

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p>247/H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road</p>	<p>Support –agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.</p>	<p>943/20518</p>	
	<p>Support – no correspondence received from constituents regarding this site. Support slight reduction in its boundaries in order to protect land surrounding St Leonard’s Hospice.</p>	<p>1355/18613</p>	<p>Julian Sturdy MP</p>
	<p>Objection – opposed to the Technical Officer Assessment and the proposed amendments to the boundary. The proposed amendment to the site boundary has been done to protect views to the rear of St Leonards Hospice. The Wilberforce Trust understands that care needs to be taken to respect the setting of any development and ensure that it is of an appropriate scale and density. The Wilberforce Trust is keen to see the larger site to provide much needed housing for York, in a logical sustainable location. Loss of view should be addressed by development control once a developer has been identified and detailed proposals are put forward. If the land to the north of the allocation is to be included within the allocation, it could form part of the on-site public open space. Reducing the site boundary will result in an illogical gap, which would lead to proposals for logical infill in the future. Preserving the site to protect a view is not a planning consideration as the site is not within an area of special landscape character. On this basis, it is requested that the original site boundary remains and any issues and concerns regarding design be dealt with at an appropriate time by development control. Bringing forward the whole site will ensure a logical boundary is followed without creating another infill site. Concerns regarding design matters should be addressed at the appropriate time, not at the allocation stage. Detailed comments provided on technical officer assessment, see response.</p>	<p>1400/18526</p>	<p>Lambert Smith Hampton</p>
	<p>Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.</p>	<p>2681/17924</p>	
	<p>Support – welcome the reduction in development to protect land around the redevelopment, should include landscaping and new access.</p>	<p>2765/20608</p>	
	<p>Objection - We note that the reduced area proposed for development takes account of the concerns of the Hospice but that there is no detail given to clarify the options for vehicular access to the site, nor is the likely increase in congestion to the already busy Tadcaster Road addressed. It is clear that access to the site could not reasonably be accommodated via the Square, which was designed specifically with the size and shape of the present development in mind. We feel therefore that the Council should withdraw site 247 from the plan to allow these concerns to be properly and fully investigated.</p>	<p>3811/22047</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
247/H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road (continued)	Objection- unnecessary use of greenbelt land, the area is already over developed, existing access problems with narrow road ways, the allocation is bordered by mature trees which must be preserved, the area is a haven for wildlife which would be lost if developed, the development of the area would cause dust and noise pollution to residents of The Grove who would then need re-compensating, and hose prices may devalue.	4289/17963	
	Objection - appreciate the change to the Plan in relation to St. Leonard’s Hospice and would argue that a strong case can be made for designating the whole site as green belt land. Bearing in mind that the city’s economic growth in part depends upon attracting outside companies, and those companies have executive staff requiring housing, would it not be advantageous to present an area such as The Square, overlooking green belt land, as an example of accommodation that York can offer. Might be argued that the area is tiny in the overall housing plans of the city but that its smallness with mature trees, mammals and birds is intrinsically valuable – a green lung – to the residents of Revival, The Square, The Grove, Chessingham Gardens and the Hospice. As it is, Site 247 enhances the neighbourhood and benefits not only the communities within the immediate area, but also the general public who travel on Sim Balk Lane or use the Knavesmire pathway. Fifty additional houses would completely change the character of the locality. Square shares the entrance on and off Tadcaster Road with the Hospice and both are well used by cars, delivery and utility vehicles, and ambulances for the latter. The road into The Square is narrow and drivers of large lorries, like those collecting refuse, already have difficulties with parked cars and other lorries. An emergency, such as a fire, would pose formidable problems. The plan does not show any clear access to the site. Would it be through the Revival estate, via the Hospice, through The Square (built as a cul-de-sac) or from The Grove (officially a cul-de-sac). All lead on to the already busy Tadcaster Road, which at certain times of the day becomes gridlocked.	5193/27145	
	Objection - whilst St. Leonard’s Hospice supports the change to allocation H6 to reduce the size of the allocation and remove the allocation on the land immediately adjacent to the hospice still maintain there is a strong case for further changes that would allocate Site H6 for healthcare facilities and therefore objection to current allocation of site H6 for housing. Detailed comments and revised map provided see response. Suggested amendment to the proposed site allocation H6, in order of preference are is allocate all or part of the site for future healthcare facilities, delete housing allocation and safeguard land for future development, if the Council maintain	6142/18914	Keogh Planning

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the allocation for housing, an area to the east and south of the Hospice should be identified as a no-build zone.		
247/H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road (continued)	Objection – recognition of aspects by a small reduction in site area does not alleviate the noted and agreed concerns. Site comprises protected green and open space between built up area of York and the A64 and villages of Bishopthorpe and Copmanthorpe, Should be protected. Access to development problematic; change of traffic circulation creates grave risks, internal roads of the Square are not designed for any through traffic. Access from The Grove appears to have legal difficulties and issues regarding close tree protection orders. Preserve this plot of land as parkland amenity site for the Hospice, York College and public.	6216/21015	
	Objection – whilst the reduction in size of the site is supported this doesn't remove the objections lodged during the first consultation. This is a green belt site and will bring development closer to the A64, compromising the setting of the City. Residents of The Square and The Grove continue to object to the inclusion of the site. Access is a concern; residents feel that their cul-de-sac is not suitable because of the layout and width of the road and there are concerns about the impact of houses on the immediate road network. Residents of the Grove are concerned that a small area of land owned by the residents management company, has been included in the site in error and this includes the access to the field. Residents of The Grove were not informed about this second consultation and only found out by accident. They do not feel that the reduction in site size makes it any way acceptable to them.	6515/19243	Cllr Ann Reid, representing Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward
	Objection – doesn't fully address last year's concerns, including loss of green belt land.	6516/20321	Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – the site has mature trees (listed) which will constrain development. Access is unsafe through The Square. The site has great crested newts. The houses to The Square have small gardens as this site was considered green belt at the time of their development. A landscape screen should be included along the boundary to ensure adequate separation. Some limited development is suitable accessed from The Grove only.	9260/17821	
	Objection – this area is already an air pollution hot spot. Increased development will result in more traffic and pollution. The site is a meadow for wild life. The Grove is too narrow to accommodate the increase in traffic. The management company who own the verges would not be willing to sell them to widen the road. Concern over affordable housing and anti social behaviour.	9290/18041	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
247/H6 Land RO The Square, Tadcaster Road (continued)	<p>Objection – against development of H6 site and use of The Grove for access. Building prematurely on Green Sites when Brownfield Sites are still available. Tadcaster Road is already an air pollution red spot – development will increase traffic and pollution in an area where the current infrastructure is currently struggling. Noise spillage into The Grove. The Meadow has some very established trees and is a haven for wildlife. Access to crop field would be lost. Arguments against the Grove being used as an access - traffic density turning on and off Tadcaster Road, the Grove is currently too narrow to cope with a vast increase in traffic and Chessingham Grove Management Company own the verges and turning area at the entrance to The Meadow and would not be willing to sell.</p>	9338/18404	
	<p>Objection – the proposed modifications may allow the St. Leonard’s Hospice to retain certain green views, but this does not satisfy the many other objections to the plan. A range of brown field sites stand unused. There are a paucity of amenities, poor local work opportunities, traffic infrastructure and overload, impeded emergency services particularly to the college etc. It appears that access to the lower agricultural land will be blocked. The NFU has described it as prime agricultural land and oppose the change (Ref. 1742/1835). The field currently provides a tranquil oasis for the occupants of the Hospice and their visitors. The site is teeming with wildlife. There are ancient and protected trees and shrubbery providing for a large bird population. There are also protected bat species. It is a ‘green lung’ for the City. Should development proceed the environmental impact will be profound. There will be more cars, air pollution, noise pollution, burden on services e.g. water pressure. Traffic hazards due to inadequate overburdened infrastructure. More cars on side roads will impede cyclists and pedestrians, particularly students travelling to the College. The excellent vista available to visitors as they travel this main arterial route will be obliterated. The trees/shrubberies must be preserved for future generations. Development will fail existing communities – does this contravene Article 8 of the EU Human Rights Convention. Brown fields must be the primary choice and they are available in quantity.</p>	9456/18481	
	<p>Objection – minimal change seems to be a token gesture that will have negligible consequences for the hospice. Would make more sense to remove the allocation to allow future expansion of the hospice and maintain the aspect on open countryside. Removal of the segment of site 247 will leave an inaccessible area of the site that will become an unpleasant wilderness. Access via the square and the hospice road is not feasible. Access via the grove is obfuscated by the strip of land on the northern side.</p>	10813/21350	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	If access is impossible building on the sites is not feasible.		
627/H11 Land at Fredrick House	Support - some residential development on this site would be acceptable but is important to retain the whole of the woodland area to the east end of the site. This is of considerable local amenity value for residents on Kilbiurn Road. These requirements should be made clear in the Plan.	386/18927	York Green Party
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20520	
	Support – Shepherd Construction support the amendment to expand the range of potential uses of site 627 to include residential development and/or community uses (including medical, education or local retail). Objection – Frederick House site is currently in employment (B1 office) use. Therefore in order to enhance the potential for mixed use on the site and to remove uncertainty for the existing occupier about the continued use of the site, Shepherd Construction suggest that B1 office use should also be added to the range of potential uses on the site. The site is also close to the town centre and on a high frequency bus route that would make it attractive to potential hotel operators. Therefore suggest that the range of uses for the site should be Housing – Use Class C3, Education/Nursing Home – Use Class C2, Medical Facility – Use Class D1, Hotel – Use Class C1, Office – Use Class B1 and non-residential Education / Training Centre – Use Class D1. With regard to the Local Plan Proposals Map, this does not properly identify the full extent of the Frederick House site and should be amended. Site plan of the Frederick House site that should the full extent of the site (c.0.9ha) included with response showing an area hatched blue as the additional area that should be included in the allocation on the Local Plan Proposals Map.	1401/18911 1401/18910	Keogh Planning
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17925	
639/E11 Annamine Nurseries	Support – Shepherd Group support the recommendation to allow office use on the site.	532/26138	Keogh Planning
	Objection – Shepherd Group object to the restriction that office, or any other employment use, must be connected to the adjacent site. The NPPF sets out the Government’s commitment to securing economic growth. Local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21 st century. The user restriction on office use is unreasonable and unnecessary. It is unreasonable because if Shepherd Group do not have any need for office use on the site, it would prevent this brownfield site being brought into use in the event that an alternative occupier could be found for the site. The site, which is	532/18908	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 3: Changes to Allocated Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in a sustainable location close to other employment sites in the Monks Cross area, could effectively be blighted. This restriction on office use is also contrary to the guidance in the NPPF. Policy EMP2 of the Local Plan should be amended to include B1a office use in the range of employment uses that can be accommodated on the former Annamine Nursery site (ref. E11). There should be no restriction that any office or other employment use must be connected to the adjacent use.		
639/E11 Annamine Nurseries (continued)	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20519	
	Support– no major objection to proposed ‘change in use’ for this site from office use alone to office use and ‘other employment...connected to the adjacent use’. No responses received from constituents regarding this proposal.	1355/18614	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17923	
	Support - see no objection to the inclusion of the Annamine nursery, site ref. 639, for office use as well as other employment where this is connected to the adjacent use (Portakabin)	3799/22044	
654/H19 Land at Mill Mount	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20521	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17926	
	Support – Shepherd Engineering Services support the allocation of their premises at Mill Mount as a housing site in the Draft Local Plan and the expansion of the range of potential uses to include residential development and/or community uses (including medical, education or local retail). Objection –the range of uses could be expanded . Mill Mount is currently in employment (B1 office) use. In order to enhance the potential for mixed use on the site and remove uncertainty for the existing occupier about the continued use of the site, SES suggest that B1 office use should also be added to the range of potential uses on the site. The site on Scarcroft Road is close to the city centre – within walking distance – and well served by public transport, adjacent to a school and close to other hotels. It is a highly sustainable location. Whilst eminently suitable for the uses the Council has accepted, the site is also suitable for hotel use. The range of suggested uses therefore included but is not exclusive to Housing – Use Class C3, Education/Nursing Home – Use Class C2, Medical Facility – Use Class D1, Hotel – Use Class C1, Non-residential Education / Training Centre – Use Class D1 and Office – Use Class B1	4390/26139 4390/18913	Keogh Planning

