

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

**November 2015**

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Land at Simbalk Lane, York (Near Bishopthorpe)</b>	Support – suggested that restriction of the use of this land by Green Belt designation will have adverse economic effects in the York area and restrict the potential for logical further development. The Site is 10 hectares and there are considered to be no showstoppers in respect of the Site delivery. The A64 and cycle path form logical boundaries to the site and also to the Green Belt. The amount of development would depend on specialist demand. The existing playing fields to the east of the College could be developed with the playing fields being relocated to some of the land to provide a logical campus type arrangement.	6327/	Stephenson and Son
<b>Land to the west of A19 and east of Naburn Lane</b>	Support - this greenfield site is located to the south of the York Designer Outlet and comprises almost entirely of agricultural land. The availability of the site has not been previously brought to the local authority's attention, however a recent change in circumstances indicates that the site could be released and offers the potential to form a key strategic housing allocation that is deliverable and developable. The site is primarily located within flood zone 1 and is well connected to the surrounding highway network to the north, south, east and west. Detailed technical investigations of the site have not yet been undertaken but it is our client's intention to do these as they advance their proposals. Given the greenfield nature of the site incidences of contamination are not anticipated. We would be keen to discuss the opportunities offered by the site with the local authority in further detail prior to the Local Plan progressing.	19643/	
<b>Land adjacent to Haxby Cemetery</b>	Support – additional land should be set aside for extension to the cemetery. Opposed to the positioning of the area allocated for business use directly north of the cemetery. This positioning is inappropriate and would be better placed to the north of any development area. Haxby Town Council wishes to earmark the field to the north and field to the east of the cemetery for future expansion as well as protecting the current environment of the cemetery. If there is to be future development the increased need for extension to the cemetery must be taken into account.	63/	Haxby Town Council
<b>Land at Poppleton</b>	Support – proposed new strategic site at Poppleton for residential development. Supporting evidence submitted including transport, drainage, archaeology and ecology reports, access to services evidence, landscape assessment, masterplan and viability proforma. Site presented in phases to allow Council to allocate as much or little as required.	866/	Directions Planning Consultancy

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

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Land at Oaktree Nursery, Boroughbridge Lane, Upper Poppleton</b>	Support – do not consider that the Council have identified enough land within allocated strategic sites to meet the housing needs of York, therefore submitted a promotional brochure and high level masterplan for this site. It is requested that the land is allocated as a residential site in the York Local Plan. The Council’s reliance on delivery mainly from larger strategic sites needs to be supported by a number of smaller site allocations, as there is growing doubt that the strategic sites, which carry a number of constraints, can meet their anticipated capacity. This proposed site for allocation already contains a significant number of surface buildings and structures which currently impact on the openness of the Green Belt. These structures extend across the entire site. The village of Poppleton has excellent sustainability credentials given its accessibility to rail and bus travel. Further good sustainability credentials include good access to schools and shops/services. The completion of the Phase 1 of the Park and Ride at Poppleton Bar adds to this highly sustainable settlement. The development will result in no significant urban sprawl or threat of coalescence with another settlement. The development does not constitute a large encroachment into the countryside.	6351/	Johnson Brook on behalf of Gladedale Estates Limited
<b>Land to East of Strensall Road, Earswick (adjoining Site 810)</b>	Support –the proposal represents an exciting opportunity for Earswick to grow into a community with facilities being provided which one would expect to find in a village environment. In support of the proposal to safeguard said land as outlined in Site Ref. 810. Happy to allow land of approximately 4 acres to be included. The land referred to had been removed as requested but now wish to rescind that objection and request that this parcel of land be reinstated into the proposed safeguarded land.	9619/	
<b>Land off Northfield Lane adjacent to Northminster Business Park (Site 585)</b>	Support – opposed to the Council not taking this site forward as an allocation within the Preferred Options. The site should not be included within the proposed green belt as it does not fulfil any of the defined green belt purposes set out in the NPPF and because the range of land allocations proposed in the further sites fundamentally change the planning context and potential of land around the Park and Ride. This site has become a land-locked relict area of open land with no direct connection to the remainder of the proposed green belt. The ring road is a more effective and permanent boundary for the proposed green belt and so the representation land should be excluded. Given the proposed allocation of land clustered around the Park and Ride site for business uses plus the existing commercial uses around the site, it is proposed that the land should be allocated for development. Its exclusion from the green belt and its allocation for development will help to maximise the return on the public	9883/	Richard Baxter (Planning Consultant)

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

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	investment in the Park and Ride. Landowner's preferred development is for the site to be developed as a site for touring caravans and motorhomes, of which there is a shortage in the city, with development for Class B1 business use being the second preferred option. The preferred land use is not readily accommodated in the urban area and its development would make best use of opportunities for sustainable travel generated by the Park and Ride and assist in decongestion of the city centre.		
<b>Skelton Garden Centre, Skelton</b>	Support – site not previously promoted within the SHLAA and is submitted now as new site for consideration. Promote site for consideration as a housing, retail or mixed use allocation whilst removing the site from the Green Belt and including it within the settlement boundary of Skelton. 2.7ha site with existing vehicular access onto Shipton Road (A19). In addition to four existing dwellings on the site, the site's garden centre use means that approximately 60% of the land constitutes previously developed land for the purposes of the NPPF. This was confirmed through the approved Certificate of Lawful Use (LPA Ref: 05/01755/CLD) which established an A1 retail use.	9888/	Savills
<b>Stockhill, opposite the Water Tower, Church Balk, Dunnington</b>	Support - this would save the views and heritage of the village and a green buffer could be created around.	3132/	
	Support – housing in Stockhill, opposite the Water Tower, dunnington is supported.	3131/	
	Support - Stockhill is the perfect location for new housing and small industrial units.	3133/	

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

**November 2015**

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<p><b>Land adjacent to Buttacre Lane, Askham Richard, York</b></p>	<p>Comment - The proposed scheme is for a total of 26 dwellings (1 conversion and 25 new build dwellings). The proposed site layout retains a large proportion of the site as open space. In addition it is proposed to gift an area of land surrounding the primary school to the school/village. This will provide opportunities for the school not currently available to upgrade its facilities/amenities and provide additional recreation space. The site is currently in agricultural use and occupies an area of approximately 1.3 hectares (3.2) acres on the south-eastern edge of the village. Whilst outside of the village boundary and within the Green Belt, the site is within the village conservation area boundary. There are already numerous structures on the site which are currently in agricultural use. The site is in two ownerships, Bartram Farm, with the exception of the strip of land associated with Village Farm that currently splits the site into two. The site is currently of low ecological value and is considered somewhat of an eyesore by local residents and is clearly visible by anyone approaching the village from the south. In preparing the outline proposals the following design principles have been used: retention of a significant part of the site for public open space; green 'landscaped buffer' to the existing adjacent properties to the west and south; retention/strengthening of the eastern hedgerow boundary; definition of the southern boundary with smaller scale terraced housing/cottages; conversion of existing brick built structure to residential use; demolition of modern agricultural buildings; resurfacing/upgrade of Buttacre Lane; access to field to East; provision of high quality affordable housing; high quality landscaped spaces and homes to achieve high environmental standards.</p> <p>It is considered that any impact on the Green Belt will be largely positive due to the removal of the existing incongruous structures and replacement with well-designed, high quality dwellings.</p> <p>The local residents that have been consulted during the proposal have been generally supportive.</p>	<p>10098/</p>	<p>Niche Design Architects on behalf of Bartram Farm</p>
<p><b>Harwood Whin Waste Disposal Site, Rufforth</b></p>	<p>Support - Property Services wish to submit the site at Harwood Whin as detailed on the attached plan, as a future site for renewable energy generation. City of York is the freehold owner of the site, however it is on a long lease to Yorwaste Ltd.</p>	<p>6507/</p>	<p>City of York Council Asset and Property Management</p>

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

**November 2015**

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<p><b>Land at Elvington House, Main Street, Elvington</b></p>	<p>Comment – Representations raise concerns that the green belt / conservation area boundaries have been moved to include land which forms part of the garden of Elvington House which was not previously included within this boundary – seek clarification on this.</p> <p>Also area of land to east of Elvington House (0.1ha) proposed for allocation – proposed for accommodating 1no. detached dwelling as infill development, accessed off Main Street for development within 3-15 years.</p>	<p>3063/</p>	
<p><b>Site H37: Land at Graystone Court, Haxby</b></p>	<p>Objection – the water company cannot cope. The drainage system has not coped in the past. These are not affordable houses for people who work in shops/offices. New shops cause traffic jams. More housing will add to this.</p>	<p>5561/</p>	
	<p>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 we just don't have the schools to cope. The old people's home on Station Rd now has a plan for 15 houses. Wasn't this land gifted by the Ward family to Haxby? Maybe you should concentrate on providing good quality services for the existing residents rather than trying to sell the land around us.</p>	<p>5607/</p>	
	<p>Objection - The only exit/entry point is on Eastfield Av with a perilous bend in the road. There is a snicket next to it, used by hundreds of children to get to and from school. There have been numerous near misses. Increasing traffic will increase the likelihood of a fatality. The land proposed for development in H37 is contaminated by asbestos. It is currently a green field site. The council need to exhaust all brown field sites before destroying green belt. H37 development will lead to a cohesion with New Earswick. The wildlife will be gone forever. The wildlife study carried out in February is not representative. The proposed cycle path to the rear of Hilbra Av will lie next to the beck. Access is required for routine dredging. This is a private road and not fit for purpose. Who would be liable if a cyclist had an accident caused by poor maintenance of the road?</p>	<p>5680/</p>	

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

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>More housing would lead to increase in surface water, increasing the risk of flooding. The character when entering Haxby from the outer ring road will be lost.</p> <p>Objection - Haxby cannot sustain the amount of development you are proposing – we do not have the infrastructure available to support the huge numbers of increased cars, children (i.e. school places are already at bursting point), shoppers etc. The drainage in Haxby is already fit to burst. We are seeing more flooded gardens, taking several weeks to drain...adding the number of houses on our green belt is only going to make it worse.</p> <p>The amount of houses you are proposing are almost a village in itself...build it somewhere away from current villages (after all, Haxby is a village isn't it...and not a 'town'?) Or fill up the current brownfield sites around York before destroying our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Who would want to buy a house with pylons running through their back gardens. It serves no purpose to the people of Haxby and indeed York; all that happens is that you will get an influx of people moving into York from Leeds and surrounding areas and our village cannot cope with the additional volumes. You talked about Haxby station re-opening if this Plan develops. Haxby station will only re-open if the rail network want to invest in the station.</p> <p>Build the extra schools and the station before you build the houses. Because of the volumes of families moving into this area I fear for my daughter's chances of getting into Joseph Rowntree Secondary School.</p>	9596/	
	<p>Objection – the infrastructure already struggles to deal with high volumes of traffic, schools are over subscribed and parts of the town are prone to flooding. Health care provision is a concern. Building further homes will swamp this already overstretched infrastructure, including increasing flood risk.</p>	9770	
<p><b>Land South of A64, West of A19</b></p>	<p>Support - 550 acres of land south of the A64, and to the west of the A19. There is a significant opportunity to allocate the site for future housing-led development. Site represents a potential alternative to the Clifton moor and Whinthorpe development. The presence of the designer outlet and small business units on the periphery of the site, it supports the opportunity to develop a sustainable settlement. There is a strong public transport link with the park and ride.</p>	1525/	