

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Consultation Process	Objection – the emerging local plan seeks to maximise the redevelopment of urban brownfield sites whilst acknowledging the technical and financial difficulties in bringing them forward and the resultant impact on delivery timescales. Nonetheless, it is agreed by the Council that there is a need to release significant areas of land on the periphery of the York urban area if the assessed development needs of the area are to be met. Failure to do this will result in pressure on the green belt and compromise its permanence. In this connection we take this opportunity to reiterate our previous submissions that the Preferred Options Local Plan assumes residential densities which are not achievable without adversely affecting the character of the areas/settlements concerned and/or do not meet the needs of the current housing market.	305/	
	Comment-question how the opposing views have been fed into the process.	1680/23798	
	Objection – inadequate consultation has been made prior to the preparation of the plan.	3108/23854	
	Comment – local people should shape their surrounding. Objections have been ignored to date. Unpublicised the necessity to repeat ones objections, many people unaware, undemocratic and cynical deceptive. To date objections have been made very difficult with inappropriate deadlines being provided.	3117/	
	Objection – inadequate consultation.	3135/23858	
	Objection – local people should shape their surrounding. Objections have been ignored to date. Unpublicised the necessity to repeat ones objections, many people unaware, undemocratic and cynical deceptive.	3139/	
	Comment – weary about a two stage process. Unhelpful comment form, as deny the opportunity to comment on the general impact of proposals when considered in combination.	3209/	
	Comment- the landowners, developers and authorities have had 10 years to prepare this proposal but residents have only had 12 months to investigate it and put together a response. That is not fair.	3214/23871	
	Comment - bit tight in terms of time available to respond to the consultation.	3221/	Ward Associates Planning Consultants
	Comment – misled people by terminology. Not all household are aware of proposals. Not aware of where land had been acquired. Not been advised of alternative available sites. Not enough information about improvements to village’s infrastructures.	3257/	
	Objection – the Council received an unprecedented number of overwhelmingly negative responses to the proposed ST14 housing development in the preferred options local plan. To push ahead in these circumstances is undemocratic and contrary to the	3428/	Skelton Village Action Group

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	National Planning Policy Framework which calls for Local Plans to be drawn up in consultation with the community and empowering local people to shape their surroundings		
Consultation Process (continued)	Comment - the way documents are presented online is not helpful. Main documents do not have links to the relevant appendices.	5431/	
	Comment- lack of transparency. Believe that the process is flawed.	5444/	
	Comment – The consultation process was not publicised – did not hear about the consultation until receiving a mailing from Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.	5541/	
	Comment – there has not been sufficient local consultation between the Council and residents.	5673/	
	Objection – inadequate consultation process. It has taken Parish Councils, Ward Councillors, Public meetings by Julian Sturdy M.P. and The Press to draw attention to these proposals. Otherwise have largely passed unnoticed by CYC’s minimum attempt to consult with communities could be so affected. Rarely have received letter from the council.	6217/	
	Comment – rushed consultation process. Not awareness of other sites that had been considered and had not been shown on the main map, just on the appendices.	7151/	
	Objection – there has been no proper consultation before the preparation of your proposals – apparently even with Members (according to our Ward Councillor and his colleagues). Your recent meetings and events should be more properly regarded as ‘justification discussions’ – for they have certainly not been for the purpose of consultation	9441/	
	Comment – poor consultation process and designed to try and get the development through by stealth.	10205/	
	Objection - information from Council difficult to obtain and access. Access to printing documents only during working hours. Unfair consultation and additional sites added at the last minute without apparent reason.	10206/	
	Comment – poor consultation. Much more information about what it is going to be done, rather than proper consultation.	10222/	
	Comment – too short timeframe to respond to consultation.	10223/	
	Comment - secretive and rather quick consultation. Difficulty to find out how to object.	10224/	
Objection - attempted to manage the public response by not providing the general public with the necessary information to adequately make an informed decision. Not sufficient time, delays in making the information widely available. Level of growth information hidden from the general public.	10855/		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Non FSC -Consultation Process**

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Consultation Process (continued)	Objection – houses were missed when sending out the promotional leaflets. No details of the plans were listed on the internet. The conservation area is not marked on the maps. This is misleading.	10881/25885	