace on this site.	9396/18428	
	Objection – opposed to inclusion of all the further sites added to the existing plan in the Rural West Ward (ST1, ST2, ST19, 779, 733, 742, 772, 253, 206 and SF8) as potential for housing development. Amount to at least 2000 extra houses and increase commercial development in an area that should be kept as Green Belt. The development will take more land than that currently occupied by Nether and Upper Poppleton and is out of proportion to existing settlements. The use of this land will swamp the established communities of Poppleton and Knapton, ruin them as villages and be contrary to the Village Design Statement Guidelines. York has 'windfall sites in the last few years and the Council should allocate all available Brownfield land for development before thinking of Greenfield. Some of the commercial land which is available in York now has not been taken up and many offices in the City Centre are vacant. Concern regarding the impact on infrastructure (drainage/ flooding risks, medical support, schools, shops, roads, broadband, public transport).	9411/18440	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9692/21938	
	Objection – see survey 13. No further development should take place in NW York until the near gridlock conditions on the A1237 have been sorted out on a permanent basis – burning valuable fuel, polluting the atmosphere in this rural belt.	9827/26263	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9874/24287	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9882/24310	
	Objection – see survey 13. The scale of housing proposed on Green Belt is an outrage. There has been a lack of consideration to Brownfield sites and to the	10069/19123	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	additional strain on the already overloaded traffic and general infrastructure. There is concern regarding the needs of all the people who need schools and hospitals. Those that can afford will simply commute to their jobs to Leeds and other cities.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – development will dramatically impact to the detriment on all amenities and life in the village.	10216/21181	
	Objection – see survey 13. There are too many big sites in a small area where roads are already clogged with traffic. Infrastructure improvements (roads, schools etc) must be made prior to development.	10301/26269	
	Objection – see survey 13	10736/26274	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal as it is beyond the village boundary.	10430/19433	
	Objection - there will be an increase in traffic and a need for extra parking. There is a need to improve the infrastructure including extra school places. There will be irreversible erosion of the green corridor conservation area and Green Belt and an increase in flood risk and light pollution.	10434/19421	
	Objection – strongly oppose developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22725	
	Objection – no infrastructure to cover all the new houses. Takes there weeks to get a doctors appointment now. Parking is an accident waiting to happen.	10545/23305	
	Objection- opposed to the development as the number of houses on this site and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas. The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate these additional families.	10580/23724	
	Objection- opposed to the development as the number of houses on this site and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas. The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate these additional families.	10582/22780	
	Object – the site is part of a privately owned home and the family who own it have no intention of developing housing in the garden. The coalescent effect of the development boundary between the outskirts of the city and rural villages is to be avoided.	10677/19779	
Objection- opposed to this site as a potential extension to ST2. The owner of this piece of land has no intention of developing their part of the site. This piece of land has therefore not met the requirement to consult with land owners before allocating it for housing.	10734/19907		
Objection – see survey 13. Strongly object to this vast unsustainable development on	10752/26279		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	our Green Belt land. Completely inappropriate and will swamp our village and infrastructure – it is urban sprawl.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection- opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas.	10754/19968	
	Objection- opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas.	10767/20019	
	Objection- opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas.	10794/20644	
	Objection- opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas.	10805/22817	
	Objection- opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced should be reduced and the amenities in this area are already under great strain. As such, facilities must be provided for these areas.	10811/21334	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10848/21923	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10850/21418	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10852/21433	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10855/21456	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10881/25892	The Georgina Grace Trust
Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10904/21530		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10957/21615	
	Objection – see survey 13	10989/26282	
	Objection – see survey 13. Too many houses adjacent to Boroughbridge Road – the roads will be even more blocked up by motor traffic.	10990/26287	
	Objection – see survey 13	10992/26292	
	Objection – see survey 13	10993/26297	
	Objection – see survey 13. Insufficient thought & detail about the attendant facilities required to sustain massive development, eg lack of schools, road congestion, health service facilities (both GP and hospital), car parking.	10994/26302	
	Objection – see survey 13	10996/26305	
	Objection – see survey 13	10998/26310	
	Objection – see survey 13. Pressure on local amenities. Traffic on ring road – will need to double in size as already overcrowded.	11001/26313	
	Objection – see survey 13. The Local Plan seems to have taken absolutely no thought to the infrastructure support the building plans and just seems intent on filling every available pocket of green space.	11002/26319	
	Objection – see survey 13	11005/26324	
	Objection – see survey 13. Too much traffic on roads in this area already. Can't handle what we have already. Where are all the children in new houses going to go to school. Manor already oversubscribed. Far enough out of York to be / feel separate. More and more houses just end up like everywhere else.	11007/26329	
	Objection – see survey 13. To add more traffic, industry and housing to this would destroy the village – would become just an added suburb to the sprawl. Green Belt land is paramount to the protection of the environment.	11011/26332	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11155/21637	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11215/21898	
Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under	11246/22840		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
<b>733 The Old Vinery, Cinder Lane (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11248/22115	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11251/22130	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11252/22145	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11254/22160	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11257/22175	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11259/22190	
	Objection – opposed to this development as the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11417/23743	
<b>742 Poppleton Garden Centre</b>	Objection – increase in heavy goods traffic from a wider employment use could have an impact on the Northfield Lane/A59 Junction (see also ST19 and 793 SF8) requiring major infrastructure investment. Uses should be restricted.	45/18771	York Environment Forum
	Objection – cannot see how further employment areas are possible unless the Garden Centre were to close as one third of the area is the present garden centre, and one third is allocated for car parking and most of the remainder is used for storage, unloading, preparation etc. Any development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building. This helps to maintain the green corridor to the City of York. The infrastructure around this area has changed considerably with the advent of the Poppleton Bar Park and Ride and the area can be extremely congested with traffic at peak hours adding high levels of frustration. Recommend that a highway infrastructure/ traffic impact study be carried out before any further development is considered in this area. Development should be restricted to the footprint of the	71/18977	Nether Poppleton Parish Council

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	existing building not including the outside sales area. There is a large under usage of current office and retail space within the three Local Business Parks.		
<b>742 Poppleton Garden Centre (continued)</b>	Objection – the area is already fully developed. Cannot understand how further employment can be considered unless the garden centre were to close. Any further development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building.	74/18834	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – cannot see how further employment areas are possible unless the Garden Centre were to close as one third of the area is the present garden centre, and one third is allocated for car parking and most of the remainder is used for storage, unloading, preparation etc. Any development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building. This helps to maintain the green corridor to the City of York. The infrastructure around this area has changed considerably with the advent of the Poppleton Bar Park and Ride and the area can be extremely congested with traffic at peak hours adding high levels of frustration. Recommend that a highway infrastructure/ traffic impact study be carried out before any further development is considered in this area. Development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building not including the outside sales area. There is a large under usage of current office and retail space within the three Local Business Parks.	78/19015	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection - this should form part of a green wedge between Poppleton and Knapton/Rufforth.	91/19621	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Objection – B1c, B2 and B8 use would see a more dense development replace what is currently a comparatively open site, to the detriment of the setting of the historic city. Would contribute to the coalescence between Poppleton and York and increase the urban sprawl which is proposed together with Site 779 and ST2. Together these would harm the setting of the historic city with the lost of the green finger provided by the A59 approach to the city and the loss of the distinct break between Poppleton and the urban boundary of York. Change in planning law could see this site become a residential site at some future date which it is not suitable for. Not appropriate uses on the site, harming this important approach to York. Support that retail should not be permitted on the site; general retail (not the current restricted retail) on the site could have disastrous impact on the village shops.	192/23768	
	Objection – location of development does not facilitate the establishment of Green Belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner	544/20485	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban. The proposed allocation does not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.		
<b>742 Poppleton Garden Centre (continued)</b>	Support – agree with the recommendation for the inclusion of the site in the Local Plan.	943/20516	
	Comment – no specific concerns although some concern over scale of development being put forward in the vicinity. In order for this development to be progressed, the Council must reassess its wider ambitions for this area of the City and be realistic about what is achievable, without forcing the local infrastructure to breaking point.	1355/18611	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – located alongside the most congested section of the outer ring road and is not attractive to the market/potential employers.	1512/20576	Tangent Properties
	Objection- the plan has not been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17937	
	Support – recommended that the site be included within the Local Plan for employment uses falling within Class B1b, B2c, B2 or B8.	2738/19102	The Garden Centre Group
	Objection- the site should also be allocated for B1a uses. There is no rationale as to why B1a uses are excluded from the proposal when technical officer comments are unequivocal in their support for them. It is likely that the retail needs of the local population will justify new retail development to the north west of the city.	2738/26404	
	Objection - the infrastructure within the area is currently grossly oversubscribed and will only worsen should further development occur, unless there are plans to enhance the existing facilities.	2882/20624	
	Objection – roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic. The plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans in this area.	2893/20687	
	Objection – the traffic flow is a problem now as the ring road cannot cope with existing demands. Poppleton cut off when ring road is blocked.	2895/18260	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>742 Poppleton Garden Centre (continued)</b>	Objection – concerns about A59 corridor. Green space between suburban limits and the village are at risk. Continuous urban sprawl from Poppleton. This combined with sites ST2, ST19 and 742 place a greatly increased burden on the A59.	3209/22292	
	Objection – at present some sites around Poppleton, that have been started, are under utilised/not able to be let, therefore still not developed to their full potential because of this. Traffic situation around and outer ring road. Clients are not able to get in or out the offices and are going elsewhere.	3378/22310	
	Objection - the area is already fully developed. Cannot understand how further employment can be considered unless the Garden Centre were to close. Any further development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building.	4647/22049	
	Objection- the area is already fully developed and the existing Garden Centre provides a very useful service to the local community. Any further development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building.	4648/19683	
	Objection – this should not be reallocated for B1a office use and is unnecessary since it is already utilized for garden centre, parking, storage and other uses associated with the business which provides employment. Objection to being considered for residential purposes.	4726/22339	
	Objection – there is no possibility of further employment area unless the garden centre was to close. Any development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building, maintaining the green corridor. Extremely congested traffic. Non-porous surfaces have an impact on the incidence of flooding.	5686/20806	
	Objection- any further development in the area will only add further congestion issues.	9268/17804	
	Objection – the inclusion of this site for employment is completely unnecessary. All new employment should be met by Northminster Business Park, before other sites are considered for offices. This development will have a detrimental impact on approach along the A59 and on the residents on the A59 and Station Road. The proposal for Poppleton Garden Centre for employment (B1b/B1c/B2/B8) further erodes the visual impact on the approach to York. The local infrastructure will be put under considerable strain.	9509/18670	
	Objection – opposed to further developments for retail/employment on Green Land. Development for employment should be on Brownfield land. There are already too many business parks etc with units to let. Vacant premises must be used before using green field sites. The site should remain rural.	10450/22549	
	Objection – traffic is currently very bad. More offices are not required.	10677/19776	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>742 Poppleton Garden Centre (continued)</b>	Objection – area is already fully developed and very useful service of the Garden centre. Any further development restricted to the footprint of the existing building.	10732/19899	
	Objection – no further employment area is possible unless the Garden Centre is to close. Any development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing building. Traffic congestion. A highways infrastructure/traffic impact study should be carried out before any further development.	10734/19909	
	Objection – opposed to the continued piecemeal addition to the Northminster Business Park and the garden centre.	10771/20041	
	Objection – there is no evidence of demand for this site. Development would impact on the nature of Poppleton villages. The road infrastructure is not suitable. This would use agricultural land. There have been traffic problems already with the construction of the Park and Ride. There are considerable Brownfield sites in York to be developed.	11357/22895	
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home</b>	Objection – opposed to this and other allocated sites in Haxby. Concern that neither immigration or organic job growth have the capability to provide jobs of either the volume or quality needed to allow local people to afford homes of the level that are likely to be built should the plan go forward. If the site is removed as an elderly care home, it should be used to provide much needed parking or possibly a small park and ride facility for use by residents of Haxby and Wigginton. The closure of an elderly care facility when demand is likely to increase does not seem to be a prudent strategy. The Plan is fundamentally flawed as it places the main areas of development in localities that do not have the infrastructure to cope with expansion of this scale. There are drainage concerns, and there is a history of residential flooding. Concern regarding cumulative effects of development of this and other sites in Haxby on traffic and road safety. Inadequate public transport means car remains an attractive alternative. Concern regarding impact on amenities, on secondary school provision and the level of parking in the village. Development should either be in the city centre or close to roads which allow traffic to flow freely and can cope with additional demands. Housing should be built to west of York. Until northern ring road is sorted out, building more houses to the north of York will only lead to greater problems with traffic congestion.	63/18723	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – development is not necessary and the site would make an excellent central parking area for a considerable number of vehicles. Parking is a major concern and adds to the congestion in Haxby and Wigginton. As development will create a large influx of vehicles, timed and limited parking provisions should be introduced. The existing drainage, sewage and flooding problems experienced in Haxby and	80/18703	Wigginton Parish Council



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Wigginton remain serious and largely unaddressed by Yorkshire Water for current residents. These problems, unless addressed at the very outset of developments, will only worsen. Those responsible must provide credible plans and take appropriate action to alleviate residents' fears and concerns. Construction of all sites over a period potentially of 20 years, will impact on local communities in a significant manner. Heavy vehicles on already congested roads will cause greater inconvenience and travel delays. Noise is likely to be an issue causing disturbance and possible distress.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – there is not the infrastructure in place to support this development.	502/20669	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for the inclusion of the site in the Local Plan.	943/20513	
	Comment – very little or no comments received from constituents on this proposal, although there is significant concern within community over perceived over-development of Haxby and Wigginton due to ST9, SF4 and H37 proposals. Some existing apprehension within community over lack of open space and any development of Haxby Hall should be carefully monitored to ensure the openness of Ethel Ward is maintained and that it can continue to be enjoyed by residents should this development be progressed.	1355/18608	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – the scale of the development is unsustainable and will overload the local services. Not only will this destroy the quality of life in the area but will also have financial impact on present residents. The main road into York from Haxby was not designed for the current volume of traffic and is not suitable for the increased volume that this development will create.	1764/20676	
	Objection- the council have not addressed any problems with infrastructure which development would cause. It is developer driven and roads and drainage are not being considered properly. Haxby has existing congestion problems. The possible dualling of the ring road would not remedy the traffic problems, it would make it worse. The Green Belt is being developed due to the fact the number of houses being built has increased.	2421/18085	
	Objection –the Local Plan encourages people to walk to work within a local area yet the plan proposes to close a residential home which employs local people and proposed to build more houses on this site.	2484/18003	
	Objection – concern over the building of a significant number of dwellings at site 757, alongside site 814 and ST9. Question whether the sewers were updated sufficiently to cope with this number of dwellings. Surface drainage has proved to be an issue in	2538/18229	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	recent years. The local schools are full and the local health centre is at capacity. Major issue regards traffic. Traffic issues will be compounded if site ST14 at Clifton Moor is built.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the proposal. Brownfield sites in Haxby should be exhausted first. There has been an increase in traffic in Haxby over the last 10 years and often the traffic is grid locked. Building new housing will make this worse.	2619/18238	
	Objection- the site has not been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17934	
	Objection- opposed to the building of 800 dwellings on Green Belt land to the north and south of the village. Concern regarding infrastructure in health services, schools, drainage and road congestion.	2759/18251	
	Support- agree with the redevelopment of this site.	2765/20611	
	Objection – the drainage in Haxby and Wigginton struggles to cope now. There is a problem with parking now in the village with no area available which could be used to relieve the overflow. The health centre would not be able to cope with the extra patients. The local schools would not be able to cope with the increased demand for places. There would be a large increase in the volume of traffic which would be problematic at busy times.	2775/18254	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed plans for the future development of Haxby. Haxby just simply isn't big enough to accommodate any further major housing projects.	3086/21967	
	Objection – there are too many houses planned. Development would change the village's character. There will be strain on the infrastructure, which is already under pressure.	3257/22299	
	Objection- there is no issues with building on the Green Belt, however cannot understand the rationale of increasing the population by 40%, without taking into account the impact this will have if no additional infrastructure is to be put in place. Should this result in residents being unable to access the GP, schools, parking and the increase in traffic, will there be a refund in council tax?	3346/21974	
	Objection- too many houses are planned to be built. Concern regarding the volume of traffic and the facilities that will be needed for so many more people. Concern whether a new doctors surgery, schools, work places or more shops are planned.	3407/23897	
	Objection- concern regarding where the elderly residents will go.	3588/23916	
Objection – the council need to wake up to the fact that there is an ageing population. The need of care home provision is going to increase not decrease and support needs	3799/22043		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to be given to the elderly persons who have contributed to the economy throughout their lives.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – Usher Lane has shown up on the Local Survey as at risk of flooding. Usher Lane is used as a short cut to Strensall with cars travelling at speed. The drains are already in a perilous state. There are parked cars for the studio at the top of Usher lane, double yellow lines frequently ignored, and school parking. It will be dangerous with more traffic. The infrastructure that is needed has not been considered.	4465/18290	
	Objection- the site should be left alone. There are not enough homes for the elderly as it is. Parking in the village is unachievable now.	4687/19692	
	Objection – there are sufficient Brownfield development areas without building on our green and pleasant land which should be preserved. There will be increased pressure on the infrastructure in the area and the drains. The roads are already jammed up. There is insufficient public transport to be able to relieve this problem. Concern as to where children will go to school and concern regarding health provision in the area. Even leisure services and particularly provision for teenagers will suffer.	4826/18297	
	Objection - the existing infrastructure e.g. drains, sewers, roads, schools, parking, medical facilities will be unable to cope with the scale of development that is planned. The ring road (A1237) is already gridlocked for most of the day. Concern regarding how planned new traffic generated not only by the Haxby developments but also the other proposed housing expansions will integrate?	5139/18368	
	Objection - the plans to build are unrealistic for Haxby and surrounding area. The impact on the schools and lack of primary school places has already been highlighted previously and the vast number of additional secondary school places that will need to be catered for will cause massive problems for the local secondary schools.	5266/21780	
	Objection – all brown sites within York and spaces above shops should be utilised before any new housing is built. The ring road is already a nightmare around the Haxby turn offs and potentially adding 1600 cars to this will have further negative impacts on traffic. There is already enough strain on the facilities and drainage within Haxby without adding this many houses. The beautiful countryside and the habitats of many animals will be destroyed, and the green spaces set aside cannot make up for this as they are islands within housing. If the land is indeed a Green Belt then it is there and in place for a reason, this should be respected. Concern as to where the jobs for the proposed 1,600 will come from, as to afford a two or three bedroom house they will need to be on suitable wages. If these houses are bought and let to	5277/18377	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	people this will just help inflate already high rental process within the city.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection- the town infrastructure will no longer be able to bear the extra strain regarding drainage, traffic, school children and medical care. Haxby will not be able to cope without these problems being adequately addressed.	5281/23999	
	Objection – opposed to such large scale housing plans now or in the future. Haxby is a flood risk area. Such a massive amount of additional houses would cause irreversible damage to the local community. The current infrastructure couldn't cope and is already under pressure. Further housing would push it way beyond its current over-stretched limits particularly the current sewage and drainage. The traffic and parking situation in Haxby is currently inadequate, further housing would cause chaos. The local health care systems and schools would be stretched well beyond capacity.	5324/2178	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development as Haxby is a village and as such the roads in and around are not designed to accommodate large construction vehicles. Once completed there will be an additional 800 cars on the road. Haxby is busy enough without these extra vehicles being present. The Doctors surgery is already at full capacity to support both Haxby and Wigginton residents. 800 additional houses will mean a minimum of 1600 additional patients adding to the strain. The local primary schools of Haxby and Wigginton are already at full capacity without additional families adding to the burden. Haxby is notoriously bad for drainage, especially during heavy deluges of rain, to the point where the manholes start to back up which has a knock on effect for homes. Additional homes will only increase the burden on a suffering system and cause misery for a lot of residents. With 800 additional houses there is bound to be 800 extra vehicles adding extra noise and pollution. Adding additional houses in the area is going to increase crime in the area. Haxby will no longer feel like a village with nice community, it will feel like a suburb of York with no identity.	5330/21790	
	Objection – this site will contribute to uncontrolled development of Haxby. There is currently inadequate infrastructure. York should be looking to mid-rise developments in or near the city centre where there is access to jobs and facilities. There is a shortfall of amenity.	5444/21810	
	Objection – Haxby is already overdeveloped. The water company cannot cope with the proposed plan. The drainage system has not coped in the past. These are not affordable houses for people who work in shops/offices. All the new shops cause traffic jams and creating more housing will add to this.	5561/20749	
	Objection – the home needs refurbishment but it is in a good place for old people to	5605/20777	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	access local services and to see local activities. Where will they go. There will be more, not fewer old people in the future, therefore surely there should be an increasing provision rather than selling off such land for housing.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – the infrastructure is just not there to support these houses. The main drainage in the village is poor, the traffic congestion is a big problem and the schools cannot cope. This land gifted by the Ward family to Haxby. The Council should concentrate on providing good quality services for the existing residents rather than trying to sell the land around us.	5607/20784	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal. The site is a flood risk area. Development will cause irreversible damage to the environment and the nature of the local community. Infrastructure, including drainage and sewage, will be pushed beyond its limits. Local healthcare systems will be stretched beyond capacity, and there will be increased pressure on local schools to accommodate additional pupils. Development will constitute a loss of green land and this will have an associated negative impact on wildlife, the environment and personal well-being. It will also result in a loss of character of the area.	5736/20866	
	Objection – the ring road cannot cope with additional traffic. The village infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the increased demands that the proposed 40% increase in population. Specifically it will cause traffic congestion, adverse air quality, parking problems, drainage issues and school capacity issues.	5796/20894	
	Objection – the roads can barely cope with traffic currently. Local secondary schools are at capacity. York hospital is not big enough.	5854/20958	
	Objection – the roads can barely cope with traffic currently. Local secondary schools are at capacity. York hospital is not big enough.	5865/20961	St Mary’s Parochial Church Council
	Objection – Haxby already has a drainage problem and there is a current risk of floods. There are existing traffic issues. Green belt land would be removed by the development.	5898/20976	
	Objection – the building of so many more houses will put great strain on the way people live. The increase in traffic will be unbearable and resulting from that will be more pollution. That will mean more illnesses and strain on the GP services in Haxby/Wigginton (already overstretched). Schools are already overstretched with class sizes larger than they should be. More schools would need to be built. There is not enough green space locally. Buses are already full. There should be no building on Green Belt land. Brownfield development must be exhausted first.	5968/19217	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – the roads not big enough. Building more houses would increase traffic, which would mean flooding will be more likely. The local doctors surgery don't have the resources available.	5976/20992	
	Objection – Haxby has been developed constantly since the 1970s and is now at full capacity. The impact of increasing the population by several thousand will bring enormous pressure on the A1237, which is already congested. York Road is constantly busy. Adding several thousand vehicles to these roads will also inevitably increase pollution. The three junior schools are full and the health practice is overloaded. None of these issues have been addressed in the proposal.	5981/19220	
	Objection – concern regarding the number of cars in Haxby. There are existing drainage problems that will get worse with more houses. There are only two primary schools in Haxby and the whole environment will be damaged. There are Brownfield sites in York that should be used before any development of Green Belt land.	6201/21014	
	Objection – opposed to the site as it is an unacceptable intrusion on the Green Belt. There are too many houses already, an extra 814 is unsustainable. Extra traffic, noise and pollution will be intolerable for residents. There are issues with drainage, as the water table is already high. Sewage infrastructure cannot support more houses. There are traffic issues and parking is already difficult. Schools are already full and it is difficult to make appointment at Health Centre.	6278/21029	
	Objection – the traffic on A1237 is horrendous already. Proposed development would increase traffic on York Road. Parking in the village is already difficult. Volume of traffic would cause illegal levels of pollution.	6286/21037	
	Objection – there are problems with drainage, sewerage and traffic currently. There needs to be drastic improvements to the infrastructure prior to any development.	9323/18055	
	Objection- concern regarding the strain on local infrastructure, primarily the roads and parking in the area and if there will be sufficient facilities for an increase of up to 40% of the population. Concern on the effect development will have on the overall feel of the neighbourhood and the effect development will have on the value of properties in the area.	9332/18399	
	Objection- strongly oppose further growth in the area unless significant improvements in existing infrastructure are made. Drains and roads need attention and new links need to be created which avoid imposing any further strain on existing infrastructure. A new town is needed, not an extension of an existing one.	9340/18410	
	Objection – opposed to development due to the impact on infrastructure in Haxby. Larch Way and Lowfields could not take the volume of traffic if opened up to access	9345/18418	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and Usher Land is already heavily congested. If no further schools are planned this is likely to increase congestion due to the distance of the new estate to local schools.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the plans for more housing on proposed sites. Drainage is already a problem in Haxby and the facilities would have to be increased. There have been no recreation infrastructure improvements in 42 years.	9346/18421	
	Objection - the number of additional dwellings proposed would have a great impact on the twin villages and infrastructure. Concern about impact on schools, old people’s homes, medical facilities, the already extremely busy shopping area and roads.	9388/18152	
	Objection – opposed to the development as it will increase the village by up to 40% which is far too ambitious. Haxby has become a slum because of the services that have been withdrawn and the gutters are a disgrace with weeds. The drains are full of last years debris which means the water goes across the road when it rains which blocks off disabled access into reed park and the community centre. There is corn growing in last year’s filth in the gutters.	9401/18433	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed housing development in Haxby. This would result in further erosion of the Green Belt, strain on roads and parking places that are already becoming overcrowded and a drainage system which is in some places problematic.	9402/18300	
	Objection – this new development is going to be bad for Haxby due to the traffic on York road. Gardens already flood bad enough now without the proposed development. There are also not enough doctors or schools to take this amount of people.	9404/18307	
	Objection - there is already enough people living in Haxby and it is already bursting at the seams. There is a long waiting for a doctors appointment, Haxby shopping centre is already very congested with cars and it is hazardous to drivers and pedestrians and there are drainage problems in Haxby already.	9409/18317	
	Objection – opposed to the development due to access issues, the roads are inadequate and dangerous. There are not enough spare places in existing schools. The drainage is bordering on insufficient capacity, there is a lack of parking for shopping in the village and poor recreational facilities, especially for children.	9410/18321	
	Objection – concern regarding the increase in the size of Haxby and Wigginton, as development would cause Haxby to lose its village feel. There are significant traffic problems already on York Road, there are parking problems in Haxby and there are already issues with drains. Where would the increase of shops go?	9412/18324	
	Objection - Haxby has grown enormously since 1983. Appreciate people have to have places to live, but in Haxby and Wigginton, there always seems to be a healthy	9414/18329	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	number of houses for sale. There is no room for the thousands of extra cars in the village or on the connecting roads.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the proposed changes to the York Local Plan that affects Haxby. There is not the infrastructure in place to facilitate the building of more houses.	9416/18334	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed increase in housing at Haxby. The present size of the population is at the limit as the roads and parking in the village centre are at capacity. Whilst there is a need for housing, there are no major employers left in the town, so it is assumed that people are living here but working elsewhere. Concern that Haxby and York will turn into a dormitory town for Leeds or London. Concern regarding traffic as Haxby now needs a ring road of its own. Almost any time of the week, the traffic is crawling. Parking in the village has become very difficult. Disabled Parking is inadequate also. Development to the South would effectively merge Haxby with New Earswick to the detriment of both. This development would tip Haxby over from a big and barely manageable, but otherwise nice place to live, into just another overcrowded sprawl.	9417/18837	
	Objection –astonished at the revision to the Local Plan, as this will have an impact on Haxby and Wigginton, which the area is unable to sustain. This plan appears ill-conceived, ill thought-out, against the wishes of the residents and it's elected representatives and flies against all common-sense judgment. This says development should concentrate on Brownfield sites in the York area, many of which are an eyesore and could be improved enormously by development.	9600/22453	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure in Haxby is inadequate and the Ring Road is struggling in Wigginton, Haxby and Strensall junctions. Most of the 3 villages rely on the ring road to either cross it or use it for commuting and it can barely manage at the moment. Existing roads in Haxby leading towards the by-pass already struggle to cope with existing traffic volumes. The bus service struggles to cope with passenger numbers at peak times and service is already unreliable due to traffic volumes. All 3 existing junior schools in Haxby and Wigginton are already full most years. And how will the additional numbers be catered for in the secondary school? Parking in Haxby centre around the local amenities is already at times stretched and the feel of the community will struggle under such a sheer volume of increase. Alternative Brownfield sites should be considered first and significant improvement to road infrastructure out of York Road and improvements to by-pass roundabout should be considered. Improvements to the existing problems of poor drainage and surface	9622/19707	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	water should be considered.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection- the local infrastructure is already over stretched and does not have the capacity to accommodate the demands of an additional 1,500 homes. Concern regarding school capacity to absorb new children. Neither the shops or car park in Haxby would be able to accommodate a significant increase in people. Building on Green field land should only be considered as a last resort. There are many Brownfield sites which could be used first.	9905/19340	
	Objection – Brownfield and derelict housing should be used to meet the housing shortage. Green Belt land around villages should not be used. There is no infrastructure for this. It will create enormous problems for the area. The bypass is intolerable. It is very short sighted to build on green field when they will be needed to grow food.	10083/25795	
	Objection – there is insufficient infrastructure to support this proposal. York road is already overloaded along with schools and drainage.	10151/25987	
	Objection – concern about road structure, drainage system, parking or pollution and its adverse effect on the environment.	10209/21165	
	Objection – strongly opposed to this development. There will be an impact on the resources (roads, parking, drainage, school, medical facilities) in the area. There needs to be an assurance that buildings in the future should be on the basis of home for rent and “starter homes”, so local and young people may have a chance of finding somewhere affordable to live.	10217/21184	
	Objection – development will have a major impact on a village which has already grown in size. It will result in too much traffic for the roads and problems with parking. Schools are already full and development will change the ethos of the village.	10219/21189	
	Objection – the infrastructure in place is unable to support extra houses. The road system, school and GP are already insufficient.	10420/22516	
	Objection- no development should take place until the A1237 is made a dual-carriageway and Haxby station is re opened, together with a better bus service. Sewers and drains won't cope with additional waste as well as water pressure. The health service would need to be increased as well as other local services. Electricity and gas supplies wouldn't cope with increase in demand.	10493/22657	
	Objection – Haxby is fully saturated with housing etc and there is no slack in the system to accommodate an increased number of residents. Parking in the village is non existent. The doctors are over subscribed and the schools are at full capacity. There are issues with traffic and the drainage systems are inadequate and lead to	10678/19785	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	regular flooding. The Green Belt should not be used for flooding. There are a large number of Brownfield areas which should be built on first.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection – the traffic would be horrendous and the number of school places verging on hundreds more. A balance between new homes and consideration for existing homes needs to be addressed. Many other areas are better suited for development.	10682/19792	
	Objection – there is not enough employment in the area to support the increase in people. Local schools are at capacity. Green Belt land would be lost.	10686/19802	
	Objection – there is a huge concern about the impact on the village infrastructure. These include drainage (both surface water and sewage) telecoms, water supply and most importantly transport.	10765/20002	
	Objection – the infrastructure cannot support the expansion. Roads cannot cope at peak times. There is no train station and not enough parking for cars on the high street. Ambulance response times will get worse.	10798/21892	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal to build yet more houses in the Haxby/Wigginton area. Traffic at present queues, over 1000 extra cars morning and evening will not benefit the situation. It is difficult to get an appointment at the doctors already because of the volume of patients. Car parking in Haxby is at breaking point. Concern regarding jobs for potential residents of these houses. Opposed to any more land which could have agricultural usage being used for building.	10899/21520	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed developments in and around Haxby and Wigginton. The roads into and out of the villages are already unable to cope with the volume of traffic at peak times. The ring road is already congested. The drainage and sewage system in Haxby and Wigginton is not able to adequately support the additional loading of the proposed development, and local amenities are not satisfactory for the current population. The Green Belt should remain protected. There are Brownfield sites that should be developed. Local services including schools, doctors etc will not cope with the additional developments.	10900/21523	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed developments in and around Haxby and Wigginton. The roads in and out of the villages are unable to cope with current volume. Bypass is congested. Drainage systems unable to cope with added pressure. Local amenities not satisfactory for current population. Brownfield should be developed. Services will not be able to cope.	10903/21528	
	Objection – opposed to this development as roads are gridlocked now. There are not enough resources for the people currently living in the village.	10908/21549	
	Objection – the streets flood every time it rains. Traffic is constantly getting worse.	10910/21554	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Schools are already over capacity. Village access is difficult and wildlife will be damaged.		
<b>757 Haxby Hall Elderly Persons Home (continued)</b>	Objection - building a large number of homes to the north will impact on already overcrowded road network in the area. Infrastructure is already struggling to cope. Schools have no vacancies and doctor's surgeries are busy. More cars will create more pollution. If building goes ahead Haxby, Earswick, Strensall and Huntington will gradually merge into one conglomeration.	10930/21578	
	Objection- it is not appropriate to build on Green Belt land. The original concept for creating a green Belt is as valid today as when they were first thought of. If the proposals go forward the nature of Haxby and Wigginton will change of forever. The traffic which is already very busy will become an endless traffic jam with the resulting noise and air pollution.	11042/22240	
	Objection – concern regarding the insufficient sewer and drainage system. The roads will be overloaded with the increased traffic. Local schools are full. There are not enough health centres or dental practices. Brownfield areas should be developed first.	11173/21666	
	Objection – there are current issues with traffic congestion. Development would put great strain on the already well used local amenities. Concern about the need for school places, with primary schools in the area already over subscribed and secondary schools unable to cope with the influx of additional student places that may be required.	11293/22217	
	Objection – opposed to the plans for houses being built in Haxby. The local roads, infrastructure and amenities within the village would be stretched and damaged.	11354/22891	
	Objection – opposed to development as there are existing traffic problems. The schools are already full as is the doctors. Parking at the shops is difficult.	11355/22894	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road</b>	Comment – development will result in a loss of agricultural land of 5.8ha. It should be considered in connection with ST1 and ST2 as the cumulative proposed developments will have a major impact on Boroughbridge Road as a principal traffic artery. There must be a mandatory 20m minimum landscape buffer to the main road as strategic green space. “Treemendous York” is assessing the potential for Boroughbridge Road to become a significant green corridor entry into the city.	45/18798	York Environment Forum
	Objection – opposed to this proposal as it takes away valuable farmland, it is part of the draft Green Belt agreed with West Riding County Council and it should form a green corridor along the A59 enhancing the entry to the City from the west and left undeveloped to prevent the coalescence effect between the edge of the present city boundary and the development around the A1237/A59 roundabout and the Poppleton bar Park and Ride. Part of retaining the rural setting, part of Site 790 which failed Technical Officer Assessment, within proposed designation of historic character and setting, part of green corridor entrance to the city, within area established to prevent coalescence, subject to water-logging and surface water drainage issues, high quality grade 2 and 4 agricultural land should not be given over to housing when there is need for farmers to continue with their income generation and crop production.	71/18972	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – the proposal takes away valuable farmland and should form part of the green corridor along the A59 which enhances the entry to the City from the west. It should be left undeveloped to prevent the coalescence effect between the edge of the present city boundary and the development around the A1237/A59 roundabout and Poppleton Bar Park and Ride. It is part of historic character and setting designation. Development on this site would give rise to traffic issues on the A59.	74/18833	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – opposed to this proposal. It takes away valuable farmland, it is part of the draft Green Belt agreed with West Riding County Council and it should form a green corridor along the A59 enhancing the entry to the City from the West and left undeveloped to prevent the coalescence effect between the edge of the present city boundary and the development around the A1237/A59 roundabout and the Poppleton bar Park and Ride. Part of retaining the rural setting, part of Site 790 which failed Technical Officer Assessment, within proposed designation of historic character and setting, part of green corridor entrance to the city, within area established to prevent coalescence, subject to water-logging and surface water drainage issues, high quality grade 2 and 4 agricultural land should not be given over to housing when there is need for farmers to continue with their income generation and crop production.	78/19010	Upper Poppleton Parish Council

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – the site is open, arable farmland that continues the rural experience up to the logical urban boundary. It is important for the nations’ food supply and food security.	122/18814	Knapton Lane Residents Association
	Objection – this proposal will harm the setting of the historic city, create urban sprawl at its worst as it is also unsustainable and will impact harmfully on Knapton. Objections are even stronger in the context of the proposed allocation of ST2 for housing. The cumulative impact of Site 779 with ST2 and Site 742 will greatly exacerbate damage to the setting of the historic city and create urban sprawl.	192/23769	
	Objection – this site is considered to be a good example of the preservation of an open area between the ring road and the edge of the built up area. The development of this site would substantially reduce the gap between the edge of the built up area and the Ring-Road. As such, it would adversely affect views towards the City and its rural setting. It would also substantially reduce the gap between the edge of the main built up area of the City and the developments to the west of the A59 roundabout. Consequently, the allocation and development of this area seems likely to harm the special character and setting of the City and therefore, would conflict with the saved Policies of the RSS and National Planning Policy.	238/18161	English Heritage
	Objection – this site must be considered in the context of ST1 and ST2. Site was previously identified as an area retaining the rural setting that warrants protection in the Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper Update June 2013. ST2 already threatens the rural area and building another 161 dwellings on site 779 would further exacerbate this creeping urbanisation. Danger that it will set a precedent for the future. NPPF states that Brownfield land should be use and where it is necessary to develop agricultural land to use poorer quality land. Site 779 is Grade 2, very good so this development should not go ahead or valuable agricultural land will be lost forever. Development would reduce further the quantity of open space and its impact should be considered in conjunction with the resultant losses at ST1 and ST2. Educational establishments are already under pressure. Infrastructure is already at bursting point. No research to say where the demand for housing will be. This site is the last open space along the A59 between the city centre and outer ring road, the last check in the restriction of urban sprawl of a large built up area and it materially assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. There are problems with drainage.	278/23773	
	Comment - as the site fronts onto Boroughbridge Road it is important that any development brought forward does not result in an adverse cumulative highways	434/18534	Rapleys

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	impact on Boroughbridge Road, and in particular, the junction with Beckfield Lane/ Low Poppleton Lane. It is important that each development is responsible for addressing its own impacts and that mitigation measures required to make development acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with CIL regulations are provided by each part at the appropriate time. Any highway improvements that may be required to mitigate impacts from the development on the surrounding highways network should be funded by the developers of the site only and should not unduly burden development by Associated British Foods or other neighbouring landowners.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 13	901/26164	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for the inclusion of the site.	943/18534	
	Objection – see survey 13	956/26169	
	Objection – concern that the proposal is not accompanied by any proposal to increase provision for open space in an area that is already very poorly provided for in relation to Open Space including use of this for Sport and Recreation (see Council’s Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, 2008).	1305/19185	Church of the Holy Redeemer Parochial Church Council
	Objection – opposed to the development of this site. This area is designated as an area of Historic Character and the rural Setting, as well as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this development. This land is good quality land for growing crops. There are numerous available Brownfield sites. Not enough employment.	1324/20571	
	Objection – Local constituents have expressed grave concerns over the cumulative impact that these developments will have on their quality of life. This is productive agricultural land that is an important part of the Green Belt in serving the purpose of preventing suburban sprawl. Concerns over associated infrastructure, or lack thereof, in the area including access, traffic, pollution, school places, the strain on local health care facilities and sewage facilities. Site cannot be considered in isolation and the ST1 and ST2 allocations should be borne in mind.	1355/18609	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – see survey 13	1582/26173	
	Objection – see survey 13	1597/26178	
Objection – opposed to the inclusion of this site, within the context of ST1 and ST2, would add an additional 180-200 houses to the 1700 houses planned within 1km of Trenchard Road. Infrastructure and services are already stretched within this area, particularly in relation to leisure facilities, the medical services, schools and policing. The proposal would also represent loss of valuable agricultural land and loss of Green Belt on the edge of a sprawling urban environment.	1603/18118		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 13	2009/26181	
	Objection- the transport infrastructure, shops, schools, medical centre and other facilities are already overstretched and cannot cope with such radical developments. Gridlock is a reoccurring problem on the A59, A1237 and other roads in the area. Before considering development, there should be a way of banning cars from central York.	2550/23816	
	Objection- concern raised over the actual need for any new proposed new developments in the York area at all. Opposed to the scale of the building works. The density of properties on this site is higher than other nearby sites which is out of character with adjacent properties. There is a lack of consideration given to the numerous developments in this area (ST1, ST2) and there is limited ability for the existing infrastructure to service this development. Healthcare is an issue, electricity and water sewage supplies would need major upgrading, additional run off water will be an issue and there is no mention of education provision. Development of this 'urban sprawl' will plunder the existing Green Belt areas and subsequently alter the character of York.	2580/23817	
	Objection – see survey 13	2603/26186	
	Objection – see survey 13	2607/26189	
	Objection - traffic flow on the outer ring road is a problem now and access to Clifton Moor and Monks Cross is difficult. Congestion on the A1237 cuts Poppleton village off for emergency vehicles. School, doctors and the hospital are over loaded. Broadband service is slow and unacceptable, this should be upgraded. The drainage issues in Poppleton need addressing. The Green Belt should be preserved and Brownfield sites used. Preserving rural suburbs should be given priority.	2681/17935	
	Comment – landscaping is required to maintain the area.	2765/20614	
	Objection- the plan for urban development to extend from Trenchards Road, Portal Road and Sherwood Grove would adversely affect the quality of life and domestic environment for the residents in the vicinity. The margin of agricultural land between the site and A1237 is of enormous benefit to this area and there is an abundance of wildlife. Development of this site would exacerbate the traffic problems blighting the A59. Vital infrastructure is already under strain (GP's and local schools) and there no large supermarkets or general stores within walking distance of the proposed area.	2862/23826	
	Objection – see survey 13	2874/26192	
	Objection – see survey 13	2880/26197	
Objection- residents of the area have already suffered with the new Park and Ride's	2888/23829		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	endless roadworks and now over 4000 houses are proposed to be built in the area. The village will no longer be that but an extension of Boroughbridge Road. There is not the capacity with the overstretched schools, shops and doctors. Traffic will increase further and the identity of the place will be lost.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable. The plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans.	2893/20691	
	Objection- this is agricultural land and should never be considered for housing as it provides a green lung. The site is mainly used for crops. The infrastructure on Boroughbridge road will not cope with development and there are already existing traffic problems. Small businesses are already complaining about travelling to work.	3004/23842	
	Objection- concern over the number of proposed houses to be built on ST1, ST2, 779 and 764. The local infrastructure is not suitable to cope with such developments. The roads, particularly the ring road, is already severely congested. Question raised regarding the extra school places. Concern regarding the need for further GP surgeries and other services. The proposals will lead to a complete loss of separation between the Poppletons and greater York.	3040/23850	
	Objection – see survey 13	3043/26200	
	Object – the proposed number of houses too large and it would spoil the amenities of Beckfield Lane.	3044/22262	
	Objection – open farm land is an essential element in providing a hard boundary to the built environment of York. Land should be preserved as Green Belt land. There is no objection to developing the part of this site which is to the immediate west of the Trenchard Avenue being developed by housing with access via Sherwood Grove to Beckfield Lane, or Via Trenchard Avenue to the A59.	3045/20708	
	Objection – concern about the A59 corridor. The green space between suburban limits and the village are at risk. Development will cause continuous urban sprawl from Poppleton. This, combined with sites ST2, ST19 and 742 will place a greatly increased burden on the A59.	3209/22289	
	Objection- the number of properties which the Council are trying to build has become ridiculous and will alter the nature and ambiance of a lovely village. At the moment it takes days to get a doctors appointment so with well over a thousand new properties it will probably take over a week. There would be a large change in the schools	3248/23877	



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	performance with the influx of large numbers of children and the roads will suffer.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 13	3278/26205	
	Objection – the proposed developments would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, medical facilities). It would result in more traffic on already busy roads.	3284/20713	
	Objection – the proposed developments would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, medical facilities). More traffic on already busy roads.	3285/20719	
	Objection- enough housing has been allocated without further eroding the Green Belt.	3287/21970	
	Objection – at present some sites around Poppleton, that have been started, are under utilised/ not able to be let, therefore still not developed to their full potential because of this. Traffic situation around and outer ring road. Clients are not able to get in or out the offices, going elsewhere.	3378/22309	
	Objection- the Green Belt was approved by the Council in 2011. Further protection was given in January 2013 when it was safeguarded following the revocation of the RSS. Opposed to the guidelines being ignored when settlement limits were agreed in the 1970s.	3359/23908	
	Objection – see survey 13	3481/26212	
	Objection – see survey 13	3502/26217	
	Comment – see survey 13. People have to be housed so there is nothing wrong in using the Boroughbridge Road area provided extra schools and medical facilities are provided. Also, a new link road would need to be provided but unsure on where to connect to. There are already enough cars on Boroughbridge Road.	3507/26222	
	Objection – see survey 13	3565/26227	
	Objection- there is no infrastructure in Poppleton to cover all the new housing. Takes 3 weeks to get an appointment at the Doctors. With new housing proposed the parking on main street. The Green is an accident waiting to happen.	3577/21994	
	Objection- there is no infrastructure in Poppleton to cover all the new housing. Takes 3 weeks to get an appointment at the Doctors. With new housing proposed the parking on main street/ The Green is an accident waiting to happen.	3596/22009	
	Objection – this site would result in an increase of the urban sprawl along the A59, almost to the A1237.	3618/23929	
Support – see survey 13	3628/26232		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – any further development in this area will only add further to congestion issues especially on the A1237. Parking has also become a problem. Opening up Low Poppleton Lane would help matters considerably as would open up further options regarding accessibility because at the moment there are only two main routes out of Poppleton that are able to accommodate serious traffic flows.	3728/17806	
	Objection – see survey 13	3735/26237	
	Objection – the proposals for this site do not take into account the road infrastructure that is inadequate to sustain the increased number of vehicles from each dwelling. The drainage system is inadequate and will not sustain this level of hard landscaping. There is no provision made for the increase in pupils at schools, and no provision for new doctor’s surgeries or extension to the hospital facilities at York District. The council appear to be driven to attract workers to these areas but as there are premises at the local business parks which have never been let since being built, there would seem to be little or no interest in businesses to relocate here. Therefore little or no reason to build housing on this scale in the area. The government instructs councils to develop Brownfield sites before Green field. There are a number of Brownfield sites identified in the York area which should be utilised before using greenbelt land.	3745/22035	
	Objection – see survey 13	3747/26242	
	Objection- the development of this site has not been considered alongside other developments at ST1 and ST2. The site is currently both valuable in agricultural land and open space both of which should be preserved. The residential services and infrastructure to support the development do not exist and the Council has already deemed the site to be both potential openspace, Greenfield and an area of Historic Character and Setting that should be protected. This site is not required to meet the needs of the existing community in an area where transport, education, and local health care services are under strain already. If developed, it is contrary to the Council’s pledge that the Local plan will prevent an unplanned free for all with the potential loss of Green Belt, open space, agricultural land and an area retaining the rural setting of York. This site failed criteria 1 of the Further Sites Consultation analysis but then a caveat is invoked which states that if an inclusion is the only reason it failed the site would be re-evaluated by a technical officer. The scores of those that are deemed suitable do not seem to be published.	3966/23943	
	Objection - the site is unsuitable for such a large number of houses. The pressure on local services, roads, amenities etc is already unsustainable and the number of	4422/19673	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	houses here will only add to it. The site is close to already very busy roads and traffic black spots. Added to the number of other large development sites identified in the document (764, ST1, ST2 etc) this is clearly going to significantly affect the whole environment of this area and effectively join Poppleton villages to the Urban York area by removing almost all green spaces between them.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection- opposed to any housing development taking place on green field sites.	4437/23969	
	Objection- opposed to this proposal in its present form. Would support a smaller site so as not to lose too much excellent agricultural land. Any proposed development on a smaller site should be positioned as to extend the existing green corridor of greensward and trees which edges the Portal and Trenchard road complex.	4647/22048	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal as it takes away valuable farmland and should form part of the green corridor along the A59 which enhances the entry to the City from the West. It should be left undeveloped to prevent the fusing effect between the edge of the present city boundary and the development around the A1237 / A59 roundabout and Poppleton Bar Park and Ride. It is part of Historic character and setting designation. Development on this site would give rise to traffic issues on the A59. Improved Infrastructure such as roads should be in place before new houses are built and proper traffic management should be used. I also believe that Brownfield sites should be fully used before any Green Belt land is considered for use.	4648/19682	
	Objection – this would remove valuable farm land which is part of the green corridor. It should remain undeveloped to prevent coalescence between the edge of the city boundary and existing development around A1237/A59 roundabout and the new Poppleton Park & Ride.	4726/22338	
	Objection- opposed to this development on the grounds the site is Green Belt land and will contribute to the appearance of urban sprawl.	5408/24009	
	Objection – this site is part of the green corridor. Left undeveloped to prevent the coalescence effect between the edge of the present city boundary and the development around the A1237 and A59. Objection to the threat levelled against the tranquil country existence.	5686/20807	
	Objection – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping	5704/20815	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5705/20831	
	Objection – the existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the government. Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt which is essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York, directly contravening the government directives. The houses on Northfield Lane vibrate with the HGV traffic and this will increase with further use. Original building restrictions on use and opening times are not being adhered to and an extension to the business park will be unbearable to live with. Negotiating areas around the green where there are no footpaths is already difficult and will be worse with the additional traffic caused by more families. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses. The extent of this development is excessive.. This land forms part of the Green Belt corridor which is essential to preserve Poppleton as a village and not a suburb of York.	5735/20850	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas. The current road infrastructure could not cope with the additional families.	5817/20902	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5852/20941	
	Objection – see survey 13	5950/26244	
	Objection – the Green belt must be preserved. Traffic is at standstill. Utility services	6050/20998	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and local facilities are at risk of being overburdened.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 13. Development of Boroughbridge Road / British Sugar – using Green Belt is totally inappropriate. Is the old Manor School to be re-opened. Boroughbridge Road development out of proportion with last 2 years of development.	6190/26248	
	Objection – see survey 13	6203/26252	
	Objection – valuable farm land would be removed from Green Belt which should be kept to retain the rural setting. Concern regarding the additional traffic close to the A1237/A59 roundabout. There are empty business units at Clifton Moor and the York Business Park because traffic on the outer ring road is too heavy.	6222/21025	
	Objection – see survey 13. New housing would normally reflect the local need. It would appear the Council are imposing the scheme against our wishes. The inadequate road system will not cope with the large increases in traffic which would follow the housing development.	6425/26257	
	Objection – the impact of the site must be considered alongside other proposals in the area. Schools and the doctor’s surgery in the area are at capacity. Worried that there is not the infrastructure to support this.	9226/20071	
	Objection- there are issues with traffic congestion already. No further development on the land proposed will only add further congestion issues especially on the A1237 which struggles at the moment.	9268/17803	
	Objection – the inclusion of the site has not been considered in the context of ST1 and ST2. A more detailed, sensible and sympathetic analysis would arrive at the different conclusion that this site is not required to meet the needs of the existing community in an area where transport, education and local health care services are under strain already. Concern regarding the impact of the additional houses. It is an affront to the sensible and necessary guidance to provide land for growth and development within York. It is good quality agricultural land that cannot be lost. The land is quite clearly Green Belt. The site is the last check in the restriction of urban sprawl of a large built up area along the Boroughbridge Road and it’s materially assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Should the Council persist in considering the site as having development potential, much more thought should be given to the infrastructure requirements, vehicle access, major utility work, greatly increased residential traffic, a large increase in the need for public transport and increased environmental and noise pollution. Should also consider the consequent greatly increased demand for school places and doctors surgeries. Additionally sewerage facilities close to the site have been unable to cope with some of the recent	9269/17833	York (Threnchard) Residents Company Ltd.

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	rains.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection- further development in this area will destroy the local area and ambivalence alongside increasing traffic volume around the village. Local services are already full (school, surgery) and development will increase this strain. Further services will need to be provided. The developments proposed will merge the village with York.	9273/17838	
	Objection- opposite to the proposal as it will destroy the local area and ambivalence. The local primary school is full and the doctors surgery in the village already struggle to accommodate the existing population. The extra houses planned will increase traffic volume around the village and destroy the area with pollution, noise and extra danger to residents. If development goes ahead the village will merge with York and lose its identity. Before building on Brownfield land, careful consideration should be given to green field sites.	9302/18090	
	Objection – to the scale of the proposed housing planned on Green Belt land within Poppleton. Concern regarding Brownfield sites. There appears to be no consideration been made to the additional strain on the already overloaded traffic and general infrastructure, including schools and hospitals. There needs to be a better understanding of the connections between jobs and houses. There is a risk that those that can afford, will simply commute to their jobs in other cities. Residents were previously assured that the Civil Service Sports Ground would remain for sports facilities – the Olympics made keeping healthy more popular, and this decision to allocate opposes the trend. The traffic down Poppleton Road and Boroughbridge Road is already appalling now, even with the Park and Ride.	9331/18393	
	Objection – the infrastructure cannot take future development. Local schools are full, doctors is overcapacity, there is existing congestion on A59 and ring road and existing surface flooding on A59 at Cinder Land. Concern regarding where all the jobs will come from to support this extra housing. The Green Belt is necessary to preserve the villages of Upper and Nether Poppleton being absorbed into the City of York.	9396/18427	
	Objection – to the process of including all the further sites added to the existing plan in the Rural West Ward (ST1, ST2, ST19, 779, 733, 742, 772, 253, 206 and SF8) as potential for housing development. These amount to at least 2000 extra houses and increase commercial development in an area that should be kept as Green Belt. The total potential development will take more land than that currently occupied by Nether and Upper Poppleton and is out of proportion to existing settlements. The use of this land will swamp the established communities of Poppleton and Knapton, ruin	9411/18439	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	them as villages and be contrary to the Village Design Statement Guidelines. York has 'windfall' sites in the last few years and the Council should allocate all available Brownfield land for development before thinking of Greenfield. There are infrastructure issues including drainage and flooding risks, GP surgeries currently overloaded, schools full up to capacity, shops are inadequate or non-existent in some settlements, broadband issues, and transport issues.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – this open land is already decimated by overcrowding. Valuable wildlife areas should be protected. Open countryside for pleasure and recreation are seriously undermined.	9452/24110	
	Objection – with the sites at the Sugar Factory and Civil Service Sports Ground, the local infrastructure will already be stretched to the limit. The number of new houses needed on this side of town will be more than met by these large developments. The Green Belt at this portion of the A59 is already under strain and will be completely filled in from the A127 to Beckfield Lane. The entry into York from this direction will be completely spoilt. This level of land grab is unsustainable.	9509/18667	
	Objection - the Strensall Road is a very busy road with motorists paying little heed to the speed limits. The additional volume of traffic generated would mean a constant backlog of vehicles and more congestion on the ring road. Where is the infrastructure to support this population explosion? This will affect GPs surgeries and school places. Green Belt should be kept exactly that.	9522/22428	
	Objection – this is an inappropriate development. Existing scales of traffic at peak times is already alarming and the Poppleton Park & Ride at the present time only adds to the congestion. The proposed house build will be suicidal in an area which is already unsustainable on this main artery into York and of course there is also the question of adequate schooling and important amenities to support the area.	9581/19119	
	Objection – this should remain as a green corridor into York. Adding yet more housing in this area given the development across the road would lead to traffic congestion and the locality cannot support more housing. People are waiting long times to see GP's, schools are over subscribed, and other facilities will be under pressure. Any bit of open space in this area should be protected. These houses are not needed. If built it would only be occupied by yet more people who will live in York and work in Leeds or Harrogate.	9614/20633	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9692/21939	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – the development has been viewed in isolation and its impact must be considered alongside other planned developments in the area. The site was designated an area of Historic Character and Setting and considered important to retain the rural setting of the city. Building on this site would further exacerbate creeping urbanisation and signify failure of Council to adhere to its own principles. Set a precedent for further development on the last piece of green belt before the A1237. Valuable agricultural land (Grade 2) will be lost forever. The A59 is a major artery into the city and already has serious congestion issues. Educational establishments in the area are already under pressure and there is no evidence that this has been properly considered. The nearest doctor’s surgery is already working to capacity. Further detailed comments regarding the technical scoring detailed in the response.</p>	9773/20225	
	<p>Objection – see survey 13. No further development should take place in north west York until the near gridlock conditions on the A1237 have been sorted out on a permanent basis – burning valuable fuel, polluting the atmosphere in this rural belt.</p>	9827/26264	
	<p>Objection- opposed to the proposal as development may produce an average of 2 cars per household which will make Boroughbridge Road a nightmare again. Development will cause further run off from rain. Concern regarding how the road infrastructure and schools, surgeries, emergency services, gas and water pipes will deal with this development.</p>	9857/20294	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposal. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.</p>	9874/24290	
	<p>Objection- opposed to the proposal. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.</p>	9882/24313	
	<p>Support – agree with the allocation of the site for housing. A Green Belt and Landscape Appraisal and further technical information is currently under preparation for the site to support the planning application. The site will make an important and quickly deliverable contribution to York’s housing. The proposed allocation will provide 50% affordable housing, 20% higher than the ‘dynamic’ target outlined in Policy AH1. The site is in a sustainable location for housing; 500m from shops/services on Beckfield Lane and 600m from the nearest primary school. It is envisaged that pedestrian/cycleway links would be formed. Nearest secondary school 600m to north on Millfield Lane. Employment uses also located on Millfield Lane. Nearest bus stops</p>	9896/19337	Cobalt Builders Ltd



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>on Boroughbridge Road. Poppleton railway station lies only approximately 750m to the north of the site. Site is unconstrained in terms of potential delivery of housing. Does not require any remediation or substantive on-site infrastructure works. Site does not have adopted Green Belt boundaries, and therefore the site cannot be considered to be in the Green Belt. Site would allow for land between the site and A1237 ring road, to the west, to remain undeveloped, and therefore potentially form Green Belt between the outer edge of the built area of York and the ring road. Technical studies carried out in relation to ecology, archaeology, flood risk and drainage, noise, transport, landscaping and trees indicated there are no particular environmental considerations that would preclude housing. Further detailed comments provided, please see response.</p> <p>Comment- site measures 5.8ha, therefore more akin to the allocated sites, rather than the other strategic sites. Some of the allocated sites will in fact provide a greater number of housing units. There is a concern that the allocation of the site as a 'strategic site' has the potential to undermine the anticipated short term delivery of the site, because the term 'strategic' infers the site will be delivered over a longer time period, possibly related to infrastructure delivery. This simply is not the case with this site. When Policy H3: Housing Allocations is updated to reflect the FSC, it is urged that the estimated phasing for the site is clearly stated in the policy to be in the short term (Years 1 to 5).</p>	9896/26162	
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	<p>Objection- see survey 13. The scale of the proposed housing plan on Green Belt is an outrage. What about the Brown sites. Concern that no consideration has been made to the additional strain on the already overloaded traffic and general infrastructure. Those that can afford will simply commute to their job to Leeds or other cities. The traffic down Poppleton Road and Boroughbridge Road is appalling now.</p>	10069/19122	
	<p>Objection – it is important that this area is kept as fields to protect the rural nature of York and act as a buffer to stop urban sprawl. The roads at the A59 junction cannot cope with more traffic.</p>	10102/25823	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the inclusion of this site. The site has not been considered as a whole with the nearby planned sites ST1 and ST2. The infrastructure is unable to cope now. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, there is not evidence that justifies this destruction of green belt land. This land is also valuable grade 2 agricultural land. This site has already been found unsuitable for development twice in the past as part of larger proposals yet it has been assessed again and has had a significant change in the result without any change in the</p>	10120/19462	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	material facts. Detailed comments on the technical officer assessment provided, see response.		
	Objection – developments will feed out onto the A59 at a point with the new park and Ride. This access will become gridlocked and virtually impassable. This once beautiful and pleasant city is fast becoming a nightmare for residents and visitors alike.	10138/25907	
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection- development of these would represent undesirable ribbon development and the loss of breathing space between the main city and a satellite village. If this site, ST2, 764, SF8 and 793 were developed the impact on health, education and employment would be unsustainable.	10202/21147	
	Objection – this development will dramatically impact to the detriment on all amenities and life in the village.	10216/21179	
	Objection – the impact of development must be considered alongside other local projects (ST1, ST2). Site was designated an area of Historic Character and Setting. Danger of further development of last piece of green belt before A1237. Land has been graded as very good for agricultural purposes, so valuable land would be lost forever.	10247/21233	
	Objection – see survey 13. There are too many big sites in a small area where roads are already clogged with traffic. Infrastructure improvements (roads, schools etc) must be made prior to development.	10301/26270	
	Objection – this development should not be viewed in isolation but with ST1 and ST2. The road infrastructure is already at capacity. The introduction of the Park and Ride has done little to improve the congestion. The roads cannot support the increase of traffic that will come from this development.	10324/26012	
	Objection – this proposal, along with others in the area will result in a huge change from semi-rural to a densely urban landscape. This will change the character of the North of York. There is a lack of facilities for any new housing.	10375/26070	
	Objection – this proposal should be viewed with others in the area, specifically ST1 and ST2. In previous version of the plan this was proposed greenbelt. The A59 in this area has serious congestion. This development will create more traffic which will increase the congestion. There is no evidence to show the impact on education has been considered. This site is currently both valuable agricultural land and open space, both of which should be preserved.	10381/26075	
	Objection – the Green Belt should be safeguarded for future generations not for development. Building at West Poppleton will substantially erode the Green Belt. This goes against Policy SS5 to preserve the setting and special character of York.	10434/19423	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Once this land is developed for housing, retail industrial use, it is gone forever. The trees, ditches and fields around the area provide habitats for many of our native species. Deer, newts, frogs, owls and many other animals are regularly seen in this area. It is not clear that the impact on these animals has been properly assessed. A comprehensive review should be made. Given the loss of habitats from developments 733, ST2, 779, ST1, it is imperative that rural land is retained in the vicinity at site 764.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22726	
	Objection – the rural character of Upper and Nether Poppleton must be retained. Development should be restricted to Brownfield sites. The number of houses proposed for ST1 and ST2 is already too high.	10450/22547	
	Objection- houses planned exceed the ability of local infrastructure. The local roads are single carriageway, heavily congested. More houses/people will create worsening pollution. Local doctor’s surgery and schools are already heavily oversubscribed and the proposed houses would create even more demand. Poppleton is a close community which has many attractions; this would be permanently eroded if the village were to become part of an urban sprawl.	10474/22596	
	Objection – current traffic levels are already high, and extra homes will add unbearable pressure on an already overloaded road network. Development will also affect the infrastructure and other services in the area.	10503/22673	
	Objection – no infrastructure to cover all the new houses. Takes there weeks to get a doctors appointment now. Parking is an accident waiting to happen	10545/26337	
	Objection- opposed to this proposal as the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in this area are already under great strain and facilities must be provided. The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate these additional families.	10580/23725	
	Objection- opposed to this proposal as the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in this area are already under great strain and facilities must be provided. The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate these additional families.	10582/22781	
	Objection – the local amenities and infrastructure are currently overwhelmed.	10615/26108	
	Objection – opposed to the development as it will cause increased congestion on A59 and A1237, it uses green field land and is in the Historical Character and Setting.	10637/20430	
	Objection – this site is Grade 2 agricultural land. The land owner still farms the land	10677/19780	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	which acts as a valuable drainage area for surface run off water in heavy rain. It was envisaged that this medieval city would have a green corridor entrance which would place it in a unique position for all time.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – the proposal takes away valuable farmland that should be part of the green corridor. The site is part of the Historic character and setting designation. There are traffic issues and there is a need for improved infrastructure.	10732/19898	
	Objection – development will take away valuable farmland and should be part of green corridor. The site within proposed designation of Historic Character and setting and is part of green corridor entrance to the city. It is also within the area established to prevent coalescence. It is subject to water logging and surface water drainage issues and is high quality grade 2 and 3 agricultural land.	10734/19908	
	Objection – see survey 13	10736/26275	
	Objection – the proposed site is clearly Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. It is not clear why the change of use of this land is necessary or indeed wise and the draft Local plan contains no evidence to support such premise. It is the last open space along the A59 between the city centre and the outer ring road and it materially assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Concern that consideration for infrastructure requirements have not been fully explored, for the increased demand of school places and that the sewage facility close to the site has been unable to cope with recent rains.	10742/19932	
	Objection – see survey 13. Erosion of the green belt and encroachment on the countryside. Brownfield should be developed first. Traffic systems are inadequate. Infrastructure is inadequate. Strongly object to this vast, unsustainable development on our green belt land. It is completely inappropriate and will swamp our village and infrastructure. It is urban sprawl.	10752/19947	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10754/19971	
	Objection – would erode the green belt.	10758/19985	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10767/20022	
Objection – taking into account ST1 ST2 and 773 (The Old Vinery) the lack of school and medical provision, the increased traffic on the road and the overwhelming	10771/20045		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	addition to the sewage system, this appears to shoe horn properties into a space without considering the overall impact. Additional traffic will make car movements in York unbearable.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10791/20646	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10805/22818	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10811/21335	
	Objection- site has already been found unsuitable for development twice. The whole of the site is important to the setting of the city. Poor access to most facilities is deficient in open space. Disagree with scoring of the site and think site fails criteria 4 - site is not within 800m of primary school, includes Old Manor School playing fields in analysis but no guarantee this will be retained in this location. Technical officer findings for transport and historic environment, landscape and design for sites 790 & 250 are just as valid when considering 779. Cannot understand how site can be considered to have potential for development when it has been found unsuitable as part of a larger proposal for housing; it has been found unsuitable as part of a larger proposal in the Local Plan and it has the same issues as adjacent site 250 which failed suitability criteria.	10819/21362	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10848/21924	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10850/21419	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10852/21434	
	Objection – overdevelopment of an area adjacent to the conservation area. Insufficient infrastructure.	10855/21457	
	Objection – inappropriate to be included in the Local Plan	10881/25895	Georgina Grace Trust

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10904/21531	
	Objection – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10957/21616	
	Objection – see survey 13	10989/26283	
	Objection – see survey 13. Too many houses adjacent to Boroughbridge Road. The roads will be even more blocked up by motor traffic.	10990/26288	
	Objection – see survey 13	10992/26293	
	Objection – see survey 13	10993/26298	
	Objection – see survey 13. Insufficient thought and detail about the attendant facilities required to sustain massive development eg. lack of schools, road congestion, health service facilities (both GP and hospital), car parking.	10994/26303	
	Objection – see survey 13	10996/26306	
	Objection – see survey 13	10998/26311	
	Objection – see survey 13. Pressure on local amenities, traffic on ring road – will need to double in size because already overcrowded.	11001/26314	
	Objection – see survey 13. Local Plan seems to have taken absolutely no thought to the infrastructure to support the building plans and just seems intent on filling every available pocket of green space.	11002/26320	
	Objection – see survey 13	11005/26325	
	Objection – see survey 13. Too much traffic on roads in this area already. Can't handle what there is already. Where are all the children in new houses going to go to school. Manor already oversubscribed. Far enough out of York to be / feel separate. More and more houses just end up like everywhere else.	11007/26330	
	Objection – see survey 13. To add more traffic, industry and housing to this would destroy the village – would become just an added suburb to the sprawl. Green Belt land is paramount to the protection of the environment.	11011/26333	
	Objection – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	11155/21638	
Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are	11215/21899		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
<b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11246/22841	
	Objection - It is noted that one of the aims of the Local Plan is to 'create, for the first time, a permanent Green Belt to ensure the city's boundaries are protected until around 2040 and beyond'. In the original proposal which was circulated for public consultation in June and July 2013, the land at what has now become Site 779 was shown as 'proposed green belt', and it was considered that this area should be 'protected'. However, with the subsequent publication of the 'Local Plan Further Sites Consultation' document, it appears that the council no longer considers the importance of it's own policy, suggesting this same piece of land no longer worthy of protection	11247/22854	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11248/22116	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11251/22131	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11252/22146	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11254/22161	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11257/22176	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11259/22191	
	Objection - the proposal to build housing on Site 779 is inappropriate and not in conjunction with chapter 9 of The National Planning Policy Framework. Greenbelt land should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - yet these 'exceptional circumstances' have yet to be stipulated - especially when considering the already	11270/22858	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proposed sites of ST1(994 dwellings) and ST2 (241 dwellings) which will vastly change the area to meet the needs of housing. As well as destroying much needed open land, a further development of potentially 161 dwellings on site 779, will no doubt cause more issues regarding infrastructure of schools, roads and health care services as well as recreational facilities, which will be impacted already by proposals of sites ST1 and ST2. Site 779 is the last remaining open space on the A59 which assists in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Seems to be unnecessary and damaging to the area and represents inappropriate development. Given the area was previously seen as an area of 'historic character' and was hailed by the Council as 'an area retaining the rural setting' which 'warrants protection' (Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper Update June 2013, para 3.2), it seems this now means nothing to the Council, who once identified deficiencies in quantity and quality of open spaces in York under The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study of 2008.</p>		
<p><b>779 Land at Boroughbridge Road (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.</p>	<p>11417/23744</p>	
<p><b>800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet</b></p>	<p>Comment – parts of the site are located within flood zones 2 and 3. Requests the site is subject to the flood risk Sequential Test, to ensure there are no alternate sites at a lower level of flood risk. If the site passed the Sequential, any future development should adopt a sequential approach to the site layout in order to minimise the risk of flooding for the future, and appropriate mitigation measures are adopted. Site egress and access should be carefully designed, as the area of flood zone 3 dissects the site.</p>	<p>3/18859</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
	<p>Objection- it is not clear why this designation has been changed from safeguarded status. This indicates uncertainty over the need to include the site in the Plan. The statistical argument for the inclusion of such a large site with its attendant environmental disbenefits has not been made, and should not be included.</p>	<p>45/18772</p>	<p>York Environment Forum</p>
	<p>Objection - previously opposed the proposal to allocate 16 hectares as Safeguarded Land (SF7) and strongly oppose the current proposal. The existing Designer Outlet site is outside the existing built-up area within open countryside and is visually contained by mature and substantial landscaping. The out of centre development was only allowed as an exception to Green Belt policy on the basis that there was a redundant hospital on the site. It should remain as a developed site in the Green Belt subject to the policies for such sites. The land was specifically assessed in the 2011</p>	<p>62/19160</p>	<p>Fulford Parish Council</p>



**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Historic Character Technical Paper as being important to the setting of the city. No further evidence has been brought forward to justify its removal from the Green Belt. The site directly abuts the Fulford Community Orchard, which is the only managed heritage orchard of any significant size in the York area. Heritage orchards such as are under threat, with the result that they are no designated as priority habitats. Major additional development south of the Designer Outlet would have serious adverse consequences for the local environment of Fulford. There is no evidence that sequential testing has been carried out to check whether other more suitable sites might be available for B2 and B3 uses or for a suitable Park and Ride. Further detailed comments provided, see response.</p>		
<p><b>800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this should be earmarked for a Park &amp; Ride site, not employment land to maintain an element of green.</p>	91/19622	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	<p>Objection – development would substantially increase the extent of the built-up area and bring buildings far closer to the village of Bishopthorpe. The allocation and development of this area, therefore, seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City. Consequently, there will need to be an evaluation of what impact the development of this area would be likely to have upon the setting of the historic city. It could also impact upon the setting of the Bishopthorpe Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990.</p>	238/18162	English Heritage
	<p>Support - the allocation of the development of employment purposes is supported. It is also considered that the site is suitable for B1 (a) uses as well as the proposed allocation for B1 (b), B2 and B9 purposes. A Landscape Assessment shows how land to the south of the YDO can be assimilated from a landscape point of view and an initial Masterplan. Further detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	244/18713	NTR Planning
	<p>Objection- the site is a large area of Green Belt land including land of agricultural and biodiversity value immediately adjacent to the Fulford Community Orchard. It is situated close to the already over congested A19 into York via Fulford and would only make congestion worse.</p>	386/18902	York Green Party
	<p>Objection – opposed to any development which would threaten the integrity of the Fulford Community Orchard. The orchard should be protected with a sufficient buffer zone from any development, along with its connection to open countryside. The orchard is too important for York’s biodiversity to have its value compromised by neighbouring warehouses, a park and ride site or continuous leisure use of the Designer Outlet which would generate noise, light and air pollution. Any such</p>	422/19165	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developments should be rejected on the same grounds as the Dobbies Garden Centre was in 2008.		
<b>800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet (continued)</b>	Objection – the location of development sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.	544/20486	
	Support – agree with the inclusion of the site in the Local Plan.	943/20517	
	Comment – due to the location of the site it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the Strategic Road Network.	1264/18587	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Comment – there are no specific concerns raised by constituents regarding this site. Expansion of Designer Outlet could be positive addition to southern edge of the city, providing adequate provision is made for parking on site and that work is done to mitigate potential increases in the traffic flows on the A19 as a result of such a development. The land is currently within the Green Belt and the authority should consider how they will justify this greenbelt development with exceptional circumstances.	1355/18612	Julian Sturdy MP
	Comment- the location is along the A64 corridor is potentially attractive to employers. Queries whether a site appended to the back of a designer outlet centre represents the best available opportunity for a key employment site.	1512/20577	Tangent Properties
	Objection– the site 800 areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3a running through it. The NPPF	1736/18995	Oakgate PLC

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>advises that development should be directed to the lowest areas of Flood Risk which would exclude site 800. The site provides a mix of woodland and grassland that remains uncultivated. In the criteria 1 to 4 analysis however the issue of Landscape and Habitat Assessment for Site 800 is found to have no adverse impact upon Landscape and the issue of habitat is considered to be Not Applicable by officers, this cannot be correct given the nature and value of the land in terms of its potential for wildlife habitat. The site carries greater highways concerns, particularly in respect of the fact that it would generate increased traffic flows at existing peak times. The site is close to the Naburn Marsh SSSI and is near to the Ouse River corridor. The site has no strong and permanent boundaries; it constitutes unrestrained urban sprawl into the Green Belt and Green Wedge.</p>		
<p><b>800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- the site has not been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.</p>	2681/17921	
	<p>Objection- the site abuts the Fulford Community Orchard. The orchard forms part of the Green Corridor running into the city. If development goes ahead, the north eastern and eastern boundaries should be moved away from the orchard to protect both it and the Green Corridor.</p>	4039/22232	
	<p>Comment- development will have a significant impact on resident wildlife of the Community Orchard. The land in question is part of a designated local wildlife corridor.</p>	5145/23990	
	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposal for this site. The proposals constitute a direct threat to the viability and integrity of Fulford Community Orchard which is an important site for biodiversity and an important asset to York. It is the only managed traditional heritage orchard of any significant size in York. It is home to a wide range of wildlife, flora and fauna. The orchard is included in the York Biodiversity Action Plan. As a result of the development the orchard will be completely surrounded by access roads and will suffer severe air, noise and light pollution. It will be impossible to for the integrity of the ecology of the orchard to survive under such conditions. The original planning conditions of the Outlet included the restriction that it is 'retail use only' and as such leisure activities have been limited to a few weeks a year. Any extension of leisure activities must be prohibited to prevent harm to the fragile ecology of the orchard and to prevent the residents of Naburn Lane being subjected to noise and light pollution.</p>	5708/20844	
	<p>Objection- this site should not be removed from the Green Belt.</p>	6516/20320	Liberal Democrat Group

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 2: New Residential, Employment and Retail Sites Considered (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>800 (SF7) Land to South of Designer Outlet (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – site is Green Belt land. The land is retail only. Development would add to traffic congestion. There would be a direct threat to the viability and integrity of the biodiversity hotspot and environmental asset that is Fulford Community Orchard. Although not itself earmarked for development, land directly adjacent to it would undoubtedly have a serious negative impact on this important site. A similar threat to the Orchard was rejected by the council before. Hard to see if retail development was deemed unsuitable previously how a retail warehouse with a Park and Ride could be thought acceptable. The orchard constitutes an integral element of the local wildlife corridor helping to connect to the Ouse River SSSI with the Heslington Tilmire SSSI.</p>	9610/21113	Fulford Community Orchard
	<p>Objection- Fulford Community Orchard is the largest remaining 'Heritage' orchard in York. It is an important haven for wildlife. It was recognised as such in the official response to a previous planning application when development was turned down on those grounds. This type of development would cut off the area to wildlife, contravening local policy on wildlife corridors. The area also lies within the proposed Green Belt. The original planning permission for the Designer Outlet ruled out a leisure function on the grounds of noise, pollution and threat t wildlife. This type of development would cut off the area to wildlife, contravening local policy on wildlife corridors. The Plan has failed to take on the recommendation in the 'New City Beautiful Report' that the land to the south of the orchard be used as a country park.</p>	9879/24297	
	<p>Objection- the proposed developments appear to threaten the future viability of the Fulford Community Orchard, thereby undermining local and national biodiversity plans. The existing and potential environmental, historical and social values of the Orchard have already been recognised by the local community and by officers at CYC. The plans isolate the orchard within an area of environmental degradation.</p>	10392/26087	