

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 3: Employment/Retail Site Assessment Proformas

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
87 Wills and Ellis Garage, Boroughbridge Road	Support – agree with technical officer comments. Ingress and egress from this property on the A1237 major road and the A59 is at best problematic and at worst congestion producing in the extreme with no provision for passing or joining the oncoming traffic.	71/18994	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officer comments. Ingress and egress from this property on the A1237 major road and the A59 is at best problematic and at worst congestion producing in the extreme with no provision for passing or joining the oncoming traffic.	78/19032	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officer comments. Ingress and egress from this property on the A1237 major road and the A59 is at best problematic and at worst congestion producing in the extreme with no provision for passing or joining the oncoming traffic.	10734/19921	
246 Whitehall Grange	Objection – the site at Whitehall Grange has particular advantages for Authorn. Its main advantage is its proximity to the company’s clients in the city and on the Clifton Moor industrial estate. This means that journeys to deliver cars to clients and customers are short. If the company was forced to move its car storage further out of the city, delivery journeys would be longer and therefore less sustainable. The inner boundaries of the York Green Belt have never been determined in a statutory Local Plan. The Council is therefore in the position of deciding whether land should be included in the Green Belt and not whether land should be taken out of the Green Belt. Paragraph 84 and 85 of the NPPF are therefore particularly relevant. In this context paragraph 7 of the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. Authorn is an important local employer with a specific development requirement. Meeting the needs of that employer can therefore be considered to be contributing to sustainable development. Assessment of criteria in technical officer assessment undertaken, detailed comments provided, see response. Plan provided to show how the land at Whitehall Grange can be allocated to facilities the car storage facility and protect the existing leisure facility and the extent of land considered shouldn’t be included in the green belt.	6326/19234	Keogh Planning
742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane	Support – agree that this site should not be considered for extensive retail use.	71/18995	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree that this site should not be considered for extensive retail use.	78/19033	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree that this site should not be considered for extensive retail use.	10734/26475	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 3: Employment/Retail Site Assessment Proformas

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Site 798 Land to the East of Designer Outlet	Support - support the rejection of this site for the reason set out in the officer conclusions.	62/19152	
	Support – support the retention of this land in its current state and that it should not come forward for development.	244/18809	NTR Planning
	Support – support assessment that this would be detrimental to the setting of the city and retail expansion is contrary to the retail strategy to retain the pre-eminence of the city centre	386/18907	York Green Party
	Objection - object to rejection of site. Believe site is deliverable and developable for leisure and employment opportunities. There are inconsistencies between technical officer comments on this site and land to south of designer outlet (site 800). Both sites are in the extension to green wedge designation in the historic character and setting 2011 update but only site 800 is proposed to be removed. Don't consider that development of this site would have an adverse impact on landscape character or habitat. Have submitted further Ecology and Landscape evidence.	1736/18956	MM Planning