

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
230 Land to the North of Manor School	Support – the provision of further educational purposes at this site identified as open space.	71/18984	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – the provision of further educational purposes at this site identified as open space.	78/19022	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20543	
	Support – support the making over of this land to Manor School as educational open space.	1355/18644	Julian Sturdy MP
	Support – opposed to every site in the main document except the provision of 8 hectares of educational open space to the north of Manor School.	2681/17950	
	Support – the site is within the existing built up area, support green space along the edge	2765/20606	
	Support – agree with the allocation of educational open space at Manor Road	9302/18088	
	Support – support the proposal to link the site currently identified as open space with the existing Manor School designation.	9614/20631	
	Support – supportive of the proposal to link the site with the existing Manor School designation.	10732/19897	
	Support - supportive the provision of further educational purposes at this site identified as open space.	10734/19918	
794 University Expansion	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, and 794. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18969	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – late inclusion in the plan, demonstrates how much or how little serious thinking has gone into the University’s forward planning. There should be no direct access from the site, when developed, into the village other than via Field Lane. The Local Plan should stipulate that the land cannot be designated as general development land, but can only be developed for the university’s own academic purposes, which would include student residences. This would keep students on campus and not occupying good family housing, or affordable housing land. All existing public routes and Public Right of Way should be retained in any completed development.	46/18096	Heslington Village Trust

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p>794 University Expansion (continued)</p>	<p>Objection – proposal covers 28ha of good agricultural green belt land which forms a vital part of the attractive setting of the City of York and of Heslington Village. Its current use as agricultural land complements the undoubted high environmental status of the university lake and the ground nesting habitat alongside the lake. This will be lost if the land is developed. The proposed development will compromise the setting of the village and views out of the village to the Yorkshire Wolds. The significance of both setting and views is fully recognised in Heslington Conservation Area appraisal. Proposal involves reserving a substantial chunk of green belt land which currently forms a valuable green wedge protecting the environment of York and Heslington inside the A64. This would radically change the rural character of this area. It is a disproportionately large scale development in the wrong place. Heslington still preserves its unique village character despite pressures from surrounding developments. During the current expansion of the university a great deal of care was taken to preserve the character of Heslington and its setting in the green belt. Currently, no traffic of any sort generated by the University can cut through the heart of the village. This has proved to be very successful. The Inspector in his report from the Public Inquiry for the current university expansion particularly comments that the lake and wetland area will provide a positive limit to built development to the south of the Heslington East site. The siting of a new development to the south of Low Lane will severely compromise the village integrity and the objectives set out in the Heslington East development brief and landscape and master planning documents and particularly the Inspector’s report. The village will be used as a main thoroughfare between the new development and Heslington West. If further land is required it should be prioritised to be taken to the East of Campus East and Low Lane, up to the Grimston Bar roundabout. It should prevent access to Low Lane from the University. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that there should be no direct access from the site, when developed, into the village other than via Field Lane. The Local Plan should stipulate that the land can only be developed for the university’s own academic purposes, and not be designated as general development land. All existing public routes and Rights of Way should be retained in any completed development.</p>	<p>48/18601</p>	<p>Heslington Parish Council</p>
	<p>Objection – opposes further expansion of the university into land between Heslington and the ring road due to impact on historic character, local amenity, views and cumulative impacts with ST15. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	<p>62/19155</p>	<p>Fulford Parish Council</p>

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection –the current expansion would last beyond the Local Plan timescale. Some of the existing Science City is certainly not used for science based activity and these activities should be re-located to enable science based activities to use their sites. The green wedge adjacent to the A64 was deemed necessary at the planning stage for current expansion and should be retained as such. Do not believe the relatively exposed land of Kimberlow Hill should be developed.	91/19640	
	Objection - in the 1994 Report on the Green Belt Local Plan Inquiry, the Inspector considered that <i>'...in general, there would be serious harm to views of the City from the Ring Road if development were permitted to come right up to the latter and even more so if it passed beyond it'</i> [Inspector's report, paragraph A7.28 page 12]. The expansion of the University to the extent of the area identified would bring development to within 130m of the Ring Road. Even without the development of the proposed new settlement at Whinthorpe, to the south of A64, this will fundamentally change the relationship which the southern edge of York has with the countryside to the south. It will also alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the City within an area of open countryside (an element identified by the Inspector in his Report as contributing to the special character of York). The proposed development of Whinthorpe would only worsen this impression. Overall, English Heritage consider that the allocation and development of this area would be 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.	238/18178	English Heritage
	Objection – in combination with Whinthorpe, the overall effect would be to remove the majority of any green space between the university campus and the Whinthorpe development. Effectively, urbanisation would spread continuously from Heslington and the Heslington East campus through to and including Whinthorpe. This would be detrimental to the concept of York as a city within a rural environment.	401/18102	York Ornithological Trust
	Objection- Heslington Village is being engulfed by the University from all sides. Development will create more traffic, noise and pollution and will completely destroy what little we have left of the rural setting of this old village.	670/23786	
	Objection – Heslington Village is a conservation area. Siting a new development to the south of Low Lane will severely compromise the village integrity. It will mean that the village will be used as a main thoroughfare for pedestrians and cyclists and vehicles. The proposed development will compromise the setting of the village and views out of the village to the Yorkshire Dales. The significance of both setting and views is fully recognised in Heslington Conservation Area No.28. It will remove Green	863/23704	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Belt from the valuable green wedge protecting the environment of York inside the A64, contrary to the purposes of Green Belt. The Inspector in his report from the Public Inquiry for the current University expansion particularly comments that the lake and wetland area will provide a positive limit to built development to the south of the site. The reserved area will be devastating for the feel of the village and contrary to the objectives of the development brief and landscape and master planning documents and particularly the Inspector's report. If further land is required it should be prioritised to be taken to the East of Campus East and Low Lane, up to the Grimston Bar roundabout. It should prevent access to Low Lane from the University.		
	Support – see survey 9. Extending the University should only be allowed if it includes accommodation and parking.	896/26722	
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection – current amenities of the land for walkers will be destroyed. The countryside setting of the village will be further undermined by the loss of open fields to urban development. Yet further loss of green belt land. There must be no access to Heslington Village from this area .In addition, if the land if built on, it must only be developed for the university's own academic purposes, which would include student residences. This would keep students on campus and not occupying good family homes, or affordable housing land.	905/20504	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20542	
	Comment – see survey 12. The University should be required to build more accommodation for students and students should pay Council Tax (or their landlords should) if they occupy houses needed for families – there's no point in building affordable housing if it is bought by buy-to-let landlords. The University should only be allowed to expand if it is to provide more accommodation.	1094/26825	
	Comment – due to the location and size 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 this, together with other sites, potential impact 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 SRN.	1264/18588	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Comment – not strongly opposed to this development providing it is used for the purpose of housing more students on campus. I have for a long time called on the University and the Council to make better provision for student accommodation on	1355/18643	Julian Sturdy MP

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	campus, in order to restrict the rising number of Houses of Multiple Occupancy.		
794 University Expansion (continued)	Support – York Civic Trust supports safeguarding of additional land for long-term future development at the University. Request that a policy is included in the Local Plan to ensure expectations of development are made clear, especially in relation to integration of the site into its wider environment, including landscape, creation of jobs and the movement of people (i.e. accessibility, pedestrian and cycle routes, and public transport links).	1592/18819	Directions Planning Consultancy on behalf of the York Civic Trust
	Comment - whilst no amendments are proposed to the proposed allocation, the University are seeking land for future expansion, in the form of the safeguarding of 20 hectares to the south of proposed allocation to ensure that there is sufficient land outside the Green Belt to facilitate the future expansion of the University in the period up to 2040. It is also now proposed that a specific allocation for employment uses of 12 ha be included into the local plan using the University as a catalyst for the City's economic growth. Further evidence submitted includes an extended master plan, Visual Impact Assessment of Building Heights and high level viability/deliverability appraisal. A combined master plan has been developed that completes Heslington East and adds the proposed 28Ha campus extension. The increase in developable area proposed is from 65ha to 93ha – a growth of 43%. The built floorspace shown on the master plan has increased by 71%. There remains a high demand for student places and this is reflected in the growth of student numbers over the past 10 years which have increased by 5,300. It is currently projected that the University will grow by a further 5,500 students in the period up to 2030. Without the campus extension, the University will not be able to continue to grow beyond 2023 and meet its obligations to provide on campus student housing in line with the existing Section 106 agreement. Detailed comments provided, including economic case, see response.	1673/18510	O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York
	Objection – university halls expansion will just add to York's housing problem. The expansion will add to the problem with the sheer number of buy to let properties which pushes first time buyers out of the market. These rented properties are where the affordable housing is and should be homes that first time buyers are buying.	2005/22244	
	Objection - does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17949	
	Objection – impact on surrounding Greenfield land elsewhere.	2765/20616	
	Objection - more expansion of the University would only lead to the appalling structures on Campus 3. Cannot believe that sufficient student accommodation would be provided and HMOs have already ruined several residential areas locally.	2832/18256	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection – when the university was seeking planning consent for Heslington East it was suggested that the lake and the wild area had been deliberately planned to discourage access between campus and the village via Low Lane. That protection cannot be maintained if site749 is developed.	2923/20693	
	Objection – see survey 9.	2935/26724	
	Objection – there is little or no explanation that we could see of how the traffic generated by hundreds of houses and university buildings will be distributed. Heslington and Fulford, already very congested at peak hours, will be subject to constant high traffic volumes, with all the damage and pollution this will cause. We were surprised to learn that the developers plan buses into York through rural lanes and the village. The greenspaces, strategic or otherwise will not reduce this kind of impact. There is no mention of drains, sewerage or flooding risk. We fully endorse the strong and irrefutable criticisms of the Heslington Village Trust. Its conclusions that the Whinthorpe site should not be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan until the CYC, the Halifax Estates, The Highways Agency, Natural England , English Heritage etc have developed and resolved the issues of traffic, access to York, flooding, the SSSI etc to the satisfaction of those agencies and organisations, and the local communities affected are patently reasonable and should have been done already.	3480/21980	
	Comment – the expanding universities must build more student accommodation on site rather than go to the private sector. If the Universities encourage students to live on site in good accommodation a lot of the houses would revert to domestic housing helping alleviate any housing need shortfall. The university would get income from the accommodation on site.	3851/19493	
	Objection – note with interest the potential allocation of land for future expansion of the university south of low lane. The University is hugely important for York (and indeed the UK), and has managed its development in and around Heslington (with some exceptions) with great care. Concerned in this case that Low Lane could become a major thoroughfare into and then through Heslington Village Conservation Area. The only solution would appear to be an insistence that access to the new site can only be from the east, with direct access to the village made impossible. Also note that this site proposes to establish a buffer zone between it and the southern bypass. Heslington parish Council has been in recent discussions with the highways consultant acting for the Halifax Estate, who indicated that a road or roads may be constructed through most or all of this proposed green space to provide access to Whinthorpe.	4039/18538	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>What is this area to be; new roads into Whinthorpe or designated Green Space. More generally although the stated aim of CYC is to maintain York as a city set in a rural landscape, this whole development stretching from Heslington East, through University Expansion on site 794 to Whinthorpe looks to us like a major piece of urban sprawl running south and east of York that will look anything but like a rural setting. It risks fundamentally changing for the worst the setting of the city in the landscape.</p>		
<p>794 University Expansion (continued)</p>	<p>Objection - involves reserving a substantial chunk of Green Belt land which currently forms a valuable green wedge protecting the environment of York and Heslington inside the A64. This would radically change the rural character of this area. It is a disproportionately large-scale development in the wrong place. The proposal will conflict with the ethos of the University's master plan for Heslington East where the lake was deliberately sited with adjacent wetland as a barrier between the development and the open countryside to the south and a means of preventing access to Heslington village via Low Lane. If this development were to go ahead it would result in Heslington village and Low Lane being used as a thoroughfare for cyclists and pedestrians and motor traffic from this development to Heslington West.</p>	<p>4222/21723</p>	
	<p>Objection – enormous loss of prime, productive agricultural land and further erosion of the green belt. The omission of this substantial extension from the approved application can only be a result of either a deliberate withholding of information or of short sighted planning vision. The prospect of York from the section of the A64 to the south of Heslington East has already been compromised; this seems as good a location as any for the expansion providing a landscaped buffer zone is established. The university must make the case for any expansion. Wish to see proper controls in place and integrated into the Local Plan.</p>	<p>4327/22322</p>	<p>Badger hill Residents Community Group</p>
	<p>Objection – as huge land remains undeveloped on the east side, necessity cannot be seen for additional development. It will encroach onto the village. Will spoil the green fields. Amenity of old road to Dunnington will be lost.</p>	<p>5151/22379</p>	
	<p>Objection – increased development here will create an unsustainable area for traffic. This will create urban sprawl.</p>	<p>5436/24021</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 12. The University has already encroached too much and the infrastructure of the area is totally inadequate to sustain a development of this size. The village of Heslington is already suffering from the further development of the University. There is gridlock on the roads in and out of the village at peak times and further development will only compound this problem.</p>	<p>5462/21818</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection – Heslington Village is a conservation area. Siting a new development to the south of Low Lane will severely compromise the village integrity. It will mean that the village will be used as a main thoroughfare for pedestrians and cyclists and vehicles. The proposed development will compromise the setting of the village and views out of the village to the Yorkshire Dales. The significance of both setting and views is fully recognised in Heslington Conservation Area No.28. It will remove Green Belt from the valuable green wedge protecting the environment of York inside the A64, contrary to the purposes of Green Belt. The Inspector in his report from the Public Inquiry for the current University expansion particularly comments that the lake and wetland area will provide a positive limit to built development to the south of the site. The reserved area will be devastating for the feel of the village and contrary to the objectives of the development brief and landscape and master planning documents and particularly the Inspector’s report. If further land is required it should be prioritised to be taken to the East of Campus East and Low Lane, up to the Grimston Bar roundabout. It should prevent access to Low Lane from the University.	5602/21990	
	Objection – allowing this development will only add to extra traffic encroaching on the village. It is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. Will add to climate change.	5771/24048	
	Objection- the university took land to develop Heslington East saying the existing campus but they still continue to develop the existing campus. Many things proposed by the University are not related to education and are just industrial estates not suitable for Green Belt land. The site proposed is clearly visible from the A64 ring road. If allowed to develop the view across York would be ruined and will not give the right signals to visitors. Loss of productive land is a major issue. Taking more land for development will decrease the land available for food production.	5818/24052	
	Object – detrimental effect on Heslington village and the surrounding wildlife. Enormous strain would be put on infrastructure. Develop Brownfield land first. Expansion will destroy the quiet country lane. Development increases the universities footprint in the area. The area will become more urban than rural. Risk of further traffic through the village, increasing noise and pollution.	5838/20931	
	Support – see survey 12.	6033/26830	
	Objection –see survey 12. The University expansion is again up-proven, with student numbers falling in the UK and York University is heavily supported by thousands of Pacific Rim Students and this is changing the overall character of York.	6439/26832	
	Comment – York University should be made to provide their own accommodation for students so that houses currently occupied by them can be returned to the housing	6454/20141	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	stock.		
794 University Expansion (continued)	<p>Comment – existing controls on the environmental impact (for example, noise, traffic, visual impact) on the surrounding community need to be maintained. This is especially important given that the existing Heslington East lake was supposed to perform a buffering function between the campus and Heslington village, a role that would be lost should this proposal go ahead. How the development will be phased in relation to the existing (and incomplete) Heslington East site needs to be addressed. Given the confusion and disagreement regarding the interpretation of the S106 agreement for the existing site around student accommodation, the Local Plan should clearly set out how the University will cater for the additional demand generated by this new site and, if possible, the existing Heslington East site. This should cover both accommodation volumes as well as inclusion of appropriate facilities that have so far been slow in forthcoming (for example, spaces for retail, socialising, study, and extra-curricular activities), in order to make the site attractive and fit-for-purpose for students. Existing Rights of Way need to be retained, and how the setting of the City from the A64 is preserved needs to be specified in light of both the proposed Whinthorpe and University developments.</p>	6511/22413	
	Comment – need information on how the expansion will be managed	6516/20332	
	<p>Objection – it will obliterate an important rural amenity much used by walkers, bikers, bird watchers and horse riders. Home to much wildlife ,including in the hedgerows which are an increasingly rare feature of traditional landscape. Will further advance the encirclement of Heslington Village. Heslington will cease to be a village. It will feed more University traffic into the village. Any road widening and roundabout construction to relive congestion will eat into the very heart of the village itself.</p>	9748/20216	
	<p>Objection – farmland, bird and wildlife close to York will be destroyed. Given the way the university has already destroyed the environs of Heslington and given that this attractive lane and its well-used bridleway are part of the history of Heslington, this area should be preserved for York residents, visitors and students to enjoy in coming generations. Heslington is swamped with traffic and noise due to expanding university buildings and student accommodation nearby.</p>	9749/20217	
	<p>Objection – York University has grown substantially. Housing is occupied by students which could be used by families.</p>	9872/24279	
	<p>Comment – appreciation for the positive economic impact that a thriving University has on the city of York – in particular the positive impact on the economic growth agenda of the Council’s Labour administration. Also notes the huge and varied impact</p>	10055/18583	Cllr. Neil Barnes

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	that University expansion has had on immediate neighbouring properties who may not necessarily directly experience the aforementioned economic benefit. Vital to ensure that controls in place for the current development should be adequately maintained or strengthened before further development be undertaken. Any development plans must take into full consideration adequate provision for high quality, affordable on-campus accommodation, in conjunction with full academic and social facilities being available – hence ensuring the attractiveness of on-campus accommodation and reducing impact on the local housing market. The setting of any development in relation to views from the A64 and surrounding countryside must be a full planning consideration.		
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection – development of the university seems endless.	10329/26018	
	Support – see survey 9.	10557/26726	
	Objection – see survey 12. Heslington is under enough pressure from the endless expansion of the University. Unfortunately, the land owners see only more millions lining their pockets.	10558/26835	
	Objection – see survey 12. University Campus 3 – the students don't rate the development very highly.	10559/26837	
	Objection- agree with the views of Heslington Village Trust. Don't want to lose any more green belt land and have more traffic in the village.	10843/21407	
	Objection- York university plans to expand campus south and east of recent expansion. York University plans must focus on provision of student accommodation, expand residence block on current Heslington East development. By York City Council, York University and residents of York working together much more desirable accommodation could be provided to students on university campus, thereby releasing much needed existing family accommodation in Lawrence St and Tang Hall areas of York, thereby avoiding need for schemes such as Whinthorpe.	10887/21493	
	Object – development will have a significant impact on the local community and the local wildlife. Infrastructure cannot handle the increase. Develop Brownfield. Village will become more urban than rural. Increase in traffic through the village, increasing noise and pollution. Farmland will be lost.	10909/21551	
	Support – see survey 12.	10919/26839	
Objection – see survey 12. The Labour Council in York appear to ignore the fact that Heslington Village is designated as a conservation village and yet they have almost encircled it with an ever growing university and yet the Labour Council are considering even more extensions to the campus. We have suffered the consequences	10923/26841		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of the siting of four banks in the village Main Street, for the benefit of the University students and management. All this to the detriment of the residents of the village. These banks should be sited on the University Science Park, as we have to suffer the invasion of traders who travel here to the banks.		
794 University Expansion (continued)	Objection – see survey 9.	10925/26764	
	Support – see survey 9.	10927/26765	
	Objection – see survey 9.	10929/26766	
	Objection - moved to York 8 year ago knowing it was a small city. Building thousands of homes, especially on green belt land will completely spoil the image. A64 bypass was through a pleasant rural setting, sprawl of Heslington campus now taken away that effect – route taken by thousand of tourist.	10930/21574	
	Support – see survey 9.	10931/26768	
	Support – see survey 9.	10932/26771	