

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12248 | H1 | Comment | Millennium Way - now operational traffic lights already causing traffic to back up to MonkGate Roundabout. Needs left turn only to town and use roundabout to go out of town (Malton Road direction). | |
| 13012 | H1 | Comment | CYC need to ensure any houses built should be affordable and should introduce controls to avoid properties being snapped up by landlords to let out. We need housing stock for working people young residents do not have a hope of buying a place of their own or even rent. We need people living in the city to work in the city. | |
| 238 | H1 | Comment | No objection to principle of this allocation, but given its proximity to conservation area and listed building, proposals would need to ensure that those important historic elements are not harmed. | Historic England |
| 2412 | H1 | Objection | Objecting to use of the site for housing. How can this site be classified as Flood Zone 1 and part 2 - this site was devastated and should be light industry not housing. Original plan was for 283 homes, now 336(20% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 2994 | H1 | Objection | This allocation causes concerns for, loss of Green Space, congestion and inadequate access. | |
| 13043 | H1 | Support | Suitable for housing development but think the density is too high for this site. Even if flats people still want nice decent sized properties. With an ageing population York currently offers very little options for owners of family homes to move to. This site would be a great candidate for solving these needs by freeing up large family homes for new families to move to. The site would be a great candidate for self build plots as many people would like to do. but there is nowhere for this opportunity. A good housing mix should be encouraged. | |
| 1343 | H1 | Support | Support proposed site but it will need to be delivered on a phased basis | National Grid Property |
| 2765 | H1 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. Agree with Objection Comment that the full site (including the north west corner) should be included. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|---|
| 12221 | H2A | Support | Pleased the sites near the Racecourse have been deleted. These sites would have ruined one of the City's prime attractions for both residents and visitors approaching the City along Tadcaster Road. | |
| 12695 | H2a | Support | Support the removal of a proposed development at this site | Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Parish Councillors |
| 12111 | H2a | Support | There's already too much traffic along Tadcaster road. Yorks Green Belt and Character are being destroyed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 431 | H2b | Objection | Object to the deletion of this site for development as considered to be a deliverable and sustainable small site able to feed into the short-term housing supply. A range of sites should be provided to meet housing need such as this site. Decrease in number of smaller housing sites a weakness in the plan. Submission of evidence/commentary that access to the site is feasible, ecology survey concluded that site is not ecologically sensitive and that the low density scheme proposed will be in character with the area. Loss of open aspect to racecourse considered to be minimal. No technical constraints preventing development. | Shepherd Homes |
| 12221 | H2B | Support | Pleased the sites near the Racecourse have been deleted. These sites would have ruined one of the City's prime attractions for both residents and visitors approaching the City along Tadcaster Road. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12425 | H3 | Comment | This development will have a significant impact on local roads. Concerned about issues with access, lack of bus services, increase demand for local shops and demand for local schools. | |
| 12300 | H3 | Objection | Do not build - need a school | |
| 349 | H3 | Objection | The allocation contains playing field - note that approval under the SoS for Education should not be interpreted as being a justification for disposal under the Planning process. The allocation of the site should be based on a robust evidence base that shows the site is genuinely surplus for all sports, including non-educational sporting use of the site; otherwise, the Council will need to identify potential replacement provision. Simply inserting text to the effect that, unless it can be evidenced that sport facility is surplus then it should be replaced, could lead to an allocation being found undeliverable if such an appropriate replacement facility could not be found. | Sport England |
| 12149 | H3 | Support | Supporting site H3, due to concerns that land will be wasted, more housing is needed and people need to live in the area. | |
| 2765 | H3 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12250 | H5 | Comment | The local councillors via a newsletter indicated a 'mixed' use for the site. The Local Plan directly indicates housing development circa 137 houses. What is the true position? | |
| 12371 | H5 | Comment | Proposal for housing is fine but there must be consideration for services, doctors, dentists etc. Happy to support a mental hospital also. Please include a 10m border for wildlife as it would be criminal to ruin this natural habitat for birds etc. | |
| 12778 | H5 | Comment | Concerned about a number of issues with this site including: drainage, sewerage, roads and public transport, traffic and congestion, lack of infrastructure, full schools, loss of open space, increased density and decrease in quality of life. | |
| 2412 | H5 | Comment | Original plan was for 72 homes, now 137(90% increase) whereas, site size has been increased from 2.24 ha to 3.64 ha (62% increase) | |
| 6288 | H5 | Comment | Loss of public open space on the site will be significant for Westfield Ward, which has very limited open space and a deficiency in sports pitches. | Cllr Andrew Waller |
| 10729 | H5 | Comment | Concerned about inadequate highway infrastructure and access. | |
| 12127 | H5 | Objection | Objects to development on grounds of potential flooding impact on adjacent residential area. Extra surface water & flooding due to increased housing growth - include provision for sewer! | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5759 | H5 | Objection | <p>The proposal for the site represents a gross overdevelopment resulting in the loss of valuable sports pitches and recreational land. CYC had previously promised that development would be restricted to the built footprint amounting to 6.5 acres of a 13 acre site. A local survey of residents (450 homes) brought about a report being written up. The proposed use had always centred on accommodation for older persons. Delays in the programme have resulted in informal recreational use being restricted and maintenance being minimal. Responses analysed so far can be summarised thus; many people pointed out older persons accommodation would offer across the board benefits to all age groups. Downsizees would free up currently under-occupied houses for families. There was a strong wish for a larger open space and support for a sports pitch. provision of a nature reserve was also a popular choice. Opposition was shown for Hospital use or other traffic generator. Consistently we have supported an older person village on the site. and were dismayed that a similar scheme has been authorised at Burnholme at the other side of the city. There is a lot of opposition to CYC proposals for the site and overwhelming opposition to piecemeal development. Residents would welcome additional facilities but believe a police desk would be better located at nearby library on Front Street. A holistic approach was preferred. Little support for health services. We suggest putting whole of Lowfields site on open market but with limits to developable area.</p> | |
| 12300 | H5 | Objection | Do not build - need a school | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12504 | H5 | Objection | Objecting to H5 Lowfield School as was happier if the foot print of the old school was built on, old peoples accommodation would be better built here and the sports field should remain green space the football pitch should remain and the rest for a nature reserve for wildlife, urban foxes and hedgehogs, flora and fauna. | |
| 12666 | H5 | Objection | This site is totally unsuitable for the development outlined in CYC Local Plan. Page 158 states 'Westfield Ward is deficient in almost all open space typologies' and protecting existing open space is claimed to be part of the assessment methodology used to assess sites and seems to have been ignored in this case. Page 159 states ' the site is predominantly Brownfield' it is not - the site is clearly Greenfield and the document is misleading. Most of the site is covered by sports pitches. Building on sports pitches is completely contradictory to the ethos of the 2012 Olympics legacy. The site is a local green corridor acknowledged on page 158 and site has become a home to a range of wildlife including foxes, hedgehogs, and owls. Page 159 claims 'neutral impacts are identified on biodiversity' resulting from development of the site, I would like an explanation as to how this can be the case if building on the whole site takes place. Development would also result in a massive increase in vehicular traffic on a quiet residential street. Development should be restricted to the footprint of the old school resulting in minimal impact on local traffic. Sports pitches should be retained for benefit of local community and protection of wildlife. | |
| 12814 | H5 | Objection | I strongly oppose to H5 for the following reasons: habitats will be destroyed and nature is struggling in York, the high density of development, loss of a natural meeting place and the football pitch, we should be protecting green spaces and the huge increase in traffic. I don't believe that a football pitch is regarded as brownfield. I propose that the development be maintained within the original footprint of the former school. I don't believe that a football pitch is regarded as brownfield. The development should be maintained within the original footprint of the former school. Concerned about the development of this site for a number of reasons. The site is a haven for wildlife, destroying and established local ecosystem will have a significant impact. Doubling the housing density on site is not acceptable. The site is the local green corridor. The site expands further than the brownfield land that is the imprint of the original school. The site should be maintained within the original foot print of the school. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13025 | H5 | Objection | Objects to proposed use of the site for market housing/care home | |
| 349 | H5 | Objection | The loss of the existing MUGA should be assessed in accordance with NPPF para 74 - if it cannot be evidenced that the sports facility is surplus needs, then it should be replaced. Note that any proposed relocation has to be on land that is not existing playing field. | Sport England |
| 756 | H5 | Objection | Objecting to H5 Lowfield School, due to issues with: over development, development beyond Brownfield land, impact on traffic, development of an elderly persons complex on this plot and issues with only affordable housing ("cheap"). | |
| 13025 | H5 | support | Supports the principle of housing development on site but requests that site is instead used to run a pilot project to support the self and custom building housing policy with immediate effect. The findings can then be used to form the basis of the self build and custom build housing policy in the Plan. | |
| 2765 | H5 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. Agree with suggestion for retirement village. | |
| 12123 | H5 | Support | Supporting H5 as more houses are developed locally. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|---|
| 12235 | H6 | Comment | The grass verges shown on the submitted plan highlighted in pink, off The Grove, is owned by Chessingham Grove Management Company, and co-owned by the residents of The Grove. | Chessingham Grove Management Company |
| 12643 | H6 | Comment | Concerned about access to the site as the access from the main road is too narrow and not designed for increased traffic levels. Whereas the access from St Leonards Hospice is too tight. An alternative route is needed. | |
| 12695 | H6 | Comment | Look forward to hearing the views of residents and the local community on this proposal and seek clarity, in due course, on the access arrangement(s) for the site | Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Parish Councillors |
| 12786 | H6 | Comment | Concerned about a number of issues that should be considered, loss of green belt, appropriate boarder to the hospice, loss of green landscaping, increase in air pollution, loss of wildlife, access to the site, increased traffic and speeding and concerned about the loss to Chessingham Grove Management Company Ltd. | |
| 12841 | H6 | Comment | Traffic is already and issue in the area, if further houses are built new roads should be built too such as lip road to the ring road. Askham Bog Nature Reserve is also of major concern, there are issues with: loss of wildlife, loss of green belt, and local schools are full. | |
| 12921 | H6 | Comment | As a resident of the square I would like to make the following comments and concerns: poor access, increased traffic, concerned about the loss of current views from the hospice which may improve there quality of life for a short time, access through Grove Road may be more appropriate, the land should be used by the Hospice and the Tadcaster Road has already reached capacity. | |
| 4289 | H6 | Comment | Commenting on H6 Land Rear of the Grove/Square, expresses concerns over; development on the green belt, increased traffic and therefore congestion, access at Tadcaster Road, ecology relating to animals and mature trees on site. Also states Chessingham Grove Management own the land shown were access to the site maybe to the grove. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5193 | H6 | Comment | Not opposed in principle to use of the land for specialist housing, but concerned with regard to access as the road into the square is narrow and drivers of large vehicles, like those collecting refuse, can be frustrated by parked cars or other lorries. Increased traffic can only make things worse for residents and children who play in relative safety at present. | |
| 6216 | H6 | Comment | Support the change from 'housing' to 'residential special care' - need to ensure that 'special care' residence is longstanding to prevent any subsequent change to normal residential. Needs to be careful consideration regarding road and pedestrian access to the site. The design and road-widths of The Square make it unsuited for access. An entrance via The Grove or via a short extension to the road at the rear of the college would be more suitable. Pedestrian/cycle access via The Square would seem reasonable but need to prevent any car parking in The Square for occupants/workers/visitors to the special care residence. | |
| 10350 | H6 | Comment | Commenting on H6 Land Rear of The Square, Tadcaster Road, that the site has one of the very few remains of medieval ridge and furrow left in Dringhouses and shouldn't be destroyed, the mature trees were probably planted in the grounds of Dringthorpe built in the 1870's, and demolished after 1965 and should not be harmed. | Dringhouses Local History Group |
| 6121 | H6 | Objection | No development should take place here due to; Air pollution - congested road adjacent site cause air pollution this will be exacerbated with this new development and nearby proposed sites Access - will be difficult and dangerous Site is a home for a healthy wildlife population Previous commitments by CYC stated there would never be development of this land. and it would always be green belt. | |
| 12210 | H6 | Objection | Access to Tadcaster Rd is key. The Grove and The Square are not suitable thoroughfares for any new development as they were not designed for such traffic levels. Tadcaster Rd is already dangerous as cars speed from the roundabout. Further traffic lighting would only promote more queuing traffic and increase pollution levels. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1400 | H6 | Objection | At present 1.53 hectares of the land within the Trust's ownership is allocated for residential extra care (C3b) facilities in the PSC. The purpose of the representation is to set out a series of amendments to housing allocation H6 to make it consistent with the Wilberforce Trust's proposals for the site. The changes include extending the allocation to include a further 0.5 hectares of land to the north (which lies to the east of St Leonards H, with subsequent revisions to the Green Belt in order that it is more clearly defined) and removing the reference C3(b) as the use class for the development and redesignating it as use class C3(a). | The Wilberforce Trust |
| 2412 | H6 | Objection | Very sensitive site close to St Leonards Hospice. Object to any road construction allowing additional vehicular flow in to this area and obvious increase in noise resulting from construction of dwellings. Wildlife impacts are a concern particularly bats and great crested newts. Great care needed to protect mature tree boundary. | |
| 2765 | H6 | Objection | I agree with the Neighbour Objections relating to this Greenfield site and access through The Square. | |
| 9338 | H6 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: cumulative impact of traffic on already congested Tadcaster Road; loss of tranquillity and respect for St Leonard's Hospice patients - construction and occupancy noise; loss of local green space/habitat; access via The Grove unsuitable - note strip of land accessing the field is owned by Chessingham Grove Management Company. | |
| 9398 | H6 | Objection | Concerned about the loss of the historic ridge and furrow area, one of the few remaining in this area | |
| 12111 | H6 | objection | There's already too much traffic along Tadcaster road. Yorks Green Belt and Character are being destroyed. | |
| 12328 | H6 | Support | Pleased that H6 was removed from general housing sites and specialised housing for the Wilberforce Trust has emerged. This is more compatible with its location on urban fringe and adjacent housing including the Square.. Still concerned about access to site with local congestion. Subject to practicable access being identified - support current proposal. | |
| 12349 | H6 | Support | Provided approved by the Hospice and transport infrastructure can cope this appears a good location for development. The Wilberforce Trust would be a compatible neighbour to the Hospice. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1400 | H6 | support | Support for the principle of housing allocation on this site. | The Wilberforce Trust |
| 4417 | H6 | Support | Support the principle of development on this site for residential care facilities. However, the access for both emergency and normal traffic needs addressing. Suggest using the access route via the Grove to access the site, rather than the existing access to The Square. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12146 | H7 | Comment | Commenting on H7, that car parking is an issue. | |
| 2412 | H7 | Comment | Original plan was for 73 homes, now 86 indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 349 | H7 | Objection | The allocation contains playing field - while relocation is taking place, the redevelopment of the community stadium included and existing playing pitch, therefore there will be a net loss of one pitch. The allocation of the site should be based on a robust evidence base that shows the site is genuinely surplus for all sports, including ancillary facilities such as changing rooms, grandstands etc; otherwise, the Council will need to identify potential replacement provision. Simply inserting text to the effect that, unless it can be evidenced that sport facility is surplus then it should be replaced, could lead to an allocation being found undeliverable if such an appropriate replacement facility could not be found. | Sport England |
| 2765 | H7 | Support | Support redevelopment of football stadium. A similar redevelopment in my home town of Chesterfield has greatly enhanced the area's character. | |
| 12216 | H8 | Comment | Whatever is built on the site (housing or school) it need to be done soon and the area enclosed as it is currently being used by local yobbos as a racetrack at night time. When the site is developed, it should retain the many mature trees. | |
| 13017 | H8 | Comment | In principle a good idea to do something constructive with the old P&R site. Positives include good bus links, Tesco nearby, and site has very little aesthetic or environmental values as it stands. However, the roundabout is already congested at busy times as are its feeder roads. The adverse impact for cyclists should also be considered. Apart from Tesco there is no choice of accessible shopping without taking a bus or using a car. Local facilities, other than Tesco, amounts to two pubs and a fish and chip shop. The site could be unattractive to residents with restrictions imposed by the railway line and amount of traffic around it. There would be serious safety issues for pedestrians, children and anyone with mobility issues. Noise and pollution would be significant and it is difficult to see how planning and design could mitigate the effect of these factors. We favour development of the site but question whether it could feasibly support 50 homes. Favour a mixed use site with local amenities as well as housing. | |
| 8353 | H8 | Comment | Concerned about the population increased and the lack of amenities. | |
| 12111 | H8 | Comment | There's already too much traffic along Tadcaster road. Yorks Green Belt and Character are being destroyed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 2412 | H8 | Objection | Drains are often blocked in this area - improvements would be required. Ebor Academy Trust interested in site for new school - both cannot be carried out. Originally 50 homes proposed, now 60, an increase of 20% indicating a cramming of dwellings on same site. | |
| 5486 | H8 | Objection | Building any form of traffic generating scheme (housing/school) will bring local roads to a standstill. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more pressure. Housing of buy to let on the site will bring the area down. Given the lack of facilities nearby will result in additional traffic | |
| 5826 | H8 | Objection | Site should be used for employment purposes. Sandwiched between a major railway line, a major road and a large supermarket the amenity value for residents must be questioned. | |
| 9398 | H8 | Objection | Traffic to and from this site is a major concern along with greater air pollution which is excessive already at peak times | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 11708 | H8 | Objection | I would like to strongly object to any further building. This allocation would cause issues with increased, traffic, gridlock, negative impacts on askham bogg and loss of Green Belt. | |
| 12142 | H8 | Objection | Objecting to H8 as wants the site for a new school not housing. | |
| 12177 | H8 | Objection | When the old college site was developed, there was very little infrastructure provided. H8 should be better in that respect as much of the infrastructure is available at Tescos, and local buses are available. School spaces are a problem and Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Junior School are both full - so children will need to travel to other schools. York cannot continue to build isolated sites which do not have the necessary infrastructure. | |
| 12210 | H8 | Objection | Outrageous that this has increased from 50 to 60 dwellings. Site isn't suitable - next to a noisy railway line, roads and a supermarket. No local amenities. Traffic is fast at the roundabout. Height of buildings needs to be considered. Pollution is a major concern. Consideration should be given to redirecting supermarket traffic from the A64 through the new P&R rather than Tadcaster Road to ease congestion at the roundabout. | |
| 12212 | H8 | Objection | In light of the government approving the Creative Arts Academy, the siting of the school would be more beneficial than housing at the old P&R site. There is a distinct lack of school provision in the area and the school would greatly improve amenities in the area. | |
| 12346 | H8 | Objection | Object to this site - road network already congested therefore would be severely impacted by additional development around peak times. Transport assessment is essential - measures recently introduced for safety (traffic lights) have exacerbated problem. This site needs to provide adequate parking requirements (minimum of 2 spaces to allow for visitors) would prefer site to remain as parking area potentially as free parking for 6th Form College or local residents. | |
| 12349 | H8 | Objection | Roads here are already at breaking point and cannot see how 50 homes can be fitted on such a small site. | |
| 12365 | H8 | Objection | Object to development of site for residential purposes, as it should instead be considered as the preferred location for a new Creative Arts Primary School. | Ebor Academy Trust |
| 12395 | H8 | Objection | This site should not be proposed or considered as this site would cause issues with, traffic, loss of Green Belt, loss of recreational space and the negative impact it would have on ecology. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12571 | H8 | Objection | Express a strong preference for this site for the new Creative Arts Academy. It is the preferred site of Ebor Trust itself. Askham Bar is perfectly located adjacent to the new P&R site, it is easily and safely accessible by car, bus, train (via park and ride) bike and foot. There are clearly marked dedicated cycle lanes, wide pavements and pedestrian crossings and would have minimal impact on existing traffic.. Substantial new housing has been built in vicinity and local feeling is against further new housing schemes. There are better options for new housing schemes to south of Tadcaster Road/Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12572 | H8 | Objection | This site should be considered for the proposed academy school. This would be good for the area as local schools are bursting at the seams and would be popular with local parents. | |
| 12576 | H8 | Objection | Believe the Creative Arts Academy should be based at Askham Bryan P&R and would be good use of the space | |
| 12681 | H8 | Objection | Believe the Creative Arts Academy should be based at Askham Bryan P&R and would be best location for it. | |
| 12803 | H8 | Objection | I don't think it is necessary or appropriate to build anymore here as it would only further existing problem, such as: parking, traffic jams, lack of room, lack of services and facilities, schools, doctors, dentists, potential for more community activities and spaces, concerned about the density of development and need for more care homes. | |
| 12808 | H8 | Objection | This site should be used for the proposed academy and not housing, as a school would benefit the community greatly. | |
| 12811 | H8 | Objection | This site should be used for the proposed academy and not housing as there is a lack of schools. | |
| 12813 | H8 | Objection | This site should be used for the proposed academy and not housing. | |
| 12818 | H8 | Objection | This site should be used for the proposed academy. The site would be ideal as its accessible to all and close to bus services. | |
| 2765 | H8 | Support | I support redevelopment of this Brownfield site but agree with comments relating to traffic issues and unattractive location. | |
| 7686 | H8 | Support | Accept land at H8 as a brownfield site for housing or other development making use of the land. | |
| 9694 | H8 | Support | General support for the site | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 528 | H9 | Objection | We request that this site alongside combined with H9 be allocated for residential development going forward. | |
| 12745 | H9 | Support | We commend the City of York Council for removing this site, as the area would have had issues with schools, roads, flooding and drains. | |
| 4372 | H9 | Support | We welcome the decision to remove the land from the list of potential housing sites. The allocation of this site would have caused issues with, poor drainage, lack of facilities, loss of views and loss of a buffer between the bypass and the built up area. | Save Acomb Moor Campaign |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13012 | H10 | Comment | CYC need to ensure any houses built should be affordable and should introduce controls to avoid properties being snapped up by landlords to let out. We need housing stock for working people young residents do not have a hope of buying a place of their own or even rent. We need people living in the city to work in the city. | |
| 238 | H10 | comment | No objection to principle of this application, but given its proximity to city walls (scheduled ancient monument) and central conservation area, proposals would need to ensure that those important historic elements are not harmed. | Historic England |
| 5634 | H10 | comment | This is a huge development with big implications for infrastructure and local services. Not convinced they are proportionate or workable given the size and capacity of the roads and the pressure on existing services. | |
| 12197 | H10 | Objection | The Barbican site is relatively small, within a heavily built up historic part of the City. Now the hotel is complete, it is apparent that the remaining part of the site cannot accommodate the number of houses / parking spaces and associated infrastructure, as allocated. The site should be given back to the City and used as open space to draw people to this part of the City and support local businesses & contribute to regeneration. | |
| 2412 | H10 | Objection | Opposed to high rise (4 or 5 storey) losing York's identity. | |
| 2765 | H10 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |
| 10871 | H10 | support | We have no objection to the development at H10. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12884 | H12 | Objection | We object to the deletion of this site for the following reasons: the developer of the site engineered an acceptable access route, concerned that pre app advice suggested the access to the site was not an issue, contributions to infrastructure delivery was too be made, the land is currently not taken care of and drainage issues could be solved, this development could help solve the shortage in new high quality detached homes and this development would be in keeping with the area. | McBeath Property Consultancy Limited |
| 1289 | H12 | Objection | Comment queries Council's stated transport access issues, stating that access to the site is not constrained and the full capacity of the site can be delivered. Planning Application/Transport Assessment is currently being prepared. Site should be re-examined and re-instated as a housing allocation. | Pilcher Homes Ltd |
| 7432 | H12 | Support | Support removal of this site on grounds of potential congestion on surrounding roads this would bring if developed | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 2412 | H20 | Comment | Original plan was for 15 homes, now 17 (13% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 13171 | H20 | Support | Supports the redevelopment of the site for general needs housing. Suggests development density likely to be higher at 30-40 units. | CYC Adult Social Care |
| 2765 | H20 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13171 | H21 | Comment | Note that decision has not yet been made regarding residential care home closure. | CYC Adult Social Care |
| 2412 | H21 | Comment | Original plan was for 11 homes, now 12(10% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses on 0.02 less land | |
| 2765 | H21 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 2412 | H22 | Comment | Original plan was for 13 homes, now 15(14% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 2765 | H22 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13141 | H23 | Comment | Why is Grove House deleted when it is being marketed and why is the empty Fordlands Rd Elderly Persons Home missing? | |
| 13171 | H23 | Objection | Grove House, Penleys Grove Street. Fmr Care House, now closed. | CYC Adult Social Care |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1041 | H25 | Objection | <p>On behalf client (landowner of the site) propose the reinstatement of the site as a designated residential and mixed-use development site within the Council's Local Plan. The site represents an available vacant brownfield site in a suitable location within walking distance to York City Centre. The site has been deleted due to concerns over flooding and issues of deliverability/willingness of the landowner. However, upon review the site is not located within Flood Zone 3 and only partially located within Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Furthermore, the landowner has already commenced pre-application discussions with the Council over the potential redevelopment of the site, demonstrating a willingness to see the site developed. The site is considered suitable for redevelopment including residential led mixed-use development, hotel, student accommodation or retail.</p> | Tiger Developments |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 945 | H26 | Comment | Commenting on H26 that village sites should be protected from losing green belt | |
| 61 | H26 | Objection | Propose that H39 is replaced by H26 - however, H26 should contain a mix of housing type especially larger houses to meet clearly identified local need. 60 new homes would be suitable. | Elvington PC |
| 12665 | H26 | Objection | H26 Dauby Lane previous proposed site would be preferable to H39 - this has better access to A1079 and would give better ability to provide more homes and greater mix of properties including 2/3/4 bed properties. | |
| 12719 | H26 | Objection | Development would be better suited here than at H39 - more houses could be built, reflecting the need for both starter homes and larger 4/5 bed accommodation. Development here would also help link the 2 quite separate areas of the village together. | |
| 12775 | H26 | Objection | H26 should replace H39 as it is a better site. | |
| 12902 | H26 | Objection | I suggest that H26 be re-instated with up to 60 houses so that the H39 can be removed from the plan. H26 is a better location for a number of reasons, more attractive, capacity for cars and vans, room for children to play, close to main roads, would not impact breckside and overall spread more equality in the village. | |
| 12904 | H26 | Objection | If extra housing is needed in Elvington then you should look towards H26 as this site is more central to the village and closer to school. | |
| 13163 | H26 | Objection | Development would be better suited here than at H39 - a bigger site would offer opportunity for a better mix, to include affordable homes. The site has better access to shops and services; further the site has the support of Elvington Parish Council. | |
| 657 | H26 | Objection | H26 is preferable to H39. Development of H26 would help bring together what is currently two separate halves of the village. However, the housing mix should be lower than the 97 homes previously proposed and should consist of medium/larger homes currently lacking in the village. It should have direct access to Elvington Lane rather than the narrower Dauby lane. Elvington already has substantial numbers of small and affordable housing. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3532 | H26 | Objection | A more appropriate site to H39 : Land North of Church Lane Elvington would be H26 the land between the school and medical centre in Elvington that would keep most of the extra traffic generated away from the centre of the village and link the village together. | |
| 3598 | H26 | Objection | A more appropriate site to H39 : Land North of Church Lane Elvington would be H26 the land between the school and medical centre in Elvington that would keep most of the extra traffic generated away from the centre of the village. | |
| 5284 | H26 | Objection | Development would be better suited here than at H39 - a bigger site would offer opportunity for a better mix, to include affordable homes. The site has better access to shops and services; further the site has the support of Elvington Parish Council. | |
| 9381 | H26 | Objection | Object to proposed deletion of H26. CYCs objectively assessment of housing need (OAHN) is deficient and underestimates the level of housing need - this is exacerbated by the over estimation of delivery from certain sites particularly ST and ST34. CYCs position is clear certain previously proposed allocations have been modified or deleted - this does not mean these sites are unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Rather that CYC now consider these sites or part of them are less preferable than those allocated. The site was assessed as part of CYCs rigorous site selection methodology in previous draft Local Plan documents and CYC must at the time have satisfied themselves that the site is available, suitable and achievable at the time when the site is intended to deliver homes. CYC must accept that the site is a proposed housing allocation in the preferred options and it serves no or limited green belt purpose. The revised evidence base, primarily the alleged lower housing requirements sought to reduce allocations, one being H26. Rather than simply saying the Council are proposing to remove H26 because of the alleged reduction of need for housing land the Local Plan also gives a technical or planning reason or reasons that is believed to be flawed. The site is contained visually and physically and lies at the heart of the settlement. There is no constraint to the development of the site and as such should be allocated for housing. | Linden Homes |
| 10047 | H26 | Objection | A more appropriate site would be H26 (Dauby Lane) as it links both halves of the village, site is semi derelict and nearer facilities. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 10073 | H26 | Objection | Supporting the idea of an alternatively proposed site at Dauby Lane, suggesting this would; offer a bigger site, more housing, closer to the school, sports club, playground and the surgery. | |
| 10175 | H26 | Objection | H26 should be reallocated as little traffic would have to use Main Street. | |
| 10697 | H26 | Objection | H26 should replace H39 and should contain a mix of housing type, especially larger houses to meet clearly identified local need. Access is also better, closer to school, doctors surgery and sports field. | |
| 10842 | H26 | Objection | An alternative site to H39 would be land off Dauby Lane. | |
| 10543 | H26 | Support | Supporting H26 as the site is of a good size and would be less damaging and cause less of an impact on the historical centre of the village. | |
| 11728 | H26 | Support | I do not believe that H26 should be considered as an alternative to H39. Arguments that the site is closer to local amenities and services are spurious. I argue that objections to the H39 site put forward by the EPC apply equally to the H26 Dauby Lane site. This site is not the logical option for housing. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12293 | H27 | Comment | Ambivalent towards the Brecks Lane extension. | |
| 11045 | H27 | Comment | We need more houses for young people before they move to apartments and low cost housing. Lots of land could be used on MOD. | |
| 1661 | H27 | Objection | This site has consistently been excluded from draft green belt boundaries and CYC has confirmed on many occasions that it does not serve green belt purposes. It is incorrect for CYC to rely on SoS and Inspector's conclusions in relation to the call-in Inquiry in discounting Brecks Lane as an allocation as this decision was made in the context of the site being situated within the Green Belt and whether its development was justified by very special circumstances (and it was found that it was not). This does not preclude a proper consideration of whether the site should be located within the Green Belt and its contribution to Green Belt purposes. Land at Brecks Lane is a suitable site for housing that would have no unacceptable environmental impacts or create unacceptable impacts upon amenity of new and existing residents. There are no insurmountable constraints and the site is deliverable within 5 years. The OAHN for York is not robust and is inadequate to meet need and demand within the Housing Market Area. CYC should therefore allocate additional land to meet housing needs. | Linden Homes |
| 5410 | H27 | Objection | H27 should be brought back into the Plan | |
| 77 | H27 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186, should be removed from the Plan | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |
| 5957 | H27 | Support | Strensall Village is frequently log jammed with delivery vans, parked cars, commuter traffic, cars taking children to school etc. resulting in health and safety issues. Additional building would be asking for trouble - the school is over subscribed and doctors surgery at capacity. Support removal of this site for development. | |
| 6152 | H27 | Support | Infrastructure in Strensall would not be able to sustain further development at this time so support the removal of the site | |
| 12190 | H27 | Support | Land should remain as green belt and be removed from any future housing plans. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12191 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of this site (H27). Agree with the recent refusal of planning permission on this site. Any further development would place unnecessary burden on the ecological area of what is regarded as a natural area of beauty which is also a natural extension of Strensall Common. Would also place further pressure on Foss flood defences. | |
| 12193 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of this site (H27). | |
| 12195 | H27 | Support | Fully support the removal of sites H27 & H30 in Strensall. Evidence has consistently shown them to be unsuitable. | |
| 12196 | H27 | Support | Fully support the removal of sites H27 & H30. Whilst appreciating the need for more housing throughout the greater York area, these sites are inappropriate with the restricted access and overstretched school provision. Any further building must be commensurate with infrastructure provision. | |
| 12199 | H27 | Support | The village has insufficient infrastructure (eg. Schools, roads, amenities) to satisfy the existing population let alone any new development. No more new houses and concentrate on brownfield sites. | |
| 12200 | H27 | Support | Very pleased that the many and strong concerns of the Strensall residents now appear to have been taken into account with the removal of these 3 sites from the Plan (H27, H30 & SF1) | |
| 12201 | H27 | Support | Support the proposal to remove The Brecks, Strensall, from potential further development, as per the decision of the Inspector and SOS at appeal. | |
| 12202 | H27 | Support | No further housing should be entertained in Strensall. The Village infrastructure does not have capacity for more housing and more housing would be at the detriment of existing householders. | |
| 12206 | H27 | Support | Pleased that this housing development (and H30) has been dropped from the Plan. The village has too much traffic to the outer ring road as it is. | |
| 12209 | H27 | Support | Very pleased that this site has been removed from the Plan. The initial proposals to develop the site made no consideration for the village infrastructure that would support the development. Would be very concerned if it was to be reinstated. Strensall is now totally overdeveloped and the infrastructure has been stretched to full capacity. Without including sufficient infrastructure for any future housing growth, no new building should be allowed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12217 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of this site from the Plan. H27 was the subject of a public inquiry which concluded that the site was green belt and there were no special circumstances to allow housing development. The site would have as dramatic impact on the traffic through the village and the current amenities inc school, medical, leisure and shopping would not support a further increase in housing. | |
| 12227 | H27 | Support | Welcome removal of the site and no further development in Strensall. The village infrastructure cannot cope with more housing - roads, schools, and other services are at max capacity. | |
| 12231 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of site H27. No further significant development should take place in the Brecks Lane area. | |
| 12263 | H27 | Support | Particularly pleased that the housing developments previously proposed for Strensall have been removed from this plan | |
| 12267 | H27 | Support | The site was refused after full and proper considerations were carried out with due diligence. The site must remain rejected | |
| 12268 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of this site. It was unsuitable for housing and there was not adequate infrastructure or highway access to the site. | |
| 12275 | H27 | Support | The local infrastructure will not support more housing so wish these areas to remain Green Belt | |
| 12296 | H27 | Support | There is already major overpopulation and busy roads constantly and bus services are totally inadequate. More housing will cause further disruption and decline to the overall quality of the area. | |
| 12315 | H27 | Support | Support removal of this site as it would create more traffic congestion and danger in Village Street. Strensall as a village is at capacity as far as facilities, traffic and schools places are concerned - the character of the village is in severe jeopardy, traffic on The Village is dangerous. Brownfield sites should be used first. | |
| 12319 | H27 | Support | Delighted that changes to the plan will mean houses not being built on green field site in Strensall. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12322 | H27 | Support | Great to see this land removed from the plan. Strensall has been over developed for years with cumulative housing completions throughout village. We have insufficient infrastructure to support any more development. We need more school places, more shops, more pedestrian crossings and more cycle paths before any more houses. | |
| 12357 | H27 | Support | We support the removal of this site. | |
| 12364 | H27 | Support | We support the removal of this site. | |
| 12386 | H27 | Support | I am fully supportive of the changes in the plan to not develop more housing in Strensall, including the removal of safeguarded land. This would cause issues with local services and infrastructure being over used. | |
| 12388 | H27 | Support | The removal of proposed sites at Strensall are welcome. This is due to issues development would have caused with, lack of parking, poor road infrastructure, general over capacity and lack of shops and other amenities. | |
| 12390 | H27 | Support | Concerned about issues with, traffic, flooding, lack of electricity and power cuts, poor drainage and lack of capacity in schools. | |
| 12428 | H27 | Support | I approve of the decision to removal all of the proposed sites in Strensall. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12429 | H27 | Support | We particularly approve of the changes to the sites identified for development for Strensall and Towthorpe. | |
| 12489 | H27 | Support | Supports the removal of Land at Strensall, as development here would have caused issues with, roads, shops, schools, amenities, the medical centre, traffic and congestion and destroying the green belt. | |
| 12501 | H27 | Support | Approval of the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12579 | H27 | Support | In total agreement with removal of plans for developments in Strensall | |
| 12619 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of H27 as if the development had of gone ahead there would have been issues with, traffic and the school might not have coped. | |
| 12620 | H27 | Support | Delighted that H27 has been withdrawn as this would have caused problems with flooding, access, infrastructure and loss of the green belt. | |
| 12629 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as this development could have caused issues with, traffic, congestion, full schools, full surgeries and flooding. | |
| 12631 | H27 | Support | I support the removal of this sites. | |
| 12632 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as this development could have caused issues with, traffic, congestion, loss of the green belt and access safety issues. | |
| 12647 | H27 | Support | Supports the removal of this site. | |
| 12689 | H27 | Support | Support the removal of this site from the 'plan' The village is running to full capacity infrastructure cannot cope with more housing, roads are unsafe specifically for cyclists. School is full as is the medical centre. There is also a drainage problem in the village. Support approach whereby housing demand is met by expanding brownfield sites first and keep green belt safe. | |
| 12693 | H27 | Support | Support removal of this site from the 'plan'. Also believe future housing needs of York for foreseeable future can be met by development of brownfield sites. | |
| 12704 | H27 | Support | Strongly support removal of this site for housing development. It supports much wildlife is green belt land and infrastructure of Strensall could not cope with more housing developments for safety reasons. | |
| 12714 | H27 | Support | Support for the removal of the site due to its harm to the greenbelt and limited site access. | |
| 12773 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12806 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12812 | H27 | Support | objecting to more development in Strensall as more development would cause further problems with, flooding, loss of green belt and Strensall is becoming an urban jungle. | |
| 12816 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as if it had been developed it would have caused issues with, sewerage, road access, traffic and congestion over crowding and lack of parking. | |
| 12842 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12846 | H27 | Support | I agree with the removal of this site. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12893 | H27 | Support | I am pleased to see this site has been deleted as Strensall's infrastructure is already overloaded and there would have been issues with loss of the green belt and ecology. | |
| 12894 | H27 | Support | I am pleased to see this site has been deleted as Strensall's infrastructure is already overloaded and there would have been issues with loss of the green belt and ecology. | |
| 12907 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall as further development in Strensall would have had a detrimental impact on the local community. | |
| 12915 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of the site from the Local Plan. As development of this site would have caused issues with, flooding, road congestion, lack of transport, lack of access to services and negative impact on education and medical facilities. | |
| 12937 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall, as there would have been issues with, lack of infrastructure, traffic and congestion, lack of amenities and the use of alternate roads to avoid traffic. | |
| 13033 | H27 | Support | Pleased this site in Strensall has been withdrawn from the plan - infrastructure here is not able to support any further development. | |
| 13034 | H27 | Support | Support removal of this site - infrastructure in Strensall/Towthorpe could not support further development and the character of the village would be further reduced. | |
| 13047 | H27 | Support | Fully support removal of this site from the local plan. It is green belt and there are no special reasons why it should be built on. Development has already been refused by the Inspector and Secretary of State at appeal. | |
| 13056 | H27 | Support | The removal of housing planned for Strensall is welcome as the village is already at capacity | |
| 494 | H27 | Support | Support for the removal of site H27 on the grounds that: Strensall is already large enough, without infrastructure to accommodate its current scale; the land is green belt, on which housing development is inappropriate; land forms part of the setting of the village, and its environment; sewerage is already at capacity; schools and services would be put under further pressure. | |
| 1710 | H27 | Support | This proposal would destroy a village that today is already stretched to capacity. There are issues with the lack of infrastructure, population growth and loss of Green Belt land. | |
| 2846 | H27 | Support | Pleased to see removal of H27 | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3297 | H27 | Support | General support for the removal of site, noting that Strensall's infrastructure cannot sustain further development | |
| 5145 | H27 | Support | General support for the site's removal | |
| 9923 | H27 | Support | Plan not to develop this site is a sound decision based on impact it would have had on area and its infrastructure | |
| 10010 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of site H27, as the development could have caused issues with, the green belt, infrastructure in the village and low levels of sustainability. | |
| 11591 | H27 | Support | I support the removal of this site as this will safeguard the village and its Green Belt as well as not contributing to worsening of traffic congestion and safety as well as over crowded schooling facilities. | |
| 12117 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of the site from the Local Plan. | |
| 12119 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall as these developments may have caused problems with; traffic, parking and bus routes. | |
| 12120 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12122 | H27 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 945 | H28 | Comment | Commenting on H28 that village sites should be protected from loosing green belt | |
| 9381 | H28 | Objection | <p>Object to proposed deletion of H28. Further, the OAHN is deficient and underestimates the level of need. This is exacerbated by CYCs assessment of supply notably the over estimation of delivery from certain sites particularly ST5 and ST34. Thus additional land for housing will be required. CYCs position is clear certain previously proposed allocations have been modified or deleted - this does not mean these sites are unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Rather that CYC now consider these sites or part of them are less preferable than those allocated. The site was assessed as part of CYCs rigorous site selection methodology in previous draft Local Plan documents and CYC must at the time have satisfied themselves that the site is available, suitable and achievable at the time when the site is intended to deliver homes. CYC must accept that the site is a proposed housing allocation in the preferred options and it serves no or limited green belt purpose. The revised evidence base, primarily the alleged lower housing requirements sought to reduce allocations, one being H28. We disagree with the reasons for removal of this site and have shown the reasoning to be flawed. There are two available vehicular access points to serve the site and for the preferred access point an engineers drawing has been provided that demonstrates access can be achieved. On this basis there is no constraint to development and as such should be allocated for housing.</p> | Linden Homes |
| 1200 | H28 | Support | H28 should remain in Green Belt. Its a wildlife haven but landowners destroyed wildlife. Wildlife now returning to the site . | |
| 2649 | H28 | Support | <p>Agree that H28; land North of North Lane Wheldrake should be deleted from list of preferred housing sites. This land is greenfield and includes a pond. Some of the hedges date back to 1700 as part of the 'enclosure act'. There is a deficit of natural open space to the North of Wheldrake and development would have a negative impact on the village setting. The site should be included within the green belt. Access to the site is difficult and the amount of increased traffic proposed would be a danger to children, pedestrians and other vehicles. Drainage/sewage is already a problem in North Lane area. A huge burden would be placed on local services such as doctors, schools and local roads etc.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3547 | H28 | Support | General support for removal of H28. Site access could have resulted in increased traffic and village congestion. | |
| 10822 | H28 | Support | Sensible to remove H28 - this site was never appropriate due to narrow and dangerous access and egress onto increasingly busy village lane. | |
| 12106 | H28 | Support | I agree that this site should be deleted. It is a greenfield site and contains historic hedgerows. There is poor access and concerns for increased traffic, lack of parking, poor visibility and road safety. There are also concerns about the strain on public services. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12765 | H29 | Comment | The housing density on the site has been increased in this version of the local plan which is disappointing. There are also concerns for, 3 storey housing, loss of gardens and garages, loss of sense of security, loss of wildlife, loss of the view of the landscape, there are no bus routes, increase in traffic and congestion, | |
| 12925 | H29 | Comment | Concerned about vibrations from heavy locomotives and the density of housing. | |
| 1355 | H29 | Comment | Notes residents' concerns over impact of additional traffic on Moor Lane. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 2087 | H29 | Comment | Re H29 - transport impacts should be reviewed, in particular in relation to increased traffic on Moor Lane and parking (business and visitor) | |
| 2112 | H29 | Comment | Re H29 - transport impacts should be reviewed, in particular in relation to site access (sight lines) and parking (business and visitor) | |
| 2412 | H29 | Comment | Original plan was for 74 homes, now 88 (19% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 12107 | H29 | Comment | Concerned about issues with this site including: access, congestion, lack of parking, harm to existing amenities and safety concerns. | |
| 1962 | H29 | Objection | General objection on grounds of site access, traffic and access to services. | |
| 1981 | H29 | Objection | Site is too large and cumulative impact of 250+ homes is way in excess of what local amenities can support. | |
| 2215 | H29 | Objection | General objection on grounds of access to services and amenities. Moor Lane itself is already congested/dangerous and cannot cope with further traffic from prospective 88 dwellings. | |
| 2232 | H29 | Objection | General objection on grounds of site access, traffic and access to services. Area around H29 site is already congested, and suffers from road visibility and parking problems. | |
| 2371 | H29 | Objection | Development would take away the heart of the village. | |
| 2765 | H29 | Objection | Site is Grade I arable land located outside existing built-up area. | |
| 12111 | H29 | Objection | There's already too much traffic along Tadcaster road. Yorks Green Belt and Character are being destroyed. | |
| 12182 | H29 | Objection | The land on Moor Lane is a good source of local leisure - walking, cycling. Part of built up area and more housing would lead to more traffic and a strain on local schools and health facilities. Loss of Green Belt. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12309 | H29 | Objection | 88 additional homes will impact on roads and particularly the junction between Moor Lane/Station Road/main Street adding to the properties currently using the (unsafe) junction - unless made safe no development should take place. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12327 | H29 | Objection | Copmanthorpe cannot sustain additional population in its school. The shops will not sustain additional 250 homes. Roads exiting Copmanthorpe on to A64 are gridlocked at peak times. There are plenty of brownfield sites around York for additional housing why spoil our village. Additional housing will reduce my house value, whereas housing in an already populated area with proper infrastructure will not impact prices there. | |
| 12385 | H29 | Objection | This site would not be appropriate for housing for the following reasons: increase in traffic, lack of road visibility, lack of road safety, loss of children playing in the street, lack of capacity in schools, detrimental to wildlife and poor road safety. | |
| 12394 | H29 | Objection | This area cannot reasonably sustain the amount of proposed traffic that the new buildings would cause. This also causes concerns for road safety. There are also issues with the impact this site will have on local facilities. | |
| 12396 | H29 | Objection | If this development were to go ahead there would be issues with lack of infrastructure, additional traffic, noise, lack of schools, lack of buses, lack of medical facilities, libraries and overall concerns for social issues. | |
| 12439 | H29 | Objection | We still feel that Copmanthorpe is in danger of being very over populated. Services are already very stretched. There are concerns for, getting doctors appointments and places in schools and lack of parking. | |
| 12473 | H29 | Objection | Main Street in Copmanthorpe is already over subscribed with parking issues, farm and public transport conflicts. Parking restrictions have been imposed at junction of Station Rd and Moor Lane to assist bus access. Moor Lane is a narrow road neither that or Main Street can cope with increased volume of traffic unless another access to site is created? Min of 88 additional cars is too much. Several road improvement measures are recommended e.g.. speed restrictions, traffic lights speed bumps etc. Main Street in a conservation area. Can schools cope with additional numbers? | |
| 12627 | H29 | Objection | Objecting to H29 due to concerns for, pressure on village roads, costs to change the roads, road infrastructure, flooding, issues with the drains, limited facilities and lack of parking. | |
| 12628 | H29 | objection | Objecting to H29 due to issues with roads not being able to cope and parking. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12637 | H29 | Objection | Concerned about issues with poor roads, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of road safety, lack of schools, doctors, dentists, lack of parking, lack of open space, poor sewerage drains, flooding and loss of character. | |
| 12717 | H29 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: Copmanthorpe does not need any further development, which may change the nature of the village; lack of school space; drainage under capacity. | |
| 12810 | H29 | Objection | Even with the reduced number of housing this will still cause issues with, increased vehicles on the road, lack of car parking, difficult to get a bus, road safety, schools are full, loss of an attractive entry to the village and destruction of trees and hedgerows | |
| 12843 | H29 | Objection | Concerned about the pressure of this development on a number of issues: infrastructure, increased traffic, congestion, access, narrow roads, schools, doctors, shops and drainage. | |
| 12927 | H29 | Objection | Concerned about this site due to the following issues: increased traffic, lack of safe parking, dangerous roads, restricted views from cars due to shrubbery, increased commuters, increase congestion, flooding and lack of drainage, increased density of the site, size and type of housing and loss of green belt. There are other sites with better access and infrastructure. | |
| 13009 | H29 | Objection | This is high quality agricultural land and is in full production. NPPF guidelines state high quality agricultural land such as this should not be used for development until all other brownfield land or lower grade farmland has been used. | |
| 13019 | H29 | Objection | Worried about all the extra cars and trucks on the road an already busy road will only get worse with 100+ more cars and trucks on the road. Roads and paths are very unkempt with uneven surfaces and pot holes. People drive too fast on the road and parking is very poor with people using foot paths to park on. Also worried we will have lots of affordable houses and don't want more noise and trouble. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13024 | H29 | Objection | Object to this site. Access - Moor Lane was not built for the volume of traffic as it exists. The plan suggests widening Moor Lane that will take away the grass verge and significantly narrow the pavement. Traffic will be closer to the houses increasing noise levels. It has been a quiet lane that will become a busy road for commuters. Driving around the village is often dangerous. The bus services to and from Copmanthorpe have recently been reduced. Village of Copmanthorpe - We live in a Village not a small town. More houses would change the character of Copmanthorpe, increase the pressure on Copmanthorpe Primary School and create a need for more shops and facilities in the village and make it more congested and dangerous for drivers and pedestrians. The Green Belt around Copmanthorpe should be protected. Flooding - there is poor drainage around the top and bottom areas of Moor Lane with localised flooding that will only be impacted by further development. Other Sites - previous proposed sites have far better access H21 would affect fewer people. There will be environmental consequences and lower the quality of quality of our lives. Mix and precise location of houses is not specified. | |
| 57 | H29 | Support | Support site in principle but object to housing density and the number of houses proposed. Numbers would overwhelm village amenities, school,, medical facilities and drainage as well as roads. | Copmanthorpe PC |
| 99 | H29 | Support | Development should be accompanied by appropriate investment in infrastructure (water supply/drainage) and services | York Cycle Campaign |
| 1298 | H29 | Support | Fully support the allocation at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe. Proposals have the potential to provide a high quality residential development of 110 homes, alongside the delivery of public open space and associated infrastructure. The site will provide the opportunity to help meet York's current and future housing needs. The proposals will deliver development which respects the character of the surrounding area whilst seeking to incorporate 21st Century designs to provide a high quality residential development where people want to live. It is located in a suitable and highly sustainable location. The site is deliverable and available now and is under the control of a national housebuilder . The site can be considered achievable as new homes can be delivered on the site within the next 5 years and within the first 5 years of the Local Plan. There are no technical or environmental (built or natural) constraints which would preclude the development of the site. | Barratt Homes (York) Ltd |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 1504 | H29 | Support | A well chosen location - need to widen Moor Lane and a possible second outlet from the site looks feasible and would moderate traffic load. Will add to economic activity that will be welcomed but consideration on local services and cultural balance of historic village will need careful attention. | |
| 1884 | H29 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 1917 | H29 | Support | The Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan reflects the concept introduced by the Localism Act 2011 and accords with the wishes of the residents. This site combined with ST31 with a combined total of 250 houses is the maximum the village infrastructure could possibly assimilate without too great a detriment to the environment and character of the village. Land to the west of the village is a positive allocation as green belt and valued open area with field paths and footpath to Colton. | |
| 2012 | H29 | Support | Housing proposals for Copmanthorpe offer a sustainable target for the village | |
| 2025 | H29 | Support | Proposal is more in keeping with scale of village, and would not unduly stress local services | |
| 2066 | H29 | Support | Proposal is realistic and suitable for Copmanthorpe, based on modest infrastructure changes | |
| 2170 | H29 | Support | General support for site | |
| 2189 | H29 | Support | General support for site H29 - infrastructure is in place to accommodate this proposed development | |
| 2263 | H29 | Support | Support development of this site in Copmanthorpe and agree that further development on Green Belt sites should not go ahead | |
| 2272 | H29 | support | No objection in principle but site seems excessively densely developed compared to comparative site ST31. This could compound impacts for residents. | |
| 2275 | H29 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2275 | H29 | Support | Support for development of the site | |
| 2322 | H29 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2387 | H29 | Support | The current preferred locations and the number of houses proposed at Copmanthorpe seem reasonable. | |
| 2689 | H29 | Support | Support this site as combined with ST31 for up to 250 homes they are surrounded by physical boundaries that will prevent development spilling over into surrounding land and will not put too much pressure on health facilities, schools and roads in Copmanthorpe | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3035 | H29 | Support | We would prefer no further development in Copmanthorpe but if this is unavoidable approve of the proposed area as this appears to balance the village layout and keeps the majority of the Green Belt. | |
| 4423 | H29 | Support | Supporting the inclusion of H29 the (old) Moor Lane for development, but concerned that density is too high - pressure on schools and doctors at capacity, lack of amenities, struggling drainage and fresh water systems and over all sustainability issues. | |
| 6432 | H29 | Support | Support in principle the new draft plan regarding Copmanthorpe. Welcome the allocation of greenbelt land to western boundary of the village. However, concerned about increased pressure on existing local services and potential widening of Moor lane that would alter the semi-rural character of southern edge of village. | |
| 8143 | H29 | Support | General support for site | |
| 8147 | H29 | Support | General support for the site's development | |
| 8197 | H29 | support | Supports principle of development but concerned about impact of scale of development on infrastructure/amenity deficiency grounds. | |
| 8352 | H29 | Support | General support for site | |
| 8353 | H29 | support | I support the latest Local Plan for the development of Copmanthorpe, however I have reservations about the impact of H29. There are issues with, additional traffic, loss of quality of life, congestion, lack of parking, lack of amenities, capacity of water, sewerage pipes, telephone lines, broad band and over crowding. | |
| 8359 | H29 | Support | We give our support for the new draft Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 10966 | H29 | Support | I support the identified sites for copmanthorpe as being suitable for new housing in the village of Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12239 | H29 | Support | Agree with the proposals for Copmanthorpe (Manor Farm, Tadcaster Road & Old Moor Lane). York needs more houses. The 3 sites are proportionate and that more would be unsustainable and would create infrastructure problems (highways, drainage, schools, services). | |
| 12256 | H29 | support | The new proposal for Moor Lane and Top Lane [Tadcaster Road] are more acceptable | |
| 12323 | H29 | Support | Fully support housing development on this site | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12354 | H29 | Support | I find that the new proposals for Copmanthorpe are more acceptable and manageable, without putting pressure on health facilities, schools, roads and other infrastructure in the village. | |
| 12355 | H29 | Support | I feel that the York City Council has earmarked the correct sites for development in Copmanthorpe. These sites benefit the need for housing whilst providing physical boundaries of roads and railways which will stop development spilling over into surrounding land. | |
| 12358 | H29 | Support | The proposed sites within the well defined boundaries of the village envelope contained within the A64 and the railway avoiding the need to encroach further into existing Green Belt. | |
| 12359 | H29 | support | Copmanthorpe Local Plan seems satisfactory - a compromise between increasing housing stock without swamping established community. My only concern would be the traffic increase the proposed Moor Lane development would have. | |
| 12369 | H29 | Support | The 2016 draft local plan is more acceptable with its proposal for up to 250 houses. | |
| 12374 | H29 | Support | I support the new plan for housing in Copmanthorpe that proposes up to 250 houses in the village. Hopefully this new proposal will not put too much pressure in future years on the important health facilities, schools and roads as the previous 2014 draft plan would have done. | |
| 12398 | H29 | Support | I agree with the proposal for new housing in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12403 | H29 | Support | The 3 sites identified suit the needs of Copmanthorpe and the Green Belt. If further housing was allowed it would affect the value of the existing houses. | |
| 12411 | H29 | Support | I agree to the new draft local plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12415 | H29 | Support | The drafts for housing on the sites in Copmanthorpe mentioned appear to be fair. As there would be issues with lack of, schools, parking, doctors, roads, increased traffic and road safety. | |
| 12417 | H29 | Support | I am happy with the proposals made in the Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12432 | H29 | Support | I feel that the village infrastructure will cope much better with the reduced developments and we are also protecting the valuable Green Belt. | |
| 12435 | H29 | Support | I support the new draft Local Plan for CYC with reference to Copmanthorpe. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12438 | H29 | Support | I welcome the suggested reduction in the new building in the village. In my view 250 new homes would be manageable with the current resources in the village. Also retention of land as Green Belt is very desirable. | |
| 12470 | H29 | Support | Agree with this proposed housing development in Copmanthorpe | |
| 12476 | H29 | Support | This site together with ST31 are the most appropriate sites for new housing in Copmanthorpe re: location, access and low impact on existing village. | |
| 12481 | H29 | Support | Fully Support H29. | |
| 12492 | H29 | Support | Supportive of the proposed development plans for companthorpe, specifically to limit development, which would put a strain on facilities and maintain the green belt. | |
| 12496 | H29 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that proposes 250 houses for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12580 | H29 | Support | Support allocation. Proposed housing density too high compared to density level of existing development adjacent to site. All existing vegetation (trees and hedgerows) should be retained within the site. Object to the reference under site H29 to the 233 objections (879 petition signatures) to the previous version of the LP as misleading. Objections were to all sites. | Cllr David Carr |
| 12641 | H29 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that minimises development in Copmanthorpe | |
| 12713 | H29 | Support | General support for the site. Comment notes that access to the site must be taken from Moor Lane via a new entrance road as the width of the existing housing site access roads is unsuitable for increased traffic volumes. | |
| 12820 | H29 | Support | Supporting the most recent draft of the Local Plan for Companthorpe, due to a reduction in allocations allowing some growth but also limiting pressure on facilities and roads in the village. | |
| 12882 | H29 | Support | The revised sites for Copmanthorpe are acceptable. | |
| 13010 | H29 | Support | Support this site | |
| 13042 | H29 | Support | I approve of development of this site | |
| 13067 | H29 | support | In favour of building planned for Copmanthorpe so long as the infrastructure is improved to support the increased demand for school places, doctors, dentists etc. | |
| 13182 | H29 | Support | Supports allocation in principle. Site is deliverable, with no technical/environmental constraints. In a highly sustainable location within proximity of key services and facilities. | Barratt & David Wilson Homes |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 11045 | H30 | Comment | We need more houses for young people before they move to apartments and low cost housing. Lots of land could be used on MOD. | |
| 304 | H30 | Objection | Seeks the allocation of the site - Land at South of the Village, Strensall (part) - for housing development. The site was part of a larger area of land proposed for housing in the Preferred Options Local Plan 2013. The Publication draft of the Local Plan approved by the Council's Local Plan Working Group in September 2014. This did not include any changes to the proposed allocation. However, that version of the plan never progressed to public consultation. The current PSC has deleted the H30 site . From the Council's methodology it is clear therefore that the site has been run through a detailed suitability assessment process and has been judged to be in a sustainable location, relatively unconstrained and suitable for development. The revised access design provides an acceptable junction with The Village and is of a sufficient standard to serve up to 25 dwellings, thus is more than sufficient to serve a development of 11 dwellings. Overall the proposal satisfies local and national planning policy requirements and in the absence of a 5-year land supply there is a need to allocate sites such as the objection site (H30 (part)) that can be brought forward quickly to address the significant underprovision in housing supply across the plan period and, more particularly in the first 5 years of the plan. | Shirethorn Ltd |
| 1302 | H30 | Objection | Requests reallocation of site, which is located in a sustainable location adjoining the railway line and station, with regular services into York and West Yorks beyond. | |
| 1710 | H30 | Objection | This proposal would destroy a village that today is already stretched to capacity. There are issues with the lack of infrastructure, population growth and loss of Green Belt land. | |
| 5336 | H30 | Objection | Objects to the removal of site - would support the site's development as a super-efficient eco housing scheme. See rep for details of suggested scheme. | Xella UK |
| 5410 | H30 | Objection | H30 should be brought back into the Plan | |
| 77 | H30 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186, should be removed from the Plan. Note that In the reasons put forward for excluding site H30 that green belt and ecological considerations are also included as identified in the refusal of CYC to allows development of part of the site under planning app ref 15/02353/OUTM. | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5957 | H30 | Support | Strensall Village is frequently log jammed with delivery vans, parked cars, commuter traffic, cars taking children to school etc. resulting in health and safety issues. Additional building would be asking for trouble - the school is over subscribed and doctors surgery at capacity. H30 is a haven to much wildlife. Support removal of this site for development. | |
| 6152 | H30 | Support | Infrastructure in Strensall would not be able to sustain further development at this time so support the removal of the site | |
| 12193 | H30 | Support | Support the removal of this site (H30). | |
| 12195 | H30 | Support | Fully support the removal of sites H27 & H30 in Strensall. Evidence has consistently shown them to be unsuitable. | |
| 12196 | H30 | Support | Fully support the removal of sites H27 & H30. Whilst appreciating the need for more housing throughout the greater York area, these sites are inappropriate with the restricted access and overstretched school provision. Any further building must be commensurate with infrastructure provision. | |
| 12199 | H30 | Support | The village has insufficient infrastructure (eg. Schools, roads, amenities to satisfy the existing population let alone any new development. No more new houses and concentrate on brownfield sites. | |
| 12200 | H30 | Support | Very pleased that the many and strong concerns of the Strensall residents now appear to have been taken into account with the removal of these 3 sites from the Plan (H27, H30 & SF1) | |
| 12202 | H30 | Support | No further housing should be entertained in Strensall. The Village infrastructure does not have capacity for more housing and more housing would be at the detriment of existing householders. | |
| 12206 | H30 | Support | Pleased that this housing development (and H27) has been dropped from the Plan. The village has too much traffic to the outer ring road as it is. | |
| 12209 | H30 | Support | Very pleased that this site has been removed from the Plan. The initial proposals to develop the site made no consideration for the village infrastructure that would support the development. Would be very concerned if it was to be reinstated. Strensall is now totally overdeveloped and the infrastructure has been stretched to full capacity. Without including sufficient infrastructure for any future housing growth, no new building should be allowed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12217 | H30 | Support | Support the removal of this site from the Plan. The site would have as dramatic impact on the traffic through the village and the current amenities inc school, medical, leisure and shopping would not support a further increase in housing. | |
| 12227 | H30 | Support | Welcome removal of the site and no further development in Strensall. The village infrastructure cannot cope with more housing - roads, schools, and other services are at max capacity. | |
| 12263 | H30 | Support | Particularly pleased that the housing developments previously proposed for Strensall have been removed from this plan | |
| 12267 | H30 | Support | The site was refused after full and proper considerations were carried out with due diligence. The site must remain rejected. The same argument was made for another site, termed by the representor as H30R, on the other side of the railway line | |
| 12268 | H30 | Support | Support the rejection of this site. It was unsuitable for housing and was Green Belt land which should be protected except in exceptional circumstances. | |
| 12275 | H30 | Support | The local infrastructure will not support more housing so wish these areas to remain Green Belt | |
| 12315 | H30 | Support | Support removal of this site as it would create more traffic congestion and danger in Village Street. Access to this site is too narrow to be a safe traffic access. Strensall as a village is at capacity as far as facilities, traffic and schools places are concerned - the character of the village is in severe jeopardy, traffic on The Village is dangerous. Brownfield sites should be used first. | |
| 12319 | H30 | Support | Delighted that changes to the plan will mean houses not being built on green field site in Strensall. | |
| 12322 | H30 | Support | Great to see this land removed from the plan. Strensall has been over developed for years with cumulative housing completions throughout village. We have insufficient infrastructure to support any more development. We need more school places, more shops, more pedestrian crossings and more cycle paths before any more houses. | |
| 12357 | H30 | Support | We support the removal of this site. | |
| 12364 | H30 | Support | We support the removal of this site. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12386 | H30 | Support | I am fully supportive of the changes in the plan to not develop more housing in Strensall, including the removal of safeguarded land. This would cause issues with local services and infrastructure being over used. | |
| 12388 | H30 | Support | The removal of proposed sites at Strensall are welcome. This is due to issues development would have caused with, lack of parking, poor road infrastructure, general over capacity and lack of shops and other amenities. | |
| 12390 | H30 | Support | Concerned about issues with, traffic, flooding, lack of electricity and power cuts, poor drainage and lack of capacity in schools. | |
| 12428 | H30 | Support | I approve of the decision to removal all of the proposed sites in Strensall. | |
| 12429 | H30 | Support | We particularly approve of the changes to the sites identified for development for Strensall and Towthorpe. | |
| 12489 | H30 | Support | Supports the removal of Land at Strensall, as development here would have caused issues with, roads, shops, schools, amenities, the medical centre, traffic and congestion and destroying the green belt. | |
| 12501 | H30 | Support | Approval of the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12579 | H30 | Support | In total agreement with removal of plans for developments in Strensall | |
| 12619 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of H30 as this may have caused problems with traffic and loss of the current rural setting and the green belt. | |
| 12620 | H30 | Support | Delighted that H30 has been withdrawn as this would have caused problems with flooding, access, infrastructure and loss of the green belt. | |
| 12626 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of H30 due to concerns with, loss of the green belt, the significant impact it might have on the character and infrastructure of the village, schools are at capacity, transport, traffic and congestion, sewage and access. | |
| 12629 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as this development could have caused issues with, traffic, congestion, full schools, full surgeries and flooding. | |
| 12631 | H30 | Support | I support the removal of this sites. | |
| 12632 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as this development could have caused issues with, traffic, congestion, loss of the green belt and access safety issues. | |
| 12647 | H30 | Support | Supports the removal of this site. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12672 | H30 | Support | Agree with 'plan' to remove this site. Main reasons being access concerns and fact it is in the green belt. Numerous previous applications have been refused on green belt grounds. Wildlife are a big feature and any development would have a devastating affect on this. Green Belt protection is part of the Conservative Manifesto supported by the Lib Dems. Strensall is also an at risk conservation village and site is close to the SSSI. Content of the CYC Biodiversity Audit of 2010 is also relevant particularly references to Strensall Village Meadows (Site ID 67) SINC. Concerned regarding air quality in the village, the site provides a much needed area of green lungs, any further housing would bring more cars and traffic worsening the air quality and a risk to health. Flooding affects the village further building and an inadequate drainage system would only heighten this risk. Traffic is a major problem to the village further development would only add to the problems. | |
| 12689 | H30 | Support | Support the removal of this site from the 'plan' H30 has unsafe access and is of great interest to wildlife including great crested newts, owls etc. The village is running to full capacity infrastructure cannot cope with more housing, roads are unsafe specifically for cyclists. School is full as is the medical centre. There is also a drainage problem in the village. Support approach whereby housing demand is met by expanding brownfield sites first and keep green belt safe. | |
| 12691 | H30 | Support | Fully agree this site should be removed from the 'plan' - the development would severely affect traffic coming through village of Earswick and put pressure on A1237. No further development should take place in area of Monks Cross until ring road has been dualled. | |
| 12692 | H30 | Support | Fully agree this site should be removed from the 'plan' - the development would severely affect traffic coming through village of Earswick and put pressure on A1237. No further development should take place in area of Monks Cross until ring road has been dualled. | |
| 12693 | H30 | Support | Support removal of this site from the 'plan'. Also believe future housing needs of York for foreseeable future can be met by development of brownfield sites. | |
| 12704 | H30 | Support | Strongly support removal of this site for housing development. It supports much wildlife is green belt land and infrastructure of Strensall could not cope with more housing developments for safety reasons. | |
| 12714 | H30 | Support | Support for the removal of the site due to its harm to the greenbelt and limited site access. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12773 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12806 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12812 | H30 | Support | objecting to more development in Strensall. | |
| 12816 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of this site as if it had been developed it would have caused issues with, sewerage, road access, traffic and congestion over crowding and lack of parking. | |
| 12842 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12846 | H30 | Support | I agree with the removal of this site. | |
| 12893 | H30 | Support | I am pleased to see this site has been deleted as strensall's infrastructure is already overloaded and there would have been issues with loss of the green belt and ecology. | |
| 12894 | H30 | Support | I am pleased to see this site has been deleted as strensall's infrastructure is already overloaded and there would have been issues with loss of the green belt and ecology. | |
| 12907 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall as further development in Strensall would have had a detrimental impact on the local community. | |
| 12915 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of the site from the Local Plan for access and road safety reasons. | |
| 12937 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall, as there would have been issues with, lack of infrastructure, traffic and congestion, lack of amenities and the use of alternate roads to avoid traffic. | |
| 13033 | H30 | Support | Pleased this site in Strensall has been withdrawn from the plan - infrastructure here is not able to support any further development. | |
| 13034 | H30 | Support | Support removal of this site - infrastructure in Strensall/Towthorpe could not support further development and the character of the village would be further reduced. | |
| 13047 | H30 | Support | Fully support removal of this site from the Local Plan. It is precious green belt land and has already had planning refusal for good reason. Developing here would add to the further urbanisation of Strensall creating more traffic and over population problems. | |
| 13048 | H30 | Support | Fully support removal of this site from the Local Plan. It has already had planning refusal for good reason. Access would be very dangerous onto a very congested road. Strensall is already over populated and causing problems for existing residents. This is precious green belt land a and there are no special circumstances why it should be developed. | |
| 13056 | H30 | Support | The removal of housing planned for Strensall is welcome as the village is already at capacity | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 494 | H30 | Support | Support for the removal of site H30 on the grounds that: Strensall is already large enough, with several recently approved sites under construction; the land is green belt, on which housing development is inappropriate; land forms part of the setting of the village, and it's environment; the site's water table is very high as it acts as a sponge for water coming off Strensall Common; sewerage is already at capacity; schools and services would be put under further pressure. | |
| 2846 | H30 | Support | Pleased to see removal of H30 | |
| 3297 | H30 | Support | General support for the removal of site, noting that Strensall's infrastructure cannot sustain further development | |
| 5145 | H30 | Support | General support for the site's removal | |
| 9923 | H30 | Support | Plan not to develop this site is a sound decision based on impact it would have had on area and its infrastructure | |
| 10010 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of site H30, as the development could have caused issues with, ecology, the green belt, infrastructure in the village and low levels of sustainability. | |
| 11591 | H30 | Support | I support the removal of this site as this will safeguard the village and its Green Belt as well as not contributing to worsening of traffic congestion and safety as well as over crowded schooling facilities. | |
| 11838 | H30 | Support | I am pleased to see from the revised report that site H30 has been rejected and removed from the plan. I believe that this is the correct out come as there were concerns for the following issues: lack of capacity in schools, lack of capacity at the local health care centre, lack of parking, increased traffic, pedestrian safety, overloading sewerage and drainage systems and flooding and climate change. This site is the logical option for housing. | |
| 12117 | H30 | Support | Supports the removal of the site from the Local Plan. | |
| 12119 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall as these developments may have caused problems with; traffic, parking and bus routes. | |
| 12120 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |
| 12122 | H30 | Support | Supporting the removal of sites at Strensall. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12305 | H31 | Comment | Do not oppose development on this site, however, legal agreement should be made that all livestock activity on adjacent land should cease to remove any possible conflict with residential amenity. Significant additional traffic activity will result along Eastfield Lane and will require improvements to be made. Junction improvements at Church Balk will also be needed. Conservation area needs consideration if works carried out. Density levels should reflect those that already exist in the village. Proposals now are likely to result in over development, poor design and layout. | |
| 12898 | H31 | Comment | Concerned about this site due to issues with: highways, footways, loss of rural character, loss of hedgerows, damage to wildlife, traffic speeding, cycle routes, congestion, agricultural buildings, speeding, pedestrian safety, need to promote a healthy if style, footway provision and loss of amenity space. | |
| 12945 | H31 | Comment | Concerned about the lack of school places, lack of doctors, widening roads and foot paths, sewerage, surface water, transport, walking distances and Eastfield Land and Church Balk Road Junction. | |
| 13113 | H31 | Comment | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, traffic, loss of character, negative impact on the environment and local amenity, loss of wildlife and habitats, lack of road safety, lack of parking, and loss of hedgerows. Suggests that development yield is revisited in light of concerns raised. | |
| 13114 | H31 | Comment | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, traffic, loss of character, negative impact on the environment and local amenity, loss of wildlife and habitats, lack of road safety, lack of parking, and loss of hedgerows. Suggests that development yield is revisited in light of concerns raised. | |
| 13155 | H31 | comment | Concerns about the impact this development will have on traffic patterns. | |
| 1355 | H31 | Comment | Notes that residents are concerned about this site due to issues with: drainage, sewerage, access, public transport and increase in the size of the site. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 2412 | H31 | Comment | Original plan was for 70 homes, now 84(20% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses adding to a diminution of quality of life style | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3213 | H31 | Comment | I accept that there is a need for more housing. Eastfield Lane would need to be widened to accept additional traffic. There are concerns for congestion and road safety. Speed humps could be constructed to increase road safety. There are also concerns for the loss of hedge row and trees. | |
| 3262 | H31 | Comment | Commenting on site H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington: the site is allocated on green belt used for agriculture and would need special circumstances to justify a change of use, removal of small businesses on site for housing would damage the economy, the proposals would damage the character and visual amenity of the village, development of the site would destroy ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking and congestion, suggests widening of East field Lane should only extend the entrance of the road to the housing site, vehicular access issues especially at J2 A166, congestion and access issues around Pear Tree Lane School and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 3431 | H31 | Comment | Much more detail is required of the intended transport links from the proposed site, including how additional cycle paths may ease congestion. | |
| 4804 | H31 | Comment | Commenting on H31 Eastfield Lane Dunnington, expressing issues with; access to site, roads are too narrow to cope, housing density for the site too high, loss of wildlife habitats, concerns for drainage, sewage and low water pressure. | |
| 6204 | H31 | Comment | All services will have to be greatly improved. Water pressure is often poor. There are drainage problems at the bottom of Holly Tree Croft. Estfield Road is very narrow with a dangerous crossroads at the end of it. Can the school take any more pupils? | |
| 6949 | H31 | Comment | Local infrastructure must be improved in Eastfield Lane (in places only 10' wide) Mini roundabout at junction of Stamford Bridge Road. The No. 10 bus service is already full and unreliable. Will services be able to cope with increase in housing i.e. electricity, gas, plus schooling? | |
| 8445 | H31 | Comment | Development should address highway safety issues, notably Church Balk junction. | |
| 10871 | H31 | Comment | Whilst we do not oppose to this development, there are a number of issues which should be addressed first. These include: lack of capacity in schools, public transport, hedgerows, loss of historic nature and environment, poor drainage, water pressure, and the need for footpaths. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 59 | H31 | Objection | Whilst the development of site H31 is not welcome, as access to the village centre, school, public transport and other amenities along Eastfield Lane is narrow and the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is not suitable for the inevitable significant increase in vehicular traffic, it is recognised that this is the least worst option of the sites previously proposed. It squares off the village and removes the less than attractive features of one part of the site. There are significant drainage problems in the village and any such significant development will have to ensure that it does not exacerbate the severe surface water drainage problems that currently exist in times of heavy rain. Water pressure in that part of the village is very low and may cause problems for the rest of the village if no action is taken to improve it. The proposed increase in housing density from the previous Plan is to be regretted as this is likely to reduce the quality of the housing, leading to overcrowding of the site, lack of green space, and the loss of the opportunity for a mixture of housing. Given the topography of the site, any provision for older residents and / or affordable housing should be located with easy access to the surgery and shops on Petercroft Lane. Any development here will also have to deal with the inevitable shortage of school places, play areas and other green spaces due to the increase in population. | Dunnington Parish Council |
| 1056 | H31 | Objection | Road access issues - narrow access and bad junction | |
| 1109 | H31 | Objection | There are concerns over this allocation due to issues with, high density, access, vandalism, loss of openness, loss of Green Belt, surface water drainage, extra traffic, lack of infrastructure, and issues with transport routes. | Dunnington Village Design Statement |
| 1189 | H31 | Objection | There is a cemetery on Eastfield Lane and road is very narrow - totally unsafe for extra traffic. Restricted vision on junction - would need to be improved. | |
| 1898 | H31 | Objection | Grave concerns over access to site. Eastfield Lane is far too narrow and will need widening to cater for the extra traffic. The junction of Eastfield lane towards the water tower is not very good now. There is also a possible drainage issue along Eastfield. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 2511 | H31 | Objection | 84 new homes for this site is too many, will add greatly to the traffic already using Eastfield Lane. Concerned the lane will be widened and ancient hedgerows and habitat will be removed. Traffic calming measures will be required as widening will encourage certain drivers to drive more speedily. | |
| 2517 | H31 | Objection | Object on housing numbers, green belt, access to site, infrastructure (drainage, water supply and sewerage), access to local services, pressure on local schools and doctors surgery and loss of agricultural land. H31 is greenbelt land and has an agricultural restriction placed on it. Development will impact on the open character of the village. The effect on wildlife and scenery in the valley to east of village will be severely affected. This site forms part of the moraine and is productive agricultural land and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change. Eastfield lane is a single track lane with blind bend and no passing places. To expand to an acceptable width land will need to be purchased, removal of hedgerows, possible re-siting of drains. Dangerous junctions would be made worse. | |
| 2551 | H31 | Objection | This site should be re-appraised for transport and accessibility. Recent cuts to local bus service have taken place. Drainage issues exist and a thorough assessment of the situation should be carried out. Development of hard standing and roads could exacerbate run off into current housing. Water stands in the fields in winter months sometimes longer. Access improvements, especially the junction of Eastfield lane and Church Balk should be widened as there is poor visibility here. | |
| 2556 | H31 | Objection | Eastfield Lane is already dangerous. It is too narrow for existing traffic. The junction with Church Balk is particularly bad. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 2628 | H31 | Objection | Should site be developed there would be significant impact on local roads increasing the changes of accidents putting other car users, pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and farm vehicles at greater risk. Eastfield Lane provides a picturesque walk with access to existing footpaths. Fields adjacent to Kerver Lane continue to flood extensively from water run off from the top of Eastfield Lane - development would worsen this affect. Concerned about the flow and natural habitats of wild life especially for owls. The site includes a pond which is home to great crested newts, frogs, toads. A bat survey should be carried out. The primary school is oversubscribed. Flooding and drainage risks associated with developing the site would need to be addressed if development allowed. | |
| 2970 | H31 | Objection | I would like to object to this development due to the following issues, lack of appropriate access, over crowding, lack of facilities, road safety, surface water and flooding, over subscribed doctors and schools. | |
| 3006 | H31 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of inadequate infrastructure (drainage); access/egress from the site. Note possible ancient hedgerow. | |
| 3122 | H31 | Objection | Object on following grounds; *Yorkshire Water already advised Dunnington residents drainage is at full capacity in the village (Eastfield Lane, Holly Tree lane junctions subject to flooding) *Wildlife - many birds use the hedgerows as well as great crested newts - protected species *Roads - existing roads would be unable to cope with increased traffic *Doctors surgery - one has closed leaving only one impacting on waiting times. *Village infrastructure - not geared up for an additional estate. Bus services do not run after 8pm. Roads will need widening, drainage improved, school capacities increased, additional traffic problems. | |
| 3446 | H31 | Objection | Concerned about this allocation in Dunnington due to issues with, increased traffic, road safety, lack of capacity in schools, pressure on the doctors surgery and poor drainage system. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3533 | H31 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of inadequate infrastructure (drainage) and local amenities (schools/doctors); Access/egress from the site extremely difficult and dangerous - Eastfield Lane is too narrow to accommodate traffic. Note impact of additional traffic generated by 600+ home development at Stamford Bridge. | |
| 3536 | H31 | Objection | Additional dwellings will place undue pressure on already inadequate infrastructure including transport, drainage and supporting services (doctors, schools and recreation). | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3582 | H31 | Objection | <p>Object to H31 for the following reasons: There is no planning criteria to consider the effect of the development on the community of Dunnington (no holistic plan for the village); No assessment appears to have been made of the effect of extra housing on either school places or getting children to schools; The site is not, as suggested in the Site Assessment, close to public transport routes or have good access to services in the centre of Dunnington; the number of houses has gone up from 60 to 84 (proposed density of 35dph), which is a massive increase of 40% and is much too high for Dunnington, and totally out of character with the rest of the village; Its location would encourage increased car use; The local infrastructure, esp highways and drainage, would require a costly upgrade (who would pay for this?); Access to the site is very poor, along very narrow country lanes with no passing places (If development were to go ahead, the road would be totally unsuitable for construction traffic) - and any attempt to alter the road would damage the character of the village and hedgerows; Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane (which is used as a shortcut) and has a dangerous junction at the Church Street / Church Balk end; the drainage is inadequate specification and the development will only make matters worse; There is very significant surface water run off from adjacent fields to the north of Eastfield Lane; Houses on Eastfield Lane suffer from low water pressure. Additionally, there are inconsistencies with the scoring of site H31 and other sites in the area. There are major inconsistencies in the way sites in Dunnington, including H31, have been assessed. The allocation is contrary to the NPPF, which allows in filling - this site isn't infilling, it results in a reduction of the area of the York Green Belt. Development of this site in the open countryside will have a significant impact on the rural character of the village. It is therefore inappropriate development in the green belt. Who will pay for upgrading of junctions, highways, drainage and sewage?</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3821 | H31 | Objection | <p>Object to H31 for the following reasons: There is no planning criteria to consider the effect of the development on the community of Dunnington (no holistic plan for the village); No assessment appears to have been made of the effect of extra housing on either school places or getting children to schools; The site is not, as suggested in the Site Assessment, close to public transport routes or have good access to services in the centre of Dunnington; the number of houses has gone up from 60 to 84 (proposed density of 35dph), which is a massive increase of 40% and is much too high for Dunnington, and totally out of character with the rest of the village; Its location would encourage increased car use; The local infrastructure, esp highways and drainage, would require a costly upgrade (who would pay for this?); Access to the site is very poor, along very narrow country lanes with no passing places (If development were to go ahead, the road would be totally unsuitable for construction traffic) - and any attempt to alter the road would damage the character of the village and hedgerows; Extra housing will increase the volume of traffic on this narrow lane (which is used as a shortcut) and has a dangerous junction at the Church Street / Church Balk end; the drainage is inadequate specification and the development will only make matters worse; There is very significant surface water run off from adjacent fields to the north of Eastfield Lane; Houses on Eastfield Lane suffer from low water pressure. Additionally, there are inconsistencies with the scoring of site H31 and other sites in the area. There are major inconsistencies in the way sites in Dunnington, including H31, have been assessed. The allocation is contrary to the NPPF, which allows in filling - this site isn't infilling, it results in a reduction of the area of the York Green Belt. Development of this site in the open countryside will have a significant impact on the rural character of the village. It is therefore inappropriate development in the green belt. Who will pay for upgrading of junctions, highways, drainage and sewage?</p> | |
| 3840 | H31 | Objection | <p>This is a greenfield site and should be left for future generations to grow food. The site is close to the moraine and concerned this would lead to further development of this feature. A natural habitat for wildlife. Drainage from the site may cause flooding of existing houses.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3928 | H31 | Objection | Object to development of H31 on grounds that drainage (inadequate sewerage and storm water drainage within the village) and access (blight on village from the junction, past the cemetery, to new site. It will be important to ensure the single track road beyond the site doesn't become a rat run) are problematic. | |
| 3955 | H31 | objection | The site is allocated on land formerly proposed as green belt, used for agriculture and would need special circumstances to justify a change of use, removal of small businesses on site for housing would damage the economy, the proposals would damage the character and visual amenity of the village, development of the site would destroy ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking and congestion, suggests widening of Eastfield Lane should only extend the entrance of the road to the housing site, vehicular access issues especially at J2 A166, congestion and access issues around Pear Tree Lane School and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 3964 | H31 | Objection | Commenting on H31 Eastfield Lane Dunnington, expressing issues with; sewage and drainage, increased congestion (Main Street, Church Street), schools and services would need to meet the demands of more people and Dunnington has reached saturation point. | |
| 4373 | H31 | Objection | Object on the grounds that there are far more houses per hectare on this site than a number of others - which is out of context with the setting. The current infrastructure of the village cannot cope, road widening would be required, the junction of Church Balk/Church Lane/Church Street/Eastfield Lane is dangerous as its virtually blind. Schools, doctors and public transport would need to review their capacity. Sewage management / surface water management would need to be increased. Loss of wildlife habitats for newts and barn owls. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 4383 | H31 | Objection | <p>Local authorities and public representatives do not fully consider and plan new developments taking into account the interests of all affected parties with a view to long term sustainability - for example, considering junctions / traffic light phasing on nearby roads / traffic flows etc. H31 is totally unsuitable for housing as it "would result in loss of openness that would be harmful to the Green Belt" (Appeal ref APP/C2741/A/12/2187812 The Market Garden, Eastfield Lane). 84 new homes is a lot in a relatively small area - have any traffic flow management studies been undertaken to address the impact of extra cars?. Access concerns - especially on Eastfield Lane which is narrow and has a bad junction at its western end with Church Balk etc. Will it need widening (impacting on hedgerows & wildlife?). Infrastructure - Dunnington has a problem with drainage (esp H31 - which is described by Cranfield University as naturally wet), water supply is low pressure and sewerage is a problem, H31 is a long way from the shops, and other public facilities (inc library, doctors surgery, schools etc); Site is in Green Belt and its development would result in the loss of agricultural land(has agricultural restriction placed on it), wildlife and its development would have an effect on the character of the village; Increased risk of flooding; What criteria was used to select H31 and why were other sites rejected? What % are going to be affordable homes and what will CIL be used for?</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 4384 | H31 | Objection | Local authorities and public representatives do not fully consider and plan new developments taking into account the interests of all affected parties with a view to long term sustainability - for example, considering junctions / traffic light phasing on nearby roads / traffic flows etc. H31 is totally unsuitable for housing as it "would result in loss of openness that would be harmful to the Green Belt" (Appeal ref APP/C2741/A/12/2187812 The Market Garden, Eastfield Lane). 84 new homes is a lot in a relatively small area - have any traffic flow management studies been undertaken to address the impact of extra cars?. Access concerns - especially on Eastfield Lane which is narrow and has a bad junction at its western end with Church Balk etc. Will it need widening (impacting on hedgerows & wildlife?). Infrastructure - Dunnington has a problem with drainage (esp H31 - which is described by Cranfield University as naturally wet), water supply is low pressure and sewerage is a problem, H31 is a long way from the shops, and other public facilities (inc library, doctors surgery, schools etc); Site is in Green Belt and its development would result in the loss of agricultural land (has agricultural restriction placed on it), wildlife and its development would have an effect on the character of the village; Increased risk of flooding; What criteria was used to select H31 and why were other sites rejected? What % are going to be affordable homes and what will CIL be used for? | |
| 4626 | H31 | Objection | Object to H31 for the following reasons: The site is green field, is Grade 2 Agricultural Land, has been cited as green belt in refusing planning applications in the past so should remain green belt, the house currently on the site has an Agricultural Tenancy restriction on it, has poor access (single track lane) which was recognised by CYC when rejecting a traveller site on it, has poor drainage, no nursery provision in Dunnington, no schools within 800m of the site and the local C of E school is full, nearest secondary schools are at Fulford and Huntington, the A166 is very busy, there are significant traffic / parking issues in Dunnington and the development would have a major visual impact on the locality. | |
| 5257 | H31 | objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of inadequate infrastructure (drainage/sewerage); access/egress problems from the site, particularly at Eastfield Lane. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5377 | H31 | Objection | This site has always been regarded as being within the green belt and previous planning applications were refused on grounds that development was not appropriate. NPPF states greenbelt land is to assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment and planning authorities should positively enhance and retain landscapes. Site is greenfield and agricultural grade 2. Development of this site will have a considerable visual impact and will alter the look and character of the village. Notes further issues around: capacity of local schools; drainage/flooding; site access; increased pressure on roads and knock on effect to other routes; note protected hedgerow on north side of eastfield lane. Building on H31 is likely to have a negative effect on SA objectives 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 13. | |
| 5554 | H31 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: overdevelopment; loss of site's agricultural use; visual amenity; inadequate infrastructure (drainage) and local amenities (schools/doctors); Access/egress from the site extremely difficult and dangerous - Eastfield Lane is too narrow to accommodate traffic; pedestrian/highway safety (see rep for detail); exacerbated congestion on A166/A1079 and Grimston Bar roundabout; impact on site's open character and Greenfield/green belt status; Note impact of additional proposals at ST15/ST4/H56, which together add nearly 3800 new homes to the area - this renders H31 completely unnecessary. | |
| 6313 | H31 | Objection | A development of this size is too large for the village for the following reasons: lack of amenities, schools are at full capacity, doctors are full, poor access roads, lack of affordable housing for young people, lack of bungalows for the elderly and increased traffic. | |
| 6519 | H31 | Objection | Access will be difficult and oppose removal of ancient hedgerows and affect that would have on landscape and wildlife. Site will not be close to village amenities and request that if developed area to south of site is designated for elderly housing so there is walking access to amenities on the flat. The proposed density is too high and out of keeping with surrounding area. Surface water and sewerage drainage in Dunnington are under pressure at times of heavy rain and Internal Drainage Board has opposed additional inflow. No additional housing should be allowed in village until these problems are resolved. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 11343 | H31 | Objection | We wish to object to the proposed building due to the following concerns: Vastly increased vehicular traffic, bad visibility, impact on wildlife, loss of walking paths, the environment, lack of parking, damage to grass verges, schools are at capacity and there is a lack of accommodation for elderly residents. This site for development for up to 80 plus properties seems reasonable overall. There are concerns about issues with, access, increased vehicles, increased traffic and drainage issues. | |
| 11348 | H31 | Objection | I would like to object to the allocation of site H31 for housing, particularly the large number of dwellings proposed. The site is a considerable distance from the village primary schools. This causes concerns for road safety and parking issues. The construction of housing on site H31 would represent a loss of valuable wildlife habitat, including Barn owls and Kestrels. | |
| 12218 | H31 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: questions validity of 'need' for this site; detrimental impact of development on local services/facilities; impact on highway safety/traffic congestion; likely to compound local flooding/drainage problems; loss of trees/wildlife habitat. | |
| 12255 | H31 | Objection | Have concerns regarding the access requirements for an additional housing development of 84 new homes at the end of Eastfield Lane. Eastfield Lane is a narrow two-way road which struggles to accommodate the present transport usage and parking arrangements with an awkward poor visibility junction where Eastfield Lane meets Church Balk. At the opposite end, Eastfield Lane is a narrow single track road that is extremely popular with walkers, cyclists joggers and horse riders in addition to local access requirements, farm traffic and other cars "cutting through". Consider that squeezing 84 new homes on to a site of 2.51 hectares would produce a development that is particularly densely populated and not in keeping with the rest of Dunnington Village. | |
| 12265 | H31 | Objection | Consider looking at extending road from Kerver Lane into the development. Eastfield Lane not suitable for more excessive traffic. Junction with Church Bank is a dangerous exit. Village infrastructure - i.e. School and Doctors overcrowded now. Parking problems on Eastfield Lane and York Street. Drainage is a problem on Holly Tree now. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12294 | H31 | Objection | The proposal to build 84 Dwellings on Eastfield Lane requires more planning and consideration. Eastfield Lane is not wide enough. Any widening to the north will require digging into the benching and raising land. This will cause problems with drainage and surface water when it rains. The corner of Eastfield Lane/Church St/Church Lane/Church Balk is already very dangerous. | |
| 12298 | H31 | Objection | Eighty-four more houses will make traffic congestion in Dunnington worse. School traffic will become more dangerous as a result. | |
| 12708 | H31 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on highway safety - site is accessed by single carriageway country land and local junctions are blind/dangerous; site is green belt land; loss of wildlife habitats.; | |
| 12720 | H31 | Objection | Objection to development on the following grounds: overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with general area; impact of large volumes of construction and other traffic on Eastfield Lane; traffic pollution and highway safety; impact on wildlife; drainage/flooding issues; impact on visual amenity of adjacent neighbours; | |
| 12851 | H31 | Objection | I consider this to be an ill thought development, due to concerns for: narrow roads, housing density, loss of character, increased traffic, noise and air pollution, lack of public transport, speeding and concerns about traffic accidents. | |
| 13093 | H31 | Objection | Site H33 is preferable to this site (H31) as part of the land is already in active use as an employment site which would necessitate relocation, improvements and carriageway widening of Eastfield Lane would alter the rural character of the eastern edge of the village and the site does not perform well against the sustainability criteria applied by the council in their sieving of sites. | Yorvik Homes |
| 12264 | H31 | Support | Much prefer this option and support in favour of previous H35 option. Need to widen Eastfield Lane from Church Balk at least up to the housing development. | |
| 13027 | H31 | Support | Supports the proposed allocation of the site which has the potential to provide for a high quality residential development of 84 homes, public open space and associated infrastructure which respects the character of the surrounding area. The proposals are situated in a highly sustainable location. The site is available now, is achievable and will provide the opportunity to help meet York's current and future housing needs | David Wilson Homes |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13182 | H31 | Support | Supports allocation. Site is deliverable and without technical/environmental constraints. Site is in a highly sustainable location and within proximity of key services and facilities. | Barratt & David Wilson Homes |
| 99 | H31 | Support | Development should be accompanied by appropriate investment in infrastructure (water supply/drainage) and services | York Cycle Campaign |
| 2765 | H31 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield part of site. Agree that Greenfield land isn't part of Green Belt. | |
| 2974 | H31 | support | Happy for development to go ahead provided road is widened and kerbed on both sides, and junction with Eastfield Lane/Church Lane improved. Eastfield Lane should also be widened and possibly made one-way? | |
| 3689 | H31 | Support | H31 appears to be the better option (for housing in Dunnington) keeping Eastfield lane as a natural boundary. Access/egress roads should be prioritised - built prior to work on site. | |
| 4782 | H31 | Support | No objection to the principle of development of H31 as it fills an appropriate gap made by surrounding housing. However, it should not involve the removal of hedgerows to widen the road as they are an increasingly rare resource and sparrows & ducks live and forage in them. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13093 | H33 | Objection | <p>Seeks the re-allocation of the site - Water Tower Land Dunnington (H33) for housing development. Land to the east of Church Balk was previously allocated for housing development within both the York Local Plan Preferred Options (June 2013) and the Local Plan Publication Draft (September 2014) - a sustainable location for new housing development. The Site is not significantly constrained, it is available now and there is realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within the first five years of the plan period. It is within walking distance of an existing primary school. The delivery of the site does not rely on the location (sic) of an existing business and access from Church Balk can be facilitated without significant improvements to the highway. The proposed allocation is not considered to impact on the York Moraine or the historic setting of the village. It has the potential to deliver areas of planning gain and performs well against the sustainability and deliverability criteria applied by the Council in previously allocating the site for housing. On the southern side of Church Balk there is a row of dormer bungalows, which form part of a wider suburban estate. The development of these bungalows has already had the effect of shifting the settlement limit of Dunnington to the north of Eastfield Lane. This was acknowledged by officers in their previous technical assessments for housing allocation H33. The development of this area will effectively fill a gap between existing housing along Church Balk to the west, Eastfield Lane to the south, Dunnington Cemetery and its associated expansion site to the east and the water tower to the north. Do not agree that the creation of defensible Green Belt boundaries will be difficult for this site. The boundaries of the site that are not already fully enclosed by existing housing are considered to be clear and defined by physical features that are a recognisable and likely to be permanent in accordance with the criteria of paragraph 85 of the NPPF. The proposed allocation is not considered to impact on the York Moraine or the historic setting of the village as there are other examples of development along the Moraine. This is acknowledged in the conservation appraisal for Dunnington, which explains that it has become one of the larger villages in the city, due to extensive suburban style development.</p> | Yorvik Homes |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 59 | H33 | Support | Eastfield Lane forms a clear and well defined boundary for the northern edge of the village, and provides a significant visual amenity as one enters the village. This land is part of the York Moraine and is currently productive agricultural land within the proposed Green Belt. Inclusion of this land for development would compromise defensible Green Belt boundaries. Any additional housing in this location would potentially make the already precarious surface water drainage issue for the village much worse. The development of this site would impact the junction of Church Balk / Eastfield Lane, which is already problematic. | Dunnington Parish Council |
| 12305 | H33 | Support | Support proposals to delete this site. Reasons; site is not infill, this is agricultural land and green belt and open in character and would be deemed as encroachment. Forms part of York moraine. Has serious surface water drainage issues. Would impact on local road junctions. | |
| 12898 | H33 | Support | Pleased to see H33 removed as this preserves, key geological and topical feature and it contribution for the historic character. | |
| 13155 | H33 | Support | There are issues with the level of housing growth and the negative impact this will have on the environment and wildlife. | |
| 2657 | H33 | Support | Although land is needed for housing this site proposes far too many houses for its size. The site is also currently used for, walking dogs, cycling and enjoying the views of the Wolds. This would be lost through this development. 84 homes planned for this site is far too many. This development would result in Dunnington spreading eastward along Eastfield Lane and necessitate a two lane road. This road is currently used by many people (adults and children) walking dogs, cycling enjoying views of the Wolds and would change the whole character of the village. | |
| 2974 | H33 | Support | Supports removal of site | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3262 | H33 | Support | Development would extend existing village boundaries and encroach on open countryside and the green belt, would harm the character and visual amenity of the village, would threaten the ancient geographical feature the York Moraine, development would destroy ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking and congestion in the centre of the village at the "Cross" area, changes to road may harm the conservation area, concerns over access and congestion around Pear Tree Lane School, the development would over look the cemetery and intrude on people tending to graves and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 3446 | H33 | Support | Concerned about this allocation in Dunnington due to issues with, increased traffic, road safety, lack of capacity in schools, pressure on the doctors surgery and poor drainage system. | |
| 3533 | H33 | Support | Support removal of site | |
| 3536 | H33 | Support | Support removal of site | |
| 3928 | H33 | Support | Support removal of H33 - agree that this site would impinge on the greenbelt and have a major and negative impact on the entrance to the village | |
| 3955 | H33 | Support | Development would extend existing village boundaries and encroach on open countryside and the green belt, would harm the character and visual amenity of the village, would threaten the ancient geographical feature the York Moraine, development would destroy ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking and congestion in the centre of the village at the "Cross" area, changes to road may harm the conservation area, concerns over access and congestion around Pear Tree Lane School, the development would over look the cemetery and intrude on people tending to graves and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 6519 | H33 | Support | Please to see removal of this site as it would have greatly affected entrance to village. Eastfield Lane forms a strong boundary to green belt and should be retained. | |
| 10871 | H33 | Support | This site has always been regarded as Green Belt. There would have been issues with, loss of open character, loss of agricultural land, loss of visual amenity, lack of surface water drainage and poor road safety. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12560 | H34 | Objection | Object to the deletion of this site for development as considered to be a deliverable and sustainable small site able to feed into the short-term housing supply. Transport and Access Appraisal show site can be accessed. Site should be removed from Green Belt - does not perform GB purposes. Consider Council's reasoning for deletion unsound. | DPP Planning |
| 305 | H34 | Objection | The site is no longer proposed as a preferred housing site. Our client strongly disagrees with the rejection of this site in the Preferred sites document. It is considered that the site represents as suitable available and achievable housing. The site is bounded by large hedgerows and trees to all sides which Taylor Wimpey would look to retain under their proposal. The church Lane site is suitable and sustainable for housing development, which would provide circa 34 dwellings along side an area of central public space. The site is on the rural- urban fringe and part of the large village of Skelton. It is considered that the identified issues do not pose significant constraints. We are confident that adequate access can be achieved from Church Land and that pedestrian and cycle provisions can also be met. It is considered that the site should not be removed as a housing allocation as a housing allocation from the emerging Local Plan on conservation grounds. The site is available now and comprises a viable development opportunity in terms of land value, attractiveness and market demand and could contribute to the five year housing land supply. | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd |
| 5410 | H34 | Objection | H34 should be brought back into the Plan | |
| 75 | H34 | Support | Support for the removal of H34 | Skelton P.C. |
| 77 | H34 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186, should be removed from the Plan | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |
| 6510 | H34 | Support | Support for the removal of H34 | Skelton Village Action Group |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 1718 | H35 | Objection | We are promoting the development of land to the South of Intake Lane Dunnington as a new allocation for residential development in the settlement. The proposed site meets the NPPF test of deliverability in terms of availability, suitability and achievability | |
| 5826 | H35 | Objection | Site (Land at Intake Lane, Dunnington) should be retained in the Plan. Access could be achieved through careful planning and co-ordination with site H31. | |
| 9381 | H35 | Objection | Object to proposed deletion of H35 and also objects to suggested housing requirement and lack of safeguarded land policy and allocations along with density assumptions (particularly in rural villages) and assumed delivery from ST34 and ST5. CYCs position is clear certain previously proposed allocations have been modified or deleted - this does not mean these sites are unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Rather that CYC now consider these sites or part of them are less preferable than those allocated. The site was assessed as part of CYCs rigorous site selection methodology in previous draft Local Plan documents and CYC must at the time have satisfied themselves that the site is available, suitable and achievable at the time when the site is intended to deliver homes. CYC must accept that the site is a proposed housing allocation in the preferred options and it serves no or limited green belt purpose. The revised evidence base, primarily the alleged lower housing requirements sought to reduce allocations, one being H35. The Local Plan conversely gives a technical or planning reason or reasons - that are disputed. It is shown that developers have an option to acquire the H31 site, this option requires developers to provide access through to allow development of H35. We demonstrate that the layout plan prepared to guide development of H31 shows access from Eastland's Lane through the development and terminating on the southern boundary of that site. Also we demonstrate the developer of H35 controls all land up to the southern boundary of H31. On this basis there is no access constraint to development of the site. We also show the OAHN is deficient and underestimates housing need, this is exacerbated by the over estimation of delivery from certain sites (e.g. ST5 and ST34). | Linden Homes |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 59 | H35 | Support | Development of this site would require access from Intake Lane, which is a narrow lane at this point. Any development on this site will probably precipitate development of the north side of Intake Lane, which would lose the rural character of the existing cluster of 4 houses further along the lane. The lane itself is of particular value to the village as it is used regularly for walking to Hagg Wood and the surrounding countryside as part of Route 66. | Dunnington Parish Council |
| 12264 | H35 | Support | Much prefer H31 option and support in favour of previous H35 option. | |
| 12305 | H35 | Support | Support proposals to delete this site | |
| 12708 | H35 | Support | Supports the removal of site given the potential impact on protected species; disturbance/removal of wildlife corridors; threat of flooding. | |
| 13093 | H35 | Support | Site H33 is more preferable to this site (H35) as the additional land which would need to be purchased to enable access to the intake lane site constitutes a showstopper | Yorvik Homes |
| 13155 | H35 | Support | There are issues with the level of housing growth and the negative impact this will have on the environment and wildlife. | |
| 3262 | H35 | Support | Commenting on Lane at Intake Lane, Dunnington: development would extend existing village boundaries and encroach on open countryside and the green belt, would harm the character and visual amenity of the village, the site is "landlocked" as requires the purchase of some of the allocated land, development would threaten ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking widening highways and congestion (Common Rd and Intake Lane), road works would cause damage the village character, concerns of access and congestion around Pear Tree Lane School, and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 3446 | H35 | Support | Concerned about this allocation in Dunnington due to issues with, increased traffic, road safety, lack of capacity in schools, pressure on the doctors surgery and poor drainage system. | |
| 3533 | H35 | Support | Support removal of site | |
| 3536 | H35 | Support | Support removal of site | |
| 3928 | H35 | Support | Support removal of H35 - agree the access is an insurmountable problem and note that the development would have had a major impact on an already busy part of the village. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3955 | H35 | Support | Commenting on Lane at Intake Lane, Dunnington; development would extend existing village boundaries and encroach on open countryside and the green belt, would harm the character and visual amenity of the village, the site is "landlocked" as requires the purchase of some of the allocated land, development would threaten ancient native hedgerows, the development would seriously affect drainage capacity and cause moor flooding, negative impacts on parking widening highways and congestion (Common Rd and Intake Lane), road works would cause damage the village character, concerns of access and congestion around Pear Tree Lane School, and increased demand for facilities in Dunnington requiring extra funding. | |
| 6519 | H35 | Support | Please to see removal of this site would strongly oppose if access from Intake Lane became available meaning village would spread beyond what are now seen as country cottages. Encroachment to Hagg Wood would be undesirable. | |
| 10871 | H35 | Support | There would have been issues with poor access and increased traffic. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12389 | H37 | Objection | Alternative site proposed at former H37, land adjacent to Greystone Court, Haxby. | WESTFIELD LODGE AND YALDARA LTD |
| 63 | H37 | Support | Support the removal of H37. This site would add about 100 more cars directly on to Greystone Court and Eastfield Avenue, which cannot cope with these traffic levels. | Haxby Town Council |
| 77 | H37 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186, should be removed from the Plan | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |
| 12542 | H37 | Support | Support the removal of H37. This site would add about 100 more cars directly on to Greystone Court and Eastfield Avenue, which cannot cope with these traffic levels. | |
| 12550 | H37 | Support | Supports reduced scale of development in Haxby | |
| 5329 | H37 | Support | Supports removal of site | |
| 9970 | H37 | Support | Support the removal of H37. This site would add about 100 more cars directly on to Greystone Court and Eastfield Avenue, which cannot cope with these traffic levels. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1355 | H38 | Comment | Notes residents' concerns about issues with: flooding, drainage and traffic. These issues should be solved before development takes place. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 806 | H38 | Objection | Object to the development of this site as too large a scale for the village, against the village plan, site has drainage and flooding issues and access too narrow for emergency services and to cope with cars from 33 additional homes. | |
| 2548 | H38 | Objection | Object to proposed 33 homes in Rufforth. The area already has severe sewage problems - new homes will only make it worse. Middle Wood Close is not a wide road and suffers from congestion. | |
| 2765 | H38 | Objection | Development of this Greenfield land will alter village character, inadequate infrastructure / transport provision. | |
| 5826 | H38 | Objection | The site should not be earmarked for housing. As the site is directly adjacent to Rufforth Primary School, it should be reserved for potential future expansion of the school and its outdoor / play space. Instead, the plot immediately south should be earmarked for housing, with access available from the lane behind the church. There is also potential for further development on a plot north of Milestone Avenue within the fields strongly defined by hedgerows and trees. | |
| 10948 | H38 | Objection | I oppose anymore building in Rufforth unless a bypass is built. | |
| 12237 | H38 | Objection | Already have drainage problems on this site and 33 extra houses will make it worse. It will be close to a large pig shed which will be built nearby - surely a health hazard | |
| 12352 | H38 | Objection | We would like to raise our concerns on several points to oppose the proposed site for the following concerns: increased density, loss of green belt, poor sewerage and drainage systems, traffic, disruption to the community and village balance, limited amenities, lack of bus routes, would not fit in with the aesthetics of the village and would be a road safety issue to families and elderly people. | |
| 12493 | H38 | Objection | Objecting to H38 as its too much for this small village, the school is at capacity, there are traffic issues and speeding vehicles. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|---|
| 12578 | H38 | Objection | CYC's elected members fail to demonstrate they have taken views of population into account re comments previously made to this proposed housing site. The site is green belt and should be protected. It supports a wide range of wildlife enhanced by an additional hedgerow. Issues surround sewerage system at back of Middlewood Close and Yorkshire Water have failed to improve situation. Land is clay based and suffers flooding issues, additional housing would significantly reduce drainage and soak away further. Increase in traffic causes concerns. Bus service continues to be cut. Cycle paths do not provide safe route to York. Middlewood Close footpath is very narrow and traffic calming measures have failed to slow traffic. Parking and congestion problems are experienced. Access onto Wetherby road from the site would make junction unsafe and difficult. An additional 10% housing to village would have an impact on community feel of village. | |
| 13061 | H38 | Objection | Concerns relating to development of this site are; Flood risk - the land is very wet and drainage will be made significantly worse by the loss of this green belt. Traffic - Middlewood Close is a small road , increasing traffic levels will cause significant problems at the junction and for the rest of Rufforth using Wetherby Road.. School Capacity - the school is already at capacity. Pig Barn - a pig breeding barn has been approved in fields adjacent to H38. The proposed houses at H38 would mean this facility is closer to domestic dwellings than when approval was granted. Character - houses on Middlewood Close, Yew Tree Close and other residences on Wetherby Road will lose their rural aspect. Furthermore, the boundary of the village to the greenbelt will be significantly disturbed. | |
| 74 | H38 | Support | Support the proposal in principle, with attached conditions regarding mix/type, parking, sewerage and drainage. See rep. | Rufforth and Knapton PC |
| 12648 | H38 | Support | I am pleased this area is allocated for residential use as this will help our housing shortage, with incentives for residents and young people to stay locally, also helping to keep the village alive as is away from the main road and not too many houses to affect traffic. | |
| 12660 | H38 | Support | We support the proposal. | Rufforth and Knapton Neighbourhood Planning Group |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13127 | H38 | support | Supports site in principle. New affordable housing in Rufforth can only be a good thing. Some concerns raised: houses should be in scale and designed in sympathy with existing properties. There must be provision for off-road car parking for new homes. A separate car park/drop off zone should be created as a core part of the development so as to relieve the school run pressure on Yew Tree Close and Middlewood Close. A separate pedestrian access to the rear of the school is highly desirable. Drainage and sewerage handling capacity has long been a problem here - any development must take this into account. Increasing the village size by 10% would justify a better bus service. | |
| 2356 | H38 | Support | Support for Rufforth Primary School site - Note the requirement for infrastructure improvements should development proceed, namely additional school spaces and upgrading/renewal of drainage. Site could provide a mix of housing: small affordable starter homes and bungalows (downsizing). | |
| 8026 | H38 | Support | Support the proposal in principle, with attached conditions regarding drainage. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 9381 | H38 | Support | <p>The site was assessed as part of CYCs rigorous site selection methodology and as a result of passing the process the site was proposed as a housing allocation in previous versions of the draft local plan. Suitability of the site is not therefore in question. (although note also amended site boundary). Access to the site would be off Middlewood Close which joins Wetherby Road, the main road through the settlement. NPPF indicates that to be considered deliverable sites should be available now, offer a suitable location and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within 5 years and in particular that development is viable. This site is available now. The site is located on eastern edge of Rufforth directly adjacent to the existing settlement, thus the site is both physically and visually very well related to the urban area. Rufforth offers a range of shops and services including a public house, village store, tea room, primary school and church. Therefore Rufforth is regarded as a sustainable location. Bus stops are within close proximity of the site, consequently the site is well connected to nearby facilities as well as those further afield. The site is plainly suitable for housing development, a fact recognised in all stages of the Local Plan process. The site is a flat green field parcel of land currently in agricultural use and access would be off Middlewood Close which forms a simple 'T' with Wetherby Road - neither of which have capacity issues. Given the site is in agricultural use it is unlikely to have any material nature conservation value. The site is entirely in Flood Zone 1 and is not, therefore, recognised to be at risk from flooding. Foul water will be directed to public sewers. Development of this site is plainly achievable.</p> | Linden Homes |
| 10946 | H38 | Support | <p>I feel that the Local plan, insofar as it affects Rufforth, has achieved the right balance between housing growth and the need to retain the Green Belt.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3 | H39 | Comment | Site is located close to River Derwent and Derwent Valley SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI. This is a designated site which is failing to meet its protected area objectives and WFD objectives and efforts to improve this stretch of river and associated water dependent habitats come under the Derwent Restoration Plan. One of the key issues is sediment. Should the site remain as an allocation it would be critical to ensure that sediment from the construction site does not end up in the River or local ditches. Ideally Surface Water should not be discharged into the river. Checks must be made by CYC to ensure that no cross connections on completion to ensure no contamination | Environment Agency |
| 12151 | H39 | Comment | Commenting on H39, that more transport planning should be done, especially on Church Lane. | |
| 12759 | H39 | Comment | The are issue with this development as the road systems are full, flooding issues, drainage issues and general traffic concerns. | |
| 1355 | H39 | Comment | Concerned about this site due to issues with the extra traffic that will be generated and the negative impact this will have on local residence. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 2412 | H39 | Comment | Original plan was for 29 homes, now 32(10% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 10842 | H39 | Comment | Commenting on H39 that, current infrastructure is insufficient for this development. | |
| 61 | H39 | Objection | A previous inspector determined this site serves green belt purposes. Extra traffic would be generated from 32 homes and adversely impact on exiting residents of Beckside. Density of homes should be similar to existing Beckside development to minimise any 'difference' to the phases. | Elvington PC |
| 657 | H39 | Objection | Objection - historic conservation area surrounding this site, impact of extra traffic on currently relatively child safe rural village (site now for 32 not 25 dwellings!), already been subject of public inquiry (1992/3) Inspector stated site should remain open in order to fulfil Green Belt functions, Inappropriate to exclude from greenbelt as likely access issues that would cause harm to character of village or amenity of exiting residents | |
| 671 | H39 | Objection | Area serves green belt function and is of local leisure value (access to PROW). Development would be out of character with the village. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1008 | H39 | Objection | Site is effectively an extension to existing Becks Estate, and the increased population would further impact on congestion and access to local amenities. Sites has existing drainage issues and ridge and furrow. | |
| 1057 | H39 | Objection | <p>*H39 is an important part of the village vernacular bang only a short walk from the village centre and in a completely rural and tranquil setting - this should not be lost</p> <p>*significant habitat for wildlife</p> <p>*green belt land</p> <p>*nature of village will be destroyed and one of only few villages around York with village ambience important to York area</p> <p>*historically important lane runs along side site linking villages of Wheldrake, Thorganby and beyond</p> | |
| 1399 | H39 | Objection | In the absence of a HRA having been completed, this allocation is at risk of being neither legally compliant with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 nor sound, as it may not be effective, justified or consistent with national planning policy. | RSPB |
| 1666 | H39 | Objection | Site ST26 should be replaced in the Local Plan with H39. | |
| 1667 | H39 | Objection | Object to proposed development at H39 - that would lead to erosion of character of the village and should not be considered without careful assessment of local infrastructures ability to absorbed the additional populace - particularly on the local school and sewerage capacity | |
| 2765 | H39 | Objection | I agree with Neighbour Objections relating to village character & outside existing built-up area. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3220 | H39 | Objection | Wish to object to Site H39 - Elvington is a village set in the green belt its village character contributes to the overall character of the Greater York area. H39 would have a severe and disproportionate and irrevocable negative impact on this character. The site is long established green belt and has been put forward as the only allocation for the village without prior consultation with villages/parish council. There are more acceptable sites for development locally e.g. H26 behind the school. In 1992/3 LP Inquiry an Inspector concluded it should remain in the green belt. Expansion would be contrary to NPPF (see Para 86) and to its shape and form and would represent sub-urban style housing, encroachment on to the countryside and impingement upon the historic core and character of the village. Church Lane is a quiet cul de sac for traffic but a lengthy lane for walkers and horses into the countryside. Much of this lane is within the Conservation Area. The site would not be 'rounding off' and bears no relation to the structure and form of the village. A large housing estate would not be in keeping with the surroundings or other modern developments. Elvington lies astride the B1228 - any further development in the area will impose additional traffic problems upon an already dangerous road which is used by much HGV traffic as a short cut to the M62. | |
| 3532 | H39 | Objection | Object to this site as a previous Planning Inspector ruled this site would affect the character of the village and site should remain in green belt. There are flooding problems in Church lane adjacent to the Grange entrance caused by water running off the field and flooding road for 10 days. 32 properties could generate 60 new vehicles passing through Beckside and accessing the B1228 in middle of main Street already a busy road. | |
| 3598 | H39 | Objection | This allocation causes concerns for loss of character, loss of Green Belt, flooding, increased traffic, road safety and narrow footpaths. Strongly object to development of this site - previously an Inspector ruled that this would radically affect the character of the village and the site should remain in the greenbelt. Thirty two properties could generate at least sixty vehicles passing through Beckside to access the B1228 in the middle of Main Street which has a narrow footpath for children to walk along to go to school. Any additional traffic would add to congestion of Grimston Bar roundabout. | |
| 5153 | H39 | objection | Some additional housing in Elvington is sensible however Land at Dauby Lane would be a more appropriate site - housing density/type is not compatible with the village need and/or other developments; The village has a shortage of larger 4/5 bedroom houses and development should concentrate on these. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5259 | H39 | Objection | Oppose the proposal as a previous inspector confirmed that H39 serves Green Belt purposes. The proposed density is not in keeping with the existing Beckside development | |
| 5284 | H39 | Objection | Objects to development on the site on the following grounds: site serves greenbelt purposes; development would alter character of the village; impact on wildlife; infrastructure under capacity; impact on traffic congestion; likely to exacerbate existing drainage problems; loss of informal children's play space. | |
| 5536 | H39 | Objection | Beckside is a settled and family orientated estate, development will spoil all of present owners with more traffic, noise, pollution and added dangers for children. | |
| 5571 | H39 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: detrimental impact on conservation area/wildlife habitats; site is green field, and development will impact on the rural feel of the village and residents' ability to use this as open space; infrastructure under provision; potential for congestion. | |
| 5572 | H39 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: detrimental impact on conservation area/wildlife habitats; site is green field, and development will impact on the rural feel of the village and residents' ability to use this as open space; infrastructure under provision; potential for congestion. | |
| 5738 | H39 | Objection | Object on grounds of loss of Green Belt, extra traffic on estate, more housing adversely affecting residents, extra traffic congestion on Beckside estate and Main Street. | |
| 9528 | H39 | Objection | The Local Plan fails to adequately describe any supporting infrastructure. The level of traffic on Elvington Lane is already very high. This adds further pressure. Also additional pressure on facilities within Elvington - GP Sewage | |
| 9726 | H39 | Objection | Amazed this site is still being considered and local people were not listened to. Site looks as if it would square off the existing development in Beckside, however, when visiting the site it is very rural in nature. Site runs along Church Lane and much used by dog walkers, walkers, and children playing safely. Supportive of more housing in general but this is driven by financial considerations rather than needs of local people. | |
| 9803 | H39 | Objection | General objection on the grounds that the site is currently green belt and existing infrastructure cannot cope with the scale of development proposed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 9917 | H39 | Objection | Land is currently green belt Larger properties are required in Elvington for families. Additional congestion on main Elvington/York road. | |
| 9934 | H39 | Objection | Very difficult to access because of parked cars and access very narrow. | |
| 9937 | H39 | Objection | 32 New dwellings will be built on green field land bringing more private vehicles to the village adding to existing congestion and pollution. This will adversely impact on nearby Beckside development with resultant public safety concerns. Could have impact on wildlife and near to Statutory Nature Conservation Site. | |
| 10047 | H39 | Objection | Although not objecting to new development in Elvington as a whole, objecting to H39. The development is on a site previously determined by an Inspector to be serving green belt purposes. The southern hedge boundary is also of SINC quality, identified in the York Biodiversity Action Plan (Site E50). Hedgerow is diverse mature deciduous trees (inc TPOs) - forms important wildlife link with Wheldraken Ings and River Derwent - would be severely impaired by housing. Current greenfield site and hedgerow are contiguous with conservation area for the village which links to the River Derwent and Church Lane - forms part of the Minster Way. Need to have regard to safeguarding species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994, and the Badgers Act 1992. Any application must be accompanied by a Biodiversity/Geological Survey & Report. The extra traffic both within Beckside and exiting on to Main Street would adversely impact on existing residents. | |
| 10073 | H39 | Objection | Objecting to site H39 North of Church Lane, Elvington, Due to concerns over; loss of the green belt, loss of the village character and quality of life, destruction of wildlife, infrastructure is at full capacity, traffic and congestion, loss of the Backside dead end that children play on, | |
| 10175 | H39 | Objection | This site should be withdrawn because of the extra traffic generated on Beckside estate road and Main Street. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 10459 | H39 | Objection | Having lived in Elvington for 24 years have witnessed an increase in traffic and parking on roadside in Beckside and the increased volumes of traffic caused by new homes would be very dangerous for children playing in the cul de sac. There are queues of traffic on busy local roads in the morning . The site serves green belt purposes and development would radically alter character of village and affect the many residents that use the area for enjoyment/recreational purposes (walking, horse riding, enjoying wildlife) Negative impacts on character and infrastructure and quality of life would result as village is already full to capacity - drainage is already a problem with many areas flooding. | |
| 10488 | H39 | Objection | Having lived in Elvington for 24 years have witnessed an increase in traffic and parking on roadside in Beckside and doubt emergency services could get access. Children have played quite safely in Beckside with one minor accident some time ago. Children learn to ride bikes and scooters as playground is too far away and B1228 unsafe for young children to ride/walk to. 32 new homes would add potentially 64 more cars that will radically alter the character and safety aspect of Beckside. Accept new homes are needed but Elvington is not a village to be increased in size. The School and medical practice would not easily cope with additional numbers. Yorkshire Water admit facilities are working to full capacity. The B1228 is a very congested road. Leave Elvington and its green belt alone. | |
| 10527 | H39 | Objection | The proposed development for 32 homes would feel too great an impact on the village structure and way of life and have an environmental impact on what is already designated as green belt (green field) site and only a short distance from Statutory Nature Conservation Site - River Derwent SAC/SPA/RAMSAR. Church Lane is a well used area for walking, exercise in dogs an horses and one of few areas providing quiet rural feel within easy distance from village centre. Southern boundary of site is a wonderful series of trees providing an avenue effect. Housing built adjacent would have a significant impact on whole character of the village. Church lane in parts experiences frequent flooding in times of heavy rainfall which would be exacerbated with additional homes/access roads/hard standing being built. In 21 years since this planning refusal Elvington has accepted its share of development both residential and industrial. The developments are not designed for local needs but for net migration to village. Loss of green belt is a major concern. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 10543 | H39 | Objection | Objecting to the inclusion of site H39 due to issues with, negative impact on the rural nature of the village, damage to hedgerows and trees, negative environmental impact, density of the village, increased traffic and HGV vehicles and the loss of the green belt. | |
| 10632 | H39 | Objection | Church Lane is a well used area for walking, exercise in dogs and horses and one of few areas providing quiet rural feel within easy distance from village centre. Southern boundary of site is a wonderful series of trees providing an avenue effect. Housing built adjacent would have a significant impact on whole character of the village. Church lane in parts experiences frequent flooding in times of heavy rainfall which would be exacerbated with additional homes/access roads/hard standing being built. In 21 years since this planning refusal Elvington has accepted its share of development both residential and industrial. The developments are not designed for local needs but for net migration to village. Loss of green belt is a major concern. These houses would have an environmental impact on what is already a green field/ green belt site and only a short distance from Statutory Nature Conservation Site - River Derwent SAC/SPA/RAMSAR. | |
| 10697 | H39 | Objection | H39 should be replaced by H26 - where access is better closer to school, doctors surgery and sports field. | |
| 11367 | H39 | Objection | This would be an extension to existing housing development of Beckside that already has traffic issues with cars parking on roads due to lack of space - this will only compound the problems. Elvington is short of small family homes and larger family housing. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12312 | H39 | Objection | Question methodology in which parcels of land are assessed in their importance in contributing to green belt objectives. Site statement that ' site is not considered to serve green belt purposes' and rounding off of settlements is not in itself a sustainability objective the variability of the urban fringe is a quality that contributes to the character of landscape around villages in the greenbelt - a planning inspector has previously concluded 'this site served greenbelt purposes and that its development would radically alter the character of the village'. H39 lies within 250m of a RAMSAR, SAC/SPA and SSSI and Natural England assessed in 2009 that the River Derwent was in an unfavourable condition and the EA is working with them to restore the river. This development would introduce approx 77 residents to the part of the village closest to the river who will use the footpath by the Church to access the countryside alongside the Derwent and will include additional dog walkers. Pet predation of wildlife is a significant concern. These pressures are likely to work against the restoration of the river and H39 is likely to require a HRA to determine if development would significantly affect the RAMSA/SAC/SPA. Access to site - Church Lane is not a suitable access and is recognised in the notes, therefore access is likely via Beckside and with each | |
| 12516 | H39 | Objection | Objects to development on the grounds of: inappropriate development on greenbelt land (see Inspector's report); likely to exacerbate existing flooding issues (Main Street and Church Lane); highway safety issues. | |
| 12597 | H39 | Objection | Disruption to the village when flooding occurs. Village can't take any more cars - its used as a shortcut to the motorway and also used as a road for farmers to get to their fields. Development of this site would be devastating to those who already live here. | |
| 12598 | H39 | Objection | Elvington is a small rural village with a single-drag road leading to a very busy road and a very congested Grimston Bar | |
| 12618 | H39 | Objection | Objecting to H39 due to: disturbance to the green belt and wildlife, disruption to walkways around church lane, danger to children through increased traffic, increased pressure on drainage systems and infrastructure and housing not meeting the need for larger 4 bedroomed properties. | |
| 12650 | H39 | Objection | Objecting due to issues with, extra volumes of traffic and over population. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12664 | H39 | Objection | This previously been afforded green belt status and development would be in contravention of that ruling. There is not enough infrastructure in place to support an additional 32 homes and extra traffic would adversely affect existing residents in Beckside, Be Close and Belvoir Ave. | |
| 12665 | H39 | Objection | H39 has already been determined as green belt - there would be an impact on safety of current residents with increased traffic. Whilst there is a real local need for housing but old H26 Dauby Lane site would be a preferable location. | |
| 12719 | H39 | Objection | The current Beckside site is large enough. | |
| 12729 | H39 | Objection | This proposed development would spoil forever this quiet lane | |
| 12730 | H39 | Objection | This lane should be a conservation area. Ancient woodland etc needs cherishing | |
| 12735 | H39 | Objection | I object to H39 as I enjoy the wildlife on the lane and know this would be compromised. The Roe Deer we see regularly will disappear. | |
| 12736 | H39 | Objection | I object to new houses as this quiet lane would never be the same and the oldest part of the village should be preserved. | |
| 12774 | H39 | Objection | I object to this site based on the following concerns: dramatic increase in housing density, poor access, loss of visual amenity, drainage issues, loss of wildlife, loss of green belt, loss of trees, children will not be able to play in the street safely, flooding, speeding vehicles, increased traffic, noise and air pollution, stretched local amenities and loss of rural feel to our village. | |
| 12775 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development based on the following concerns: loss of green belt, loss of trees, loss of wildlife, drainage issues, access, visual amenity, unsustainable, lack of employment, transport, schools and surgeries are full, dramatic increase in housing density, increased vehicles and traffic, children will not be able to play in the street safely, loss of rural and historic character, noise and air pollution, road safety and congestion. | |
| 12779 | H39 | Objection | Objecting to H39 as this will spoil the peaceful old part of the village, a development with a better access main road is needed. | |
| 12780 | H39 | Objection | Objecting to the site as this area has the oldest housing in the village and should be preserved and development will impact on the wildlife. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12902 | H39 | Objection | H39 should be removed from the Local Plan due to concerns for: damage to biodiversity and the conservation site, loss of green belt, extra traffic and the access should not include Alvin Walk and Beck Close. | |
| 12904 | H39 | Objection | I request that you withdraw proposal H39 for the following reasons: problems with increased traffic, the development should have been in line with the Breckside, lack of infrastructure including water and sewage and low water pressure. | |
| 12961 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as the village needs some peaceful areas and this is the only one. | |
| 12962 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development for the following reasons: loss of the quiet peaceful lane, negative impact on local wildlife and flooding. | |
| 12963 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as our peaceful lane will be lost. | |
| 12964 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as this would be a disaster for this peaceful village. | |
| 12965 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as it will create a noisy busy area which will impact my commute to work. | |
| 12966 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as our peaceful lane will be lost. | |
| 12967 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as t quiet peaceful lane will be lost and the area should be preserved. | |
| 12968 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as the village would lose its only quiet part. | |
| 12969 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as our peaceful lane will be lost and it should be preserved. | |
| 12970 | H39 | Objection | I object to this development as our peaceful lane will be lost and it should be preserved. | |
| 12971 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the wildlife being effected, especially Green Woodpeckers and Barn Owls. | |
| 12972 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This development would ruin this quiet Lane and escape. | |
| 12973 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This development would ruin this quiet retreat. | |
| 12974 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This development would ruin this area. | |
| 12975 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Dont spoil our peaceful lane. | |
| 12976 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This development would ruin this area. | |
| 12977 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This lane needs to be preserved. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12978 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This quiet lane needs to be preserved. | |
| 12979 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This lane needs to be preserved. | |
| 12980 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This lane needs to be preserved. | |
| 12981 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Dont spoil our peaceful lane. | |
| 12982 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. The development is too close to Church Lane and will spoilt the oldest part of the village. Old trees which line the lane support a lot of wildlife and this will be lost. | |
| 12983 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This development would ruin this area forever. | |
| 12984 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Dont spoil our peaceful lane. | |
| 12985 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the wildlife being effected. | |
| 12986 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This area should be a conservation area. | |
| 12987 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about issues with the loss of wildlife, flooding, destruction of a quiet area, poor drainage and loss of the views. | |
| 12988 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This area should be a conservation area. | |
| 12989 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the wildlife being effected and the area would be spoilt. | |
| 12990 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the wildlife being effected. | |
| 12991 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the loss of wildlife and the oldest part of the village. | |
| 12992 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the impact on wildlife and loss of the quietness of the lane. | |
| 12993 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Please don't spoil our peaceful lane. | |
| 12994 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. This area should be a conservation area. | |
| 12995 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Concerned about the wildlife being effected. | |
| 12996 | H39 | Objection | I object to the proposed development. Please don't spoil our peaceful lane. | |
| 13163 | H39 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: site serves green belt purposes; development would negatively impact on the character of the village and residents' quality of life; impact on wildlife; infrastructure is at capacity; impact on existing congestion; loss of informal children's' play space; drainage problems. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 6046 | H39 | Support | General support for housing allocation and confirmation through additional commentary that still suitable, deliverable and viable. Suggest that site viable to deliver 28 dwellings. Larger boundary could be accommodated without detrimental effect on Green Belt or village. Existing village boundary not defensible in long-term. | Directions Planning |
| 1150 | H39 | Support | If new development to take place in Elvington, Becksides is best place as adjacent development has roads and utilities in place to be extended into H39. | |
| 11728 | H39 | Support | I have come to accept that Elvington needs some new homes. I believe that H39 is an entirely logical site for the erecting of a further 30+ houses. I fail to see how the development of H39 could possibly have any more negative impacts than the site H26. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5410 | H40 | Objection | H40 should be brought back into the Plan | |
| 12354 | H40 | Support | I find that the new proposals for Copmanthorpe are more acceptable and manageable, without putting pressure on health facilities, schools, roads and other infrastructure in the village. | |
| 12355 | H40 | Support | We would like to express our support for your recent decision to protect the Green Belt at this site. | |
| 12358 | H40 | Support | I would like to register my support for the proposals that in the triangle between the A64 and the railway at the North East corner of the village. | |
| 12359 | H40 | Support | The Copmanthorpe Local Plan seems to be a satisfactory compromise between the need to increase York's housing stock without swamping an established community. | |
| 12369 | H40 | Support | The 2016 draft local plan is more acceptable with its proposal for up to 250 houses. | |
| 12374 | H40 | Support | I support the new plan for housing in Copmanthorpe that proposes up to 250 houses in the village. Hopefully this new proposal will not put too much pressure in future years on the important health facilities, schools and roads as the previous 2014 draft plan would have done. | |
| 12396 | H40 | Support | If this development were to go ahead there would be issues with lack of infrastructure, additional traffic, noise, lack of schools, lack of buses, lack of medical facilities, libraries and overall concerns for social issues. | |
| 12398 | H40 | Support | I agree with the proposal for new housing in Copmanthorpe. If development were to go ahead this would cause issues with, loss of Green Belt, narrow and congested roads, lack of parking and additional traffic. | |
| 12403 | H40 | Support | The 3 sites identified suit the needs of Copmanthorpe and the Green Belt. If further housing was allowed it would affect the value of the existing houses. | |
| 12411 | H40 | Support | I agree to the new draft local plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12415 | H40 | Support | The drafts for housing on the sites in Copmanthorpe mentioned appear to be fair. As there would be issues with lack of, schools, parking, doctors, roads, increased traffic and road safety. | |
| 12417 | H40 | Support | I am happy with the proposals made in the Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12432 | H40 | Support | I feel that the village infrastructure will cope much better with the reduced developments and we are also protecting the valuable Green Belt. | |
| 12435 | H40 | Support | I support the new draft Local Plan for CYC with reference to Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12438 | H40 | Support | I welcome the suggested reduction in the new building in the village. In my view 250 new homes would be manageable with the current resources in the village. Also retention of land as Green Belt is very desirable. | |
| 12439 | H40 | Support | The new Local Plan is preferable to the 2014 plan. Can we be sure if current proposals go ahead that this site wont go head too. | |
| 12492 | H40 | Support | Supportive of the proposed development plans for companthorpe, specifically to limit development, which would put a strain on facilities and maintain the green belt. | |
| 12496 | H40 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that proposes 250 houses for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12641 | H40 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that minimises development in Copmanthorpe | |
| 12810 | H40 | Support | Please keep Copmanthorpe an attractive place to enter and live in. | |
| 12820 | H40 | Support | Supporting the most recent draft of the Local Plan for Companthorpe, due to a reduction in allocations allowing some growth but also limiting pressure on facilities and roads in the village. | |
| 12882 | H40 | Support | We are particularly pleased that this site has been removed. We hope that this site remains removed to stop further expansion of Copmanthorpe into Greenfield land. | |
| 99 | H40 | Support | Support for removal of site | York Cycle Campaign |
| 1884 | H40 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2012 | H40 | Support | Support for the removal of H40 | |
| 2066 | H40 | Support | Support for the removal of H40 | |
| 2101 | H40 | Support | Support for the removal of H40 | |
| 2275 | H40 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2322 | H40 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2387 | H40 | Support | Copmanthorpe can and should provide its fair share of housing. We are pleased to see that The Council has rejected this site. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 2489 | H40 | Support | Fully support the allocation of land to the west of Manor Heath and Wilstrop Farm to green belt - this is important to safeguard the environment within the village of Copmanthorpe. Local infrastructure and services would not be able to cope should this and other sites be developed for housing. The character of the village would be destroyed | |
| 2689 | H40 | Support | Should this site be developed along with ST12 and ST13 this would put enormous strain on health facilities, schools and roads within the village | |
| 3035 | H40 | Support | We would prefer no further development in Copmanthorpe but if this is unavoidable approve of the proposed area as this appears to balance the village layout and keeps the majority of the Green Belt. | |
| 8352 | H40 | Support | Supports removal of site, retaining the village as a separate entity and avoiding sprawl. | |
| 8353 | H40 | Support | I support the latest Local Plan for the development of Copmanthorpe. | |
| 8359 | H40 | Support | We give our support for the new draft Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 10966 | H40 | Support | I support the deletion of this site and its redesignation as Green Belt. The number of houses suggested would have changed the character of the village irreplaceably. These developments would also have placed an unsupportable burden on the infrastructure of the village, its school, clinics and traffic capacity. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12925 | H43 | Comment | Concerned about the density of housing being greater here than on other sites, too many houses will destroy the historic centre. | |
| 238 | H43 | comment | No objection in principle however the plan should make clear that any development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the nearby Conservation Area and Listed Building are not harmed. | Historic England |
| 2412 | H43 | Comment | Original plan was for 8 homes, now 9 (12% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 4423 | H43 | Comment | Commenting that H43 Manor Farm development should be limited to five dwellings, also suggesting that there should be allocation for playing fields, open space, children's play areas and additional allotments. | |
| 2371 | H43 | Objection | General objection - copmanthorpe is too big already. | |
| 2689 | H43 | Objection | Development of Manor Farm Yard would be a concern as the present buildings are home to various migratory birds and possibly bats | |
| 12327 | H43 | Objection | Copmanthorpe cannot sustain additional population in its school. The shops will not sustain additional 250 homes. Roads exiting Copmanthorpe on to A64 are gridlocked at peak times. There are plenty of brownfield sites around York for additional housing why spoil our village. Additional housing will reduce my house value, whereas housing in an already populated area with proper infrastructure will not impact prices there. | |
| 12396 | H43 | Objection | If this development were to go ahead there would be issues with lack of infrastructure, additional traffic, noise, lack of schools, lack of buses, lack of medical facilities, libraries and overall concerns for social issues. | |
| 12439 | H43 | Objection | We still feel that Copmanthorpe is in danger of being very over populated. Services are already very stretched. There are concerns for, getting doctors appointments and places in schools and lack of parking. | |
| 12717 | H43 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: Copmanthorpe does not need any further development, which may change the nature of the village; lack of school space; drainage under capacity. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12810 | H43 | Objection | Even with the reduced number of housing this will still cause issues with, increased vehicles on the road, lack of car parking, difficult to get a bus, road safety, schools are full, loss of an attractive entry to the village and destruction of trees and hedgerows | |
| 12415 | H43 | Support | The drafts for housing on the sites in Copmanthorpe mentioned appear to be fair, though issues with lack of, schools, parking, doctors, roads, increased traffic and road safety need to be addressed. | |
| 57 | H43 | support | Supports the principle of development but only prepared to accept this site as a small scale development of 5 or less houses. | Copmanthorpe PC |
| 99 | H43 | Support | General support for development | York Cycle Campaign |
| 1884 | H43 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 1981 | H43 | Support | General support for H43 site | |
| 2012 | H43 | Support | Housing proposals for Copmanthorpe offer a sustainable target for the village | |
| 2025 | H43 | Support | Proposal is more in keeping with scale of village, and would not unduly stress local services | |
| 2066 | H43 | Support | Proposal is realistic and suitable for Copmanthorpe, based on modest infrastructure changes | |
| 2189 | H43 | Support | General support for site H43 - infrastructure is in place to accommodate this proposed development | |
| 2263 | H43 | Support | Support development of this site in Copmanthorpe and agree that further development on Green Belt sites should not go ahead | |
| 2275 | H43 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2275 | H43 | Support | Support for development of the site | |
| 2322 | H43 | Support | I agree with the preferred sites in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 2387 | H43 | Support | The current preferred locations and the number of houses proposed at Copmanthorpe seem reasonable. | |
| 2765 | H43 | Support | I support redevelopment of this Brownfield land. Present building has no architectural interest. | |
| 3035 | H43 | Support | We would prefer no further development in Copmanthorpe but if this is unavoidable approve of the proposed area as this appears to balance the village layout and keeps the majority of the Green Belt. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 8352 | H43 | Support | General support for site | |
| 8353 | H43 | Support | I support the latest Local Plan for the development of Copmanthorpe, but have concerns about how population increase may impact on amenities. | |
| 8359 | H43 | Support | We give our support for the new draft Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 10966 | H43 | Support | I support the identified sites for copmanthorpe as being suitable for new housing in the village of Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12239 | H43 | Support | Agree with the proposals for Copmanthorpe (Manor Farm, Tadcaster Road & Old Moor Lane). York needs more houses. The 3 sites are proportionate and that more would be unsustainable and would create infrastructure problems (highways, drainage, schools, services). | |
| 12323 | H43 | Support | Fully support housing development on this site | |
| 12354 | H43 | Support | I find that the new proposals for Compmanthorpe are more acceptable and manageable, without putting pressure on health facilities, schools, roads and other infrastructure in the village. | |
| 12355 | H43 | Support | I feel that the York City Council has earmarked the correct sites for development in Copmanthorpe. These sites benefit the need for housing whilst providing physical boundaries of roads and railways which will stop development spilling over into surrounding land. | |
| 12358 | H43 | Support | The proposed sites within the well defined boundaries of the village envelope contained within the A64 and the railway avoiding the need to encroach further into existing Green Belt. | |
| 12359 | H43 | Support | The Copmanthorpe Local Plan seems to be a satisfactory compromise between the need to increase York's housing stock without swamping an established community. | |
| 12369 | H43 | Support | The 2016 draft local plan is more acceptable with its proposal for up to 250 houses. | |
| 12374 | H43 | Support | I support the new plan for housing in Copmanthorpe that proposes up to 250 houses in the village. Hopefully this new proposal will not put too much pressure in future years on the important health facilities, schools and roads as the previous 2014 draft plan would have done. | |
| 12398 | H43 | Support | I agree with the proposal for new housing in Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12403 | H43 | Support | The 3 sites identified suit the needs of Copmanthorpe and the Green Belt. If further housing was allowed it would affect the value of the existing houses. | |
| 12411 | H43 | Support | I agree to the new draft local plan for Copmanthorpe. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12417 | H43 | Support | I am happy with the proposals made in the Local Plan for Copmanthorpe. As an aside could the development at Manor Farm, Copmanthorpe be re classified as small offices. | |
| 12432 | H43 | Support | I feel that the village infrastructure will cope much better with the reduced developments and we are also protecting the valuable Green Belt. | |
| 12435 | H43 | Support | I support the new draft Local Plan for CYC with reference to Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12438 | H43 | Support | I welcome the suggested reduction in the new building in the village. In my view 250 new homes would be manageable with the current resources in the village. Also retention of land as Green Belt is very desirable. | |
| 12470 | H43 | Support | Agree with this proposed housing development in Copmanthorpe | |
| 12492 | H43 | Support | Supportive of the proposed development plans for companthorpe, specifically to limit development, which would put a stain on facilities and maintain the green belt. | |
| 12496 | H43 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that proposes 250 houses for Copmanthorpe. | |
| 12641 | H43 | Support | Supporting the new Local Plan for York that minimises development in Copmanthorpe | |
| 12820 | H43 | Support | Supporting the most recent draft of the Local Plan for Companthorpe, due to a reduction in allocations allowing some growth but also limiting pressure on facilities and roads in the village. | |
| 12882 | H43 | Support | The revised sites for Copmanthorpe are acceptable. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 42 | H46 | Comment | The site is entirely within a local interest site (Meadow at New Earswick by Joseph Rowntree School), that bats are likely to live on site and lighting of new housing would disturb them and the layout of the site will need to factor this in by possibly locating housing to the South of the site. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 5826 | H46 | Comment | If the northern half of the site should be developed, access should be from an enlarged roundabout where the existing mini roundabout provides access to Hartrigg Oaks | |
| 12153 | H46 | Comment | Commenting that no new properties should be built until adequate parking spaces are provided in Haxby. | |
| 12335 | H46 | Comment | Housing especially low cost housing is desperately needed and New Earswick is very well off for green spaces. However, consideration should be given to recent flooding on H46 and its surrounding area when the Foss overflowed. Flood protection and drainage would need to be installed as well as improvements to drainage on Haxby Road adjacent to site. Traffic impact assessment would need to be carried out locally. | |
| 12776 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about congestion in Haxby, loss of views and loss of allotments. | |
| 12844 | H46 | Comment | Has enough care been taken to ensure that there are buffer green spaces between adjacent/ close proximity new sites and between existing sites? If not there maybe over crowding consequences. | |
| 12848 | H46 | Comment | This development will cause problems with: loss of Greenfield land, open space and recreational space, increased traffic and pressure on the A1237, pollution and air quality and noise pollution. | |
| 12854 | H46 | Comment | Its going to cause more congestion in New Earswick also schools are too full. | |
| 12856 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about the increased traffic, lack of infrastructure, poor drainage and flooding. | |
| 12857 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about increased traffic and congestion. | |
| 12859 | H46 | Comment | Traffic. | |
| 12863 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about issues with: traffic and congestion, doctors appointments taking too long and the drainage system struggling. | |
| 12867 | H46 | Comment | Concerned that additional housing will cause more traffic problems and loss of character for Earswick. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12870 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about congestion on Willow Bank and Haxby Road, trouble getting doctors appointments, drainage issues and over crowding schools. | |
| 12871 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about extra traffic and how the traffic might affect schools. | |
| 12873 | H46 | Comment | The area surrounding the Hawthorn Terrace Street is already busy and this development would only worsen the problem especially with the narrow roads. | |
| 12874 | H46 | Comment | The area surrounding the Hawthorn Terrace Street is already busy and this development would only worsen the problem as well as parking issues. | |
| 12876 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about extra traffic and how the traffic blocks the by pass. | |
| 12878 | H46 | Comment | Concerned that there may be issues with, over strain on infrastructure, traffic, loss of open space and negative effect on wildlife. | |
| 12879 | H46 | Comment | Traffic and infrastructure are a concern. | |
| 12880 | H46 | Comment | Loss of village feel, traffic issues and the environment are concerns. | |
| 12881 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about the A1237 and congestion as well as issues with loss of the play area and park, health and safety of residents and school children from air and noise pollution, traffic, flooding, drainage, buses and infrastructure. | |
| 12908 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about the loss of green space, play area and the increased congestion this development might cause. | |
| 12909 | H46 | Comment | Concerned about the loss of green space and the increased congestion this development might cause. | |
| 12910 | H46 | Comment | Concerned that schools are at capacity, congestion on the roads, new housing may be an eye sore and that development may not be in keeping with the rest of the village. | |
| 12919 | H46 | Comment | This development will contribute to existing traffic and congestion issues. | |
| 13007 | H46 | Comment | My concerns are regarding local schooling - both the local primary and secondary schools are at full capacity. If up to 140 homes with possibly 2 children per household where are an extra 280 children going to go to school? | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13066 | H46 | Comment | What is the strategic roads and transport plan and associated air pollution impact assessment, especially for the northern ring road and A64 to take pressure off the linked minor arterial routes into York? This Plan must be identified and costed first to test feasibility of housing and employment growth. large part of housing proposals for York are likely to impact on traffic volumes on northern part of current ring road which struggles to cope now. Roads such as Huntington Road are already taking too much traffic, especially HGV traffic and cycling is a perilous activity. This is not an environmentally/cycle friendly city. Employment proposals will add pressure and the combination of developments is potentially going to make living and working here unbearable. | |
| 13075 | H46 | Comment | There is a public footpath between the site and the Joseph Rowntree School. It would be preferable if development were to take place on the South side of the field by the Village and the open space by the school. | |
| 80 | H46 | Comment | Members of Wigginton Parish Council do not object to further development but the necessary infrastructure must be addressed before development commences. See rep for further comments in relation to site, covering the following issues: schools; housing mix and type; upgrades to transport infrastructure (strategic network and local roads); public transport; congestion and parking; pedestrian safety; sewerage and drainage; employment, training and development; retail facilities; environmental issues; impact of construction on existing residents and businesses. | Wigginton Parish Council |
| 238 | H46 | comment | No objection in principle to allocation but plan should make it clear that any development would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the New Earswick Conservation Area are not harmed. | Historic England |
| 444 | H46 | Comment | By halving the site this allows for the concept of River Foss Regional Green Corridor which is supported. The developable area of this site would create run off with a possible knock on effect on flooding elsewhere though deemed containable through the implementation of SUDS. Question raised if SUDS standards are adequate with anticipated increases in rainfall associated with climate change and implications for Willow bank site. | River Foss Society |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 2416 | H46 | comment | Site is in close proximity to the already highly congested northwest portion of the northern ringroad, for which no provision for the increased traffic seems to be forthcoming. Southeastern portions are comparatively fluid. Any housing policy must address the issues of how people are to get to and from their homes as it is unlikely that commuter flows will diminish. | |
| 9293 | H46 | Comment | Development would add to local congestion and create additional run-off in an area subject to serious recent flooding. | |
| 10663 | H46 | Comment | Presume H46 is New Earswick not Huntington? | |
| 72 | H46 | Objection | Objection to development on the following grounds: flood risk in local area; drainage and sewerage issues; loss of open space, both in visual terms and as a longstanding recreational area; insufficient local amenities and services to accommodate additional demand; additional traffic congestion (Haxby Road) and potential parking issues. Site should instead be defined as green belt. | New Earswick Parish Council |
| 2484 | H46 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of likely increase to existing local traffic congestion and congestion on A64 and A1237. | |
| 2765 | H46 | Objection | I object to this Greenfield development due to impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and flood risks. | |
| 3210 | H46 | Objection | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, declining employment and increasing development, increased commuting, increased air pollution, lack of infrastructure, lack of capacity in schools and lack of capacity in hospitals, doctors and dentists. | |
| 3588 | H46 | Objection | Where are residents of New Earswick supposed to walk their dogs if this green space is lost. | |
| 5826 | H46 | Objection | Disagree with the selection of the northern half of the former H46 for new housing - the southern half of the site directly adjacent to Willow Bank should be developed instead. The northern edge of the field adjacent to Joseph Rowntree School would form an attractive boundary to the open space than the area to the south of the site, adjacent to Willow Bank and its garages. If underused, the garages could be demolished and incorporated into the development proposals. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5892 | H46 | Objection | Object to this site being developed as it is a valuable open space and designated as a site of local interest which supports interesting grassland and consequently wildlife. Open spaces are disappearing rapidly from our city. The location of 104 homes close to JR School and Hartrigg Oaks on a narrow stretch of road is completely unsuitable and add to misery to people trying to turn onto Haxby Road. Better to build on brownfield sites such as Old Vickers Site. Also important to preserve flood plain near River Foss especially after floods of 2015. | |
| 6383 | H46 | Objection | The Trust objects to the Council's stated reasoning for the split between built and open space, and development density proposed. Not considered possible to produce a housing scheme for 104 dwellings on approx half of the site in a form which reflects the character of the village itself. It is not accepted that there is a deficiency of open space in New Earswick. It is not accepted that the site is part of a local green infrastructure corridor linking new earswick and Huntington along the Foss corridor. Ecological concerns have now been clarified and resolved. This will also add to the character of York. The original proposals retain open space and a well used dog walking route. The land detaching any new residential development from New Earswick with no obvious open space/ recreational function is to avoid potential flooding, and there is no evidence to suggest that this land will harm the character of the village. The site has access to regular buses and CYC highways officers have no adverse comments on traffic. The site did not form part of one of the important green wedges. It is not anticipated that any contamination or contamination that cannot be remediated will arise. Suitable vehicular access into the site will be provided along with pedestrian and cycle access. The tree belt along the eastern edge of the site is to be excluded. The site will promote a mixed of cohesive community providing a wide range of housing mix. The site is not at risk of flooding. The proposal will be sustainable in terms of physical characteristics, character and social composition. residential development are to be built away from listed buildings. Changes have been made to the layout of for more flexible living and self- help ethos. This development will help meet the Trust's and The City's need for affordable housing. The proposal will not affect visual importance as views of the church are now all but obscured by the dense tree belt along the eastern boundary and landscape character will be retained. | JRHT |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 7168 | H46 | Objection | <p>Concerned over plans to build another 700+ houses on land to north of Haxby (ST9 & H54) and a further 100+ on land north of Willow Bank, New Earswick (H46). This town and villages are very close to the outer ring road (B1237) that gets extremely congested between Old Earswick and Wigginton Roundabouts on a daily basis. Air pollution in parts of York are above average - should these developments go ahead it will further increase pollution. Haxby Railway Station should be re-developed and would be appealing to residents to leave their cars at home to commute. The Road layout near the New Earswick site could create an increased risk of road traffic accidents. If the main access road into and out of proposed development were to be located away from Haxby Road there is a possibility the smaller roads would become thoroughfares and calming measures will need to be considered.</p> <p>Building a further 700+ homes in Haxby will put a tremendous strain on the two local primary schools - it seem ludicrous that this would expand and lose outdoor space for exercise. The primary school in New Earswick is smaller than average, more pupils registering fro the new developments is only going to add more pressure on a struggling school. The local secondary school (Joseph Rowntree) has higher than average numbers and will increase also on the back of new developments and will only be a matter of time before an accident occurs as pupils walk/cycle to/from school. It is difficult to get an appointment now at Haxby Health Centre, new residents from proposed developments will only add to the problems.</p> <p>New Earswick has a population of approx 2737 with minimal shops - the majority of residents will need to travel to get provisions & groceries.</p> | |
| 7196 | H46 | Objection | <p>The A1237 is already gridlocked all day as well as Haxby Road , Wigginton Road and area around Monks Cross. How can 3000+ homes be built in this area (including this site) where roads cannot cope with existing traffic. Doctors and schools are already full in the area, building more homes without more roads, schools, doctors, dentists is madness. Infrastructure needs sorting first. It is impossible to park in Haxby and businesses are closing (i.e. HSBC, Jack Fulton)</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12168 | H46 | Objection | Objecting to H46 due to concerns over traffic and congestion, drainage, parking and not enough places in schools. | |
| 12183 | H46 | Objection | JRHF already have permission for 151 more apartments, meaning more over 55s moving into the village. More people using an already overstretched GP. Play areas gradually being eroded by development. Not the infrastructure in place to cope with the increase. Increase in traffic and sewage would need considering. Large amounts of standing water in the village due to open spaces being built upon - road drains cannot cope. York Hospital is inadequate for the size of York as it is. | |
| 12208 | H46 | Objection | Greatly concerned about the traffic growth along Brockfield Road and Brockfield Park Drive. Apart from the impassable Highthorn Road, is the only route between east and west of the City between the City Centre and the Outer Ring Road. No account was taken of this when the old Sessions factory site took place, relatively recently. Traffic is noisy, polluting and dangerous - esp rat runs. Traffic calming does reduce speed, except for impatient drivers, cyclists and scooter riders. Situation around shops / shopping areas particularly bad. Must be a traffic alleviation plan to prevent the residential area becoming inhabitable. The proposal to include 900 houses to the east, 100 to the west plus increased business along Jockey Lane is unsustainable without investment in new road infrastructure. Dualling of the ring road would be the favoured option and/or a new road linking H146 through to the head of New Lane with Huntington Road. | |
| 12219 | H46 | Objection | A1237 is not able to cope with the volume of traffic. Mill Lane junction at Wigginton and York Road Haxby cannot take the extra traffic from further housing developments. Traffic at any time of day between Rawcliffe and Monks Cross roundabouts is so slow you could walk faster. Until a suitable northern relief road/bypass is built or A1237 dualled, no more development in Area 6. | |
| 12220 | H46 | Objection | Too much road congestion now, parking in Haxby is a nightmare, schools full, nightmare getting doctors appointment, drains a nightmare. | |
| 12241 | H46 | Objection | Huntington & New Earswick are already overpopulated with far too many new builds. Infrastructure, drains, schools, surgeries etc cannot cope. Build further out from Strensall, Skelton & Wigginton. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12300 | H46 | Objection | Destroys a green area - Do not Build | |
| 12406 | H46 | Objection | There are issues with, increased traffic, drainage and loss of quality of life. | |
| 12449 | H46 | Objection | The infrastructure cannot cope now. | |
| 12586 | H46 | Objection | Object to the development of this land, which is used by locals/dog walkers etc for recreational purposes. More houses will add to traffic congestion, close to Joseph Rowntree School and Hartrigg Oaks. The area is still recovering from serious flooding and the use of this land for houses will lead to more surface run off close to the River Foss. Would be more practical to use brownfield sites such as the old Vickers factory on Haxby Road for development before H46 is built on. Additionally, land to the west of Wigginton (east of Wigginton Road) could be used for housing (with adjacent Park & Ride) which would not affect village road network and retain Green Corridor. | |
| 12587 | H46 | Objection | York City FC used to use this land as a training ground but it has now deteriorated and is now used by locals/dog walkers etc for recreational purposes. Another 104 houses will add to traffic congestion, close to Joseph Rowntree School and Hartrigg Oaks. The area is still recovering from serious flooding and the use of this land for houses will lead to more surface run off close to the River Foss. Would be more practical to use brownfield sites such as the old Vickers factory on Haxby Road for development before H46 is built on. | |
| 12827 | H46 | Objection | Numerous problems exist with this proposal - access in and out would make even more busy and congested nearby section of Haxby Road with greater risk of traffic accidents both during site construction and when houses occupied. Area is prone to flooding and already considered at risk from flooding by the Environment Agency. The area currently serves as a valuable green open space its loss would be felt by the whole neighbourhood. Use of Brownfield sites would be better. | |
| 12828 | H46 | Objection | This site is unsuitable as it is on the flood plain and flooded for much of the winter engineering solutions may not be possible. The local infrastructure is poor and additional housing would result in extra traffic. Nearby ring road A1237 is already clogged and additional traffic would only exacerbate the problem. The open space is a useful amenity for locals - once lost they will never be regained. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12852 | H46 | Objection | Traffic is already bad in this area and this development will add more pressure. A larger roundabout near to elderly peoples housing is unacceptable. New Earswick is already losing open amenity space, it is not right to remove even more green space. | |
| 12853 | H46 | Objection | New Earswick is already losing open amenity space, it is not right to remove even more green space. Concerned about flooding and drainage as this land is water logged. | |
| 12855 | H46 | Objection | Traffic is currently a problem and will be made worse, loss of dog walking space, and loss of green space. | |
| 12858 | H46 | Objection | No building leave it alone. | |
| 12860 | H46 | Objection | Leave the site for the wildlife. | |
| 12861 | H46 | Objection | There is no need to build 104 houses on this site as this would cause problems with: congestion and traffic from schools and amenities and loss of green space. | |
| 12862 | H46 | Objection | Leave the site for nature. | |
| 12864 | H46 | Objection | This site is our last open space and concerned about, doctors appointments, wildlife, traffic and disturbing my personal space. | |
| 12865 | H46 | Objection | There is not enough infrastructure and the roads would not be able to cope. | |
| 12866 | H46 | Objection | Its is shocking that one of the last open green spaces is earmarked for housing. Also concerned about increased traffic and congestion, loss off trees and increased flooding, loss of green space and loss of wildlife. | |
| 12868 | H46 | Objection | The proposed site is often water logged and has lots of wildlife including newts, it would be a tragedy to loose them. | |
| 12869 | H46 | Objection | More development would be detrimental to the area as, the A1237 is unable to cope with current traffic, infrastructure is inadequate, loss of open space and negative impacts on wildlife. | |
| 12872 | H46 | Objection | Objecting to this development as traffic is already an issue and would only be made worse. | |
| 12875 | H46 | Objection | More houses and cars is unnecessary. There are already problems with, busy roads and child safety near to the school and the road. | |
| 12877 | H46 | Objection | Objecting to this development as infrastructure is inadequate. | |
| 12913 | H46 | Objection | I oppose the plans to develop this area. As concerned about the loss of places to walk and feel like its the countryside, increased traffic and increased demands on schools. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13005 | H46 | Objection | There are concerns for this allocation due to issues with, congestion, loss of walking areas, lack of care to current residents and loss of fields. There are enough properties in the area - this site will cause more congestion at both peak and normal times. An excellent dog walking area will be lost. JRT need to take care of its residents first before taking away something that residents use and enjoy. | |
| 13006 | H46 | Objection | Traffic will not cope with more cars around this area. Drainage will be a concern with flooding and bogging. | |
| 13008 | H46 | Objection | The A1237 is already a congested road down into New Earswick. Building at H46 would create untenable congestion in and around Hartrigg Oaks and Willow Bank. This is made worse on mornings with congestion on the A1237, school traffic parking in Hartrigg Oaks and Willow Bank & Park Lodge. The proposed Red Lodge scheme will make green space at a premium in the area | |
| 13038 | H46 | Objection | Object to development of this site We use this area to meet friends and walk dogs. There are enough houses in New Earswick - there will be no green egress left. | |
| 13045 | H46 | Objection | Proposed house building in Haxby and Wigginton will have an adverse affect on the already over stretched facilities. Particular concerned about affects on surface water, drains and flooding, already inadequate sewerage system, transport and traffic in immediate area and more widely onto northern ring road. The location of the new development will mean everyone has to travel through Haxby (York Road) to get to their place of work. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13052 | H46 | Objection | Concerned about the proposed development of this greenfield site. 1. There are already extensive development plans for the centre of New Earswick that involve building over open green playing fields that help make a green garden village. 2. Road traffic through the village is already heavy, causing congestion. The road near the primary school is difficult to cross with fast cars and narrow, overgrown footpaths. Poor air quality will result causing health issues. 3. Corner of Willow Bank is used as a drop of point for school children full of parked cars making access to Hawthorne Terr. difficult - if used to access H46 this will become worse. 4. Replacement of parking spaces removed by removal of Willow bank garages on already congested streets. many local houses have no off street parking and roads are already filled with cars. 6. New Earswick is a unique area of historic and architectural importance designed as a garden village. Green space is already being lost and now a possibility of losing another. In favour of affordable housing but should be focused on brownfield sites. | |
| 13117 | H46 | Objection | Rising levels of traffic will affect the quality of life of local people. | |
| 13118 | H46 | Objection | It would be a shame to lose this green space to housing. It will greatly increase traffic on an already narrow road (Willow Bank) and increase traffic around JR School. There must also be a risk of flooding as half the field is under water during winter months. | |
| 13125 | H46 | Objection | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, recreational facilities, loss of recreational space and loss of the sports club and MUGA. This land is the only major area of recreational land for New Earswick and also used by people from Huntington. It should be retained for future recreational facilities. The desire of JRHT to develop housing here is distorting its provision in the village. Loss of recreation space near Red Lodge makes this area more important as a relocation site for this use. Since Brexit and resulting reduced international migration there should be further reviews of smaller site requirement, therefore, this site should be removed from the Plan. | Huntington and New Earswick Liberal Democrat Councillors |
| 77 | H46 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186 represents the views of residents of the parish. | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12164 | H46 | support | We have no objection to reasonable development of H46 but do have 2 major concerns. 1 - Drainage - critical that any development takes account of drainage not just for new homes but also consequential effects on surrounding residential area. The Old School Field is a natural soak away and is regularly waterlogged after heavy rain especially along the western border. Drains already struggle to cope and there will be more surface water once the land is built on. 2 - Traffic and Site Access - Haxby Road is quite narrow here and already extremely busy at peak times and term time. It is also the main access route for emergency services. Pavements and crossing points are regularly used by school children and elderly residents at Hartrigg Oaks. The A1237 operates at capacity leads to further congestion down Haxby Road. Any Development must recognise and accommodate increased traffic levels, increased risk to local residents and increased noise and pollution that further traffic will bring. Adequate parking should be provided so local streets are not used by contractors vehicles during construction or subsequent new residents. | |
| 12295 | H46 | Support | Good to see sites evenly distributed | |
| 6383 | H46 | Support | The Trust fully supports the councils proposed allocation and will support the allocation. The site has access to regular buses and CYC highways officers have no adverse comments on traffic. The site did not form part of one of the important green wedges. It is not anticipated that any contamination or contamination that cannot be remediated will arise. Suitable vehicular access into the site will be provided along with pedestrian and cycle access. The tree belt along the eastern edge of the site is to be excluded. The site will promote a mixed of cohesive community providing a wide range of housing mix. The site is not at risk of flooding. The proposal will be sustainable in terms of physical characteristics, character and social composition. residential development are to be built away from listed buildings. Changes have been made to the layout of for more flexible living and self- help ethos. This development will help meet the Trust's and The City's need for affordable housing. The proposal will not affect visual importance as views of the church are now all but obscured by the dense tree belt along the eastern boundary and landscape character will be retained. Note objection to development yield and open space provision. | JRHT |
| 11398 | H46 | Support | Supporting this site for housing, and also commenting that this development will also introduce improvements in insulation and energy products. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 63 | H48 | Support | Support the removal of site as an elderly care facility, but may be better used as car parking. | Haxby Town Council |
| 77 | H48 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186, should be removed from the Plan | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |
| 13171 | H48 | Support | Supports site's removal from the Plan as Executive decision regarding re-use of the site has not yet been made. | CYC Adult Social Care |
| 5329 | H48 | Support | Supports removal of site | |
| 9970 | H48 | Support | Support the removal of site 757 as an elderly care facility, but may be better used as car parking. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13183 | H50 | Objection | The site is no longer proposed as a preferred housing site. Our client strongly disagrees with the rejection of this site in the Preferred sites document. It is considered that the site represents as suitable available and achievable housing. | Taylor Wimpey |
| 11519 | H50 | Support | I fully agree with the removal of this site | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 13171 | H51 | Comment | Note that decision has not yet been made regarding residential care home closure. | CYC Adult Social Care |
| 2412 | H51 | Comment | Original plan was for 10 homes, now 12(20% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 2765 | H51 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13012 | H52 | Comment | CYC need to ensure any houses built should be affordable and should introduce controls to avoid properties being snapped up by landlords to let out. We need housing stock for working people young residents do not have a hope of buying a place of their own or even rent. We need people living in the city to work in the city. | |
| 13171 | H52 | Comment | Note that decision has not yet been made regarding residential care home closure. | CYC Adult Social Care |
| 238 | H52 | Comment | No objection to principle of this allocation, but given its proximity to city walls (scheduled ancient monument) and central conservation area, policy would need to ensure that development proposals safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the conservation area and city walls. | Historic England |
| 3180 | H52 | Objection | Objects on the grounds that the EPH is still needed and provides support for frail older people. | |
| 2765 | H52 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1355 | H53 | Comment | Notes residents concerns about this site due to issues with: loss of character, poor access to services, limited open space, limited public transport, Green Belt land, sewerage, surface water drainage and the impact new development may have on this issues. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 2412 | H53 | Comment | Would insist on corridors of wildlife habitats and mature trees to be preserved. Bat survey should be carried out | |
| 192 | H53 | Objection | This allocation should not go ahead as there are issues with, loss of identity, large site capacity and size, loss of Green Belt, loss of green setting, increased density, lack of facilities (incl education provision), close proximity to the A1237, lack of outdoor leisure facilities, lack of a community hub and the general loss of green views. | |
| 2453 | H53 | Objection | Development would erode green belt on the village periphery. Density stated does not reflect village character and would likely young people/families requiring schools/services not offered by the village. | |
| 2765 | H53 | Objection | Object to Greenfield development outside existing built-up area. | |
| 4322 | H53 | Objection | Objecting to H53 Whiteland's Field, due to concerns for; congestion (A1237), schools and doctors being at capacity, drainage problems, concerns for the health and safety of cyclists pedestrians and horse riders, not enough leisure facilities, Brownfield land should be used before green field land, parking issues. | |
| 4356 | H53 | Objection | Objecting to H53 Knapton Village, the site is allocated on green belt and should be preserved, concerned about changes to the identity of the village, concerned about increased traffic and that development of housing would dominate the area. | |
| 4648 | H53 | Objection | Site H53 is part of a local green corridor as defined in the Green Corridors Technical Paper 2011 - the corridor is important for a series of grassland sites and aligned gardens create a network of corridors and wildlife habitats. Why has it not got the same 'Area retaining rural setting' designation as other fields surrounding Knapton? Protection of this land is particularly important as its the only village within the ring road which has not been subsumed into York. Knapton has not lost any of its rural character since the 1800's. Adding 11 houses will mean at least 22 cars, meaning numerous additional journeys, creating danger to other road users, pedestrians, cyclists, children and horseriders. Don't want it to become a rat-run. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 6061 | H53 | Objection | Object due to; loss of green belt and loss of one of only open spaces in village, too many extra vehicles in village where traffic is already a problem especially for those with younger children as village is increasingly being used as a rat run .11 homes on such a small site is completely unsuitable for families with cars. | |
| 6222 | H53 | Objection | Do not agree with the proposal to allocate Green Belt land on this site for housing du to the fact that the land is part of a local green corridor as defined in the Council's Green Corridors Technical Paper (2011). Knapton is the only complete village left within the Outer Ring Road that has not been subsumed by York and requires special care and attention so that it continues to be washed over by the Green Bell and is not subsumed by urban sprawl. Any development long Back Lane would harm the openness and character of this rural setting. It would have a significant impact on the drainage system and local traffic | |
| 6311 | H53 | Objection | Objects to development on the grounds of development density, impact on oak tree on site and highway/pedestrian safety. | |
| 7837 | H53 | Objection | Object to proposed development of this site with main objection being that the current drainage system along the length of Knapton is woefully inadequate in capacity in dealing with existing top water drainage. Three main areas have problems being; Main Street (North of Back Lane), Main Street and St Peters Close Junction and Back Lane South and Back Lane. The drainage system has progressively worsened as increasing housing has been developed. without any upgrade | |
| 10836 | H53 | Objection | All further development along the Northfield Lane-Knapton Main Street should be banned to prevent further coalescence and prevent harm to the green belt and local amenity. Further, the site is not supported by local services and only has a 2-hourly bus service for part of the day. | |
| 12118 | H53 | Objection | Objecting to H53 Land at Knapton, suggests that the development is not in keeping with the village and does not consider the villages design statement, the land is thought to be part of the green belt there are also concerns for parking. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12376 | H53 | Objection | Our view is that site H53 should be withdrawn. Knapton is washed over green belt and Government statements have indicated the importance of green belt land. Although in 2012 DCLG report allows appropriate housing within green belts it emphasises importance of views of local community. In preparing the Rufforth and Knapton Neighbourhood Plan in 2015 a survey revealed the communities value highly their location in the green belt with 96% giving importance to this factor. The development will not bring employment. Removal of a small plot of land from the green belt is not justified and against wishes of community and will achieve little in terms of meeting housing need in an area lacking public transport and educational facilities. Additional houses will result in more cars and adverse affect on air quality/climate change. Knapton has few open spaces. There is potential for archaeological deposits due to historical reference in Doomsday Book. Note additional concerns regarding green infrastructure/hedgerows, lack of sewerage and drainage capacity and heritage/landscape. | |
| 12670 | H53 | Objection | There is currently a planning application on this site on green belt land and I formally object to this proposal of 11 homes. There is a general lack of amenities and limited transport links and do not feel that the village should provide additional housing beyond boundaries and encroach on the green belt given there are plentiful brownfield sites available. Main Street is already becoming congested with on street parking as well as providing a rat run from the ring road to Becxkfield Lane. | |
| 12674 | H53 | Objection | The development of 11 houses on green belt land in Knapton is unacceptable. Knapton is a small village and over developed, green belt should stay green belt. Possibly an impact on gas, water/drainage and electric supplies is worrying. 11 large homes will have traffic implications as parking areas for new builds are usually small and will force new residents to park on the main road. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12703 | H53 | Objection | Object to H53. This is a small site in a small rural village. Previous applications have been refused at local/ government level on at least 2 occasions. York's Local Plan needs to support the city's economic growth and protect the green belt - this prime agricultural land is part of a local green infrastructure and will do neither. The plan compromises Knapton's green belt village ruling and the green belt definition. Weight restrictions on Main Street will be compromised from building vehicles that will cause damage whilst gaining access. There will be a reduced drainage capacity to mains services (increased flood risk is already a concern). Access will be on a very narrow road and blind bend. Main Street elevation of new properties will be overpowering. Increased traffic in village will result. Conservation of oak tree, ash trees and hedgerows will be compromised together with there being an impact on wildlife. Access from ring road is restricted now onto Main Street and access in and out of village is already dangerously busy. Loss of light to surrounding properties. Questions if site to be developed surround works vehicles access, traffic, green belt rules road parking, drainage and flooding etc. | |
| 12711 | H53 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: site is in greenbelt; impact on traffic; drainage issues; lack of local services/public transport; | |
| 12809 | H53 | Objection | A development of 11 dwellings would be totally unacceptable and not in keeping with the housing already in the village, there is a limited bus service and Knapton has no facilities, roads are too narrow and concerns about access and traffic. | |
| 12815 | H53 | Objection | Requesting that this site is removed from the Local Plan due to issues with, loss of green belt, planning permission being previously rejected and over development. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13039 | H53 | Objection | Object to this site. Back Lane is a single track in parts with weight restrictions in place. Struggle to understand how local roads, environment and residents will cope with large construction movements for 11 new builds. The site will surely need widening and removal of hedgerow and boundary tree . To keep Knapton feeling rural these features should be kept in situ. A recent proposal on this site has been submitted for 4 new homes which are out of character with surrounding properties. The new development is likely to increase traffic in the construction process and also when built and demand for parking will likely block back lane or Main Street that has developed into a rat run. Knapton has problems with poor drainage with clay soils with occasional flash floods. An increase in impermeable surfaces will only exacerbate this problem. The drainage system cannot cope as it is. | |
| 13121 | H53 | Objection | Object to H53 and proposed 11 dwellings. This is a small site in a rural village. Previous proposals have been refused, why should this now pass the criteria 4 assessment. This is prime agricultural land that is part of a local green infrastructure and is a threat to the heritage and village landscape. The plan compromises Knapton's Green Belt village ruling and contrary to the Knapton Village Design Statement. Weight restrictions will be compromised on Main Street for building vehicles that will cause damage. There is a lack of car parking and this will promote on road parking. There will be an increase flood risk. The access point would be on a very narrow road with a blind bend. Buildings would be overpowering existing properties. Increased volumes of traffic. Conservation of oak tree, ash tree and hedges compromised. There is already restricted access from A1237 onto Main Street with access in and out of village on ring road already dangerously busy. Questions raised re; access for heavy vehicles, green belt, infill? drainage system capacity and access to local services. | |
| 13123 | H53 | Objection | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, loss of fields, green space and Green Belt, Infill development, increased traffic, lack of parking, congestion, loss of rural amenity, loss of the countryside and loss of wildlife. On at least two occasions the council has rejected the application. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|---|
| 74 | H53 | support | Recognise that this small site is suitable for housing; note that approximately 60% of residents in Knapton would prefer H53 site to remain as green belt, as the only parcel of green land left in the village. Further, site would not support development of 11 properties...should be a maximum of 4 properties. | Rufforth and Knapton PC |
| 12660 | H53 | support | Whilst we recognise that this is suitable for housing it would not support a development of 11 properties and in our view should be a maximum of 4 properties. | Rufforth and Knapton Neighbourhood Planning Group |
| 1294 | H53 | Support | Site is suitable - well contained, defensible green belt boundary to east, limited infilling of existing settlement, no nature designations, negligible risk of flooding, whilst green field has no purpose, well served by local roads, relatively flat and has a willing land owner. Access should be from Main Street and indicative capacity of 11 dwellings is too high (4-6 dwg more appropriate). Ecological survey has been carried out and no protected species are on record. | Novus investments Ltd |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 80 | H54 | Comment | Members of Wigginton Parish Council do not object to further development but the necessary infrastructure must be addressed before development commences. See rep for further comments in relation to site, covering the following issues: schools; housing mix and type; upgrades to transport infrastructure (strategic network and local roads); public transport; congestion and parking; pedestrian safety; sewerage and drainage; employment, training and development; retail facilities; environmental issues; impact of construction on existing residents and businesses. | Wigginton Parish Council |
| 1908 | H54 | Comment | Before homes are built in the Haxby area, plans need to be made to deal with the traffic (including dualling the A1237), parking, infrastructure and service requirements needed to support the additional residents and protect existing residents' amenity. | |
| 2310 | H54 | Comment | Before homes are built in the Haxby area, plans need to be made to deal with the traffic, parking, infrastructure and service requirements needed to support the additional residents. | |
| 2412 | H54 | Comment | Original plan was for 46 homes, now 49 (7% increase) indicating a potential cramming of houses. | |
| 2477 | H54 | Comment | This development should not go ahead until infrastructure improvements are made. Infrastructure improvements would apply too, sewage, surface water, drainage, roads, rail, schools, medical and employment. | |
| 2549 | H54 | Comment | Concerned that there are issues with, transport, traffic, high capacity, safety issues, surface water discharge, sewerage, flooding, drainage, loss of character, loss of Green Belt, increased density, local schools are full, doctors at full capacity and concerns for pylons in the way. | |
| 3606 | H54 | Comment | Additional housing will increase significantly the volume of traffic on Usher Lane. Road is narrow and becomes congested towards junction with Station Road and safe speed limits are exceeded. Road calming measures must be imposed and improvements to junction of Station Road/Usher Lane for safety of pedestrians who frequently cross here to access school and shops | |
| 3956 | H54 | Comment | Commenting on H54, expresses concerns for ; increased congestion and schools and doctors are at capacity | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 4321 | H54 | Comment | There are concerns for this site mainly in relation to the scale of the site. However, there are also issues with, increased population, lack of amenities, pressure on schools, pressure on medical facilities, lack of funding, lack of infrastructure, increased traffic, congestion, parked cars, road safety, poor access, narrow roads, impact on local services, issues with drainage, pollution, lack of leisure facilities, lack of capacity in the hospital, loss of Green Belt and loss of Character. | |
| 4822 | H54 | Comment | Development of site H54 should be in keeping with the rest of the Usher Park estate in terms of appearance (York Stone) and density (density proposed is far higher than existing). Some house very close to pylons. Wider issues of surface water drainage and sewage need resolving. | |
| 5597 | H54 | Comment | Agrees with provision of additional housing for those in housing need, subject to the following considerations: drainage and sewerage upgrade in Haxby/Wigginton prior to commencement; upgrade to ring road (dualling); addressing local congestion, parking problems and public transport underprovision; additional local healthcare and school spaces (primary and secondary). | |
| 5647 | H54 | Comment | Comment notes that infrastructure should be in place in advance of development. Also identifies other amenity/service deficiencies, namely: need for bus route modification; highway safety, esp Usher Lane/Station Road junction; parking; reopening Haxby station; additional GP staff; development to be of sustainable design and construction; upgrading sewerage/drainage. | |
| 5846 | H54 | Comment | Concerns raised in relation to development on the site: sewerage and drainage - development must not progress before new provision is installed and in full working order. Under no circumstances must property built under H54 connect up to the existing sewer and drainage system. See rep for further detail; development density is at odds with character of local area and should be lowered. | |
| 6201 | H54 | Comment | Are the developers prepared to pay £5m per pylon to remove the pylons in the field? 49 houses at 2 cars per house. Only access Usher Park Road or Swarthdale and then Usher Lane plus all the cars from ST9. Surface drainage problems for houses already backing onto field - more houses more problems | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 6436 | H54 | Comment | There isn't capacity in the infrastructure for more houses making Usher Lane more busy and difficult to cross. In turn this will make Station Road and York Road more busy and difficult to cross. | |
| 10890 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about whether infrastructure will be in place. Concerns for, schools, doctors, dentists, utilities, parking/ road use and shops. | |
| 11088 | H54 | Comment | Does not object to more housing but concerned about this site for the following reasons: capacity for this site is too high, lack of affordable housing, need for provision for school, doctors, services, roads, drainage, traffic, parking and the need for general infrastructure improvement before development. | |
| 11098 | H54 | Comment | Houses should be no higher than two stories and constructed of the same materials as used in Usher Park road and Swarthdale. | |
| 12153 | H54 | Comment | Commenting that no new properties should be built until adequate parking spaces are provided in Haxby. | |
| 12345 | H54 | Comment | York/Haxby desperately needs more housing especially affordable. However, concerned about the pressure on existing infrastructure (e.g. ring road) and amenities (doctors, schools) if no further investment is made in these. | |
| 12442 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about the need to upgrade infrastructure and the increase in traffic this development will cause as the A1237 is already busy. | |
| 12524 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about issues with the increased pressure on GP surgeries, hospitals and the Haxby ambulance service due to this development. | |
| 12532 | H54 | Comment | This development would require a separate sewage system, surface water drainage system prior to any development. Existing land and properties should be safeguarded. | |
| 12534 | H54 | Comment | Before development goes ahead the following issues should be considered: a separate sewerage system and surface water drainage systems. | |
| 12537 | H54 | Comment | I have no objection to this development as long as improvements are made to infrastructure and encouragement given towards cycling and walking. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12540 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about issues with: lack of facilities e.g. GP's , lack of parking and road infrastructure. The A1237 is grid locked and dulling is essential. | |
| 12613 | H54 | Comment | If the development were to go ahead the site would be totally out of keeping with the area and would cause further problems to congestion especially on Usher Lane, add to drainage problems and the end of Usher Park Road and put more pressure on existing facilities and services. | |
| 12614 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about the density of the site and how this site will add to existing issues, doctors and dentist are over subscribed, facilities in general are struggling, schools are full, York hospital cannot cope with more patients and the green belt should be protected. These considerations should be dealt with before development. | |
| 12630 | H54 | Comment | No mention of the effect the increased population might have on Haxby and Wigginton health centre. Also concerned about traffic management and sewage treatment. | |
| 12747 | H54 | Comment | Concerns about increased traffic and access to the site. | |
| 12783 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about this site due to issues with: surface water and drains, traffic, access, parking, the health care centre cannot cope and schools are at capacity. | |
| 12804 | H54 | Comment | This would seem a useful parcel of land for a small housing development, however I have concerns about: soil type, drainage, flooding, climate change, the power lines and housing density. | |
| 12850 | H54 | Comment | Concerned about, sewerage and drainage, power lines, health and safety, access during construction and completion, traffic, lack of parking, loss of character and the high density of the site. | |
| 12903 | H54 | Comment | Acknowledges need for more housing - it is essential that infrastructure is improved including: drainage, transport, health care, education provision and over facilities. | |
| 12911 | H54 | Comment | Investment should be made to improve infrastructure before any new houses are built. Also concerned about poor cycle lanes, schools are full, doctors is at or above capacity, issues with flooding and sewage, and general lack of infrastructure. | |
| 12919 | H54 | Comment | This development will contribute to existing traffic and congestion issues. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12933 | H54 | Comment | Before any development takes place there should be improved made for these concerns, local infrastructure, the A1237 is at capacity, increased traffic, public transport links, rail links, medical provisions, education needs and adequate provisions for power and water services. | |
| 12960 | H54 | Comment | The roads in Haxby are already congested and this development will make it worse in addition the village would lose its village feels. | |
| 13131 | H54 | Comment | Do not object to housing but housing numbers should be revised downwards. It is imperative CYC consider overburdened infrastructure and services in Haxby & Wigginton and take action towards alleviating several problems. A holistic approach will be expensive but most cost affective in long term. Moor Lane and Usher Lane are used as rat runs - access through Haxby & Wigginton must therefore be controlled and suggest an access road onto B1363 Helmsley Road to York Road from Cross Moor Lane Haxby. The ring road itself is strangling any employment growth opportunities. Land to north of York has always been known as flood plain, therefore, subject to flooding - new housing developments will make existing drainage facilities worse. Air quality has been an issue particularly along main arterial routes in and out of York especially York Road, The Village and Main St Wigginton. More housing will have its effects on educational requirements and there will be a need for primary school provision. Parking is extremely limited - more spaces are needed together with encouragement for cycle use and walking. The new stations at Haxby and Strensall are still awaited - cases are proven. Bus route improvements and cycle lanes will help alleviate current problems. Issues of pylons, aging population and care all need consideration. York has other | |
| 13133 | H54 | Comment | Accept that more homes are needed for families without homes. The scope of the development is excessive and areas are ill served by roads. A reduced development would probably be acceptable together with essential complimentary infrastructure | |
| 13134 | H54 | Comment | Homes are needed but could numbers be reduced? More homes means more people, cars pollution, road congestion and accidents with old and young children. Parking in the village is also a problem. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|---|
| 13166 | H54 | Comment | <p>The design, quality, type, mix and construction of any proposed housing must take account of the character of the Ward's existing housing and its social and demographic mix. Green open space should be provided. H54 must not only match the character of existing housing nearby but should be constructed at a density which is as close as possible to the density of the existing housing. Concerned about the impact development will have on a number of existing issues with services and facilities, including: the local shopping area, conservation area, lack of on and off street parking, ration of food and drink too retail outlets, lack of sustainable transport, low capacity minor roads as capacity, congestion and traffic, access, primary schools are at capacity, secondary school provision is also limited, health care centre is at or near to capacity, flooding and poor drainage, surface water, poor sewerage system, removal of trees, hedgerows and drainage ditches, non porous roads, footpaths and housing, open space proposed on clay sub soil, lack of elderly people facilities and services, cemetery at capacity, replacement library, lack of meeting space and social halls, opticians practice at or near to capacity, loss of allotment land, lack of bus services, a new halt rail should be provided and concerned about the loss of hedges, trees and shrub lines. There are also concerns for air quality where there are heavy traffic movements, this should be monitored. Concerned about the National Grid power lines that run near to H54. It is disappointing that no employment land has been allocated in the haxby and Wigginton area. Greater access to employment is needed. There is a shortage of industrial units. Transport and traffic is also a concern especially on the flowing routes: junctions at Moor Lane in Wigginton, Haxby Moor Road at New Bridge/ West End, Wigginton Roundabout at the B1363/ A1237 junction, Usher Lane, Station Road, York Road, The village roundabout junction, Moor Lane The Village junction, B1363, A1237 Haxby and New Earswick roundabout, the A1237 Wigginton Roundabout and Towthorpe Road.</p> | Cllr Cuthbertson (ward councillor Haxby and Wigginton) |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13189 | H54 | Comment | <p>The design, quality, type, mix and construction of any proposed housing must take account of the character of the Ward's existing housing and its social and demographic mix. Green open space should be provided. H54 must not only match the character of existing housing nearby but should be constructed at a density which is as close as possible to the density of the existing housing. Concerned about the impact development will have on a number of existing issues with services and facilities, including: the local shopping area, conservation area, lack of on and off street parking, ration of food and drink too retail outlets, lack of sustainable transport, low capacity minor roads as capacity, congestion and traffic, access, primary schools are at capacity, secondary school provision is also limited, health care centre is at or near to capacity, flooding and poor drainage, surface water, poor sewerage system, removal of trees, hedgerows and drainage ditches, non porous roads, footpaths and housing, open space proposed on clay sub soil, lack of elderly people facilities and services, cemetery at capacity, replacement library, lack of meeting space and social halls, opticians practice at or near to capacity, loss of allotment land, lack of bus services, a new halt rail should be provided and concerned about the loss of hedges, trees and shrub lines. There are also concerns for air quality where there are heavy traffic movements, this should be monitored. Concerned about the National Grid power lines that run near to H54. It is disappointing that no employment land has been allocated in the haxby and Wigginton area. Greater access to employment is needed. There is a shortage of industrial units. Transport and traffic is also a concern especially on the flowing routes: junctions at Moor Lane in Wigginton, Haxby Moor Road at New Bridge/ West End, Wigginton Roundabout at the B1363/ A1237 junction, Usher Lane, Station Road, York Road, The village roundabout junction, Moor Lane The Village junction, B1363, A1237 Haxby and New Earswick roundabout, the A1237 Wigginton Roundabout and Towthorpe Road.</p> | Haxby and Wigginton Liberal Democrats |
| 502 | H54 | Objection | Objection to H54 - in green belt and infrastructure will not cope with increased demands on roads, doctors surgeries and schools | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 549 | H54 | Objection | Haxby already has straining infrastructure, development of this site will place further strains. There are existing drainage issues that have seen two applications refused previously on this site. Development would lead to increased congestion locally and on to the by-pass. Noise and pollution would result. School place pressures. Where will demand for these houses come from? Character and setting of village ignored. The rural villages of York should not be destroyed without understanding the unique features of these communities. | |
| 715 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to H54 Whiteland's Field due to issues with, infrastructure, doctors, nursery's, primary schools (Ralph Butterfield School), secondary schools, roads (Usher Land, Station Road, York Road and Mill Lane) shops, parking, congestion, air pollution, provisions for cyclists, flooding and sewage. | |
| 1355 | H54 | Objection | I do not believe that this is a logical site for inclusion in the Local Plan due to issues with, flooding, pylons and electricity. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 1947 | H54 | Objection | There are issues with this allocation due to it being such a large scale development. There are also issues with, lack of services, lack of capacity, issues with the road network, lack of parking, water, sewerage, health service is under pressure and concerns for funding infrastructure. | |
| 2411 | H54 | objection | I consider the proposed development on Green Belt land North of Haxby and Wigginton would be a grave error which would increase the risk of flooding of existing low-lying developed areas in Haxby and Wigginton, and depending on the point of drainage discharge, even Strensall, New Earswick, Huntington and Clifton. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 2456 | H54 | Objection | <p>Object on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Schools - too few local primary schools, and Joseph Rowntree has few places. A new primary school would be essential *Drainage - drainage in Haxby/Wigginton is poor at best. New drains would need to be laid and ditches cleared on a regular basis. *Medical provision - Haxby/Wigginton Practice has an excess of 20000 patients and already stretched - there would need to be a full consultation with the medical staff *Traffic congestion and parking - there is not enough parking in the village for the present population. Haxby is already congested causing trouble for busses and large vehicles. Station lane is parked up on both sides near the school. Several additional car parks required if development goes ahead. | |
| 2484 | H54 | Objection | <p>Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion, air and noise pollution, lack of local amenities, drainage under capacity, lack of employment in York for new residents, congestion on A64 and A1237.</p> | |
| 2523 | H54 | Objection | <p>The infrastructure cannot cope now, this increase in housing will make this worse. Concerned about traffic, buses taking forever, buses are often at capacity with school children, lack of parking and doctors surgery's are full.</p> | |
| 2672 | H54 | Objection | <p>This is green belt land and the proposed housing could easily be accommodated within ST9. The land is badly drained and prone to flooding. The site has a pylon within the centre of the boundary.</p> | |
| 2765 | H54 | Objection | <p>Site makes no contribution to surroundings and has electricity lines crossing it.</p> | |
| 2940 | H54 | Objection | <p>Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion and impact on local amenities.</p> | |
| 3210 | H54 | objection | <p>Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, declining employment and increasing development, increased commuting, increased air pollution, lack of infrastructure, lack of capacity in schools and lack of capacity at the doctors, flooding and poor drainage and lack of parking.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 3256 | H54 | Objection | Surface water drainage - the proposed development would make a bad system worse, new drainage would need to be installed before any development took place; Sewerage system is totally inadequate in the village. The WTP at Strensall is at or above capacity. The problem is recognised in the Consultation Report for ST9, but it applies equally to H54, but the response is vague. Suggest that it would not be possible to connect to the current public sewer network, but a separate discharge route would be required for any development site to be enhanced or a new facility provided. A new system should be installed and functional before any building work takes place; Schools - a new primary school to the north of Haxby would be required and expansions of secondary schools eg. Joseph Rowntree, would be required. Traffic congestion / safety around schools would be an issue; Mix of housing - must address the needs of local people; Bus routes - apart from one route (No. 1) , no frequent bus routes. A new bus route or terminus would be required to serve the sites; Electricity power lines will need diverting underground; Medical Services in the area are fully stretched; New local facilities are mentioned and their provision would be very important; Public open space - good provision is needed and good to see that it is proposed; Protection of archaeological features is important, and can't see how some can be adequately protected (eg. medieval strip ridge and furrow) | |
| 3257 | H54 | Objection | There are a number of concerns in relation to this allocation, the issues are as follows: housing site capacity, loss of character, lack of infrastructure, increased traffic, poor access, lack of road safety, lack of health and safety, lack of employment opportunities, lack of capacity in schools, lack of capacity at the health centre, poor drainage, surface water, sewage, loss of green space and Green Belt and loss of community. | |
| 3632 | H54 | Objection | Additional housing will increase the strain on existing infrastructure including roads (especially York Road), high water table, drainage of surface water, sewerage system, schools, health centre. New Train station ? There are no plans for more businesses in Haxby therefore more people will be travelling through to get to their place of work. | |
| 3773 | H54 | Objection | This allocation causes concerns for, congestion, lack of parking, funding, full drains, full schools, full doctors, loss of quality of life and lack of new local facilities. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 4048 | H54 | Objection | No further development in Haxby. | |
| 4129 | H54 | Objection | The site has already been dismissed as unsuitable for development (see campaign led by the late Ken Holdsworth) - pylons, low level electricity cables, access only through quiet residential area, not suitable for any further traffic, site absorbs surface water. | |
| 4149 | H54 | Objection | There are concerns for this allocation due to issues with, loss of green field land, roads and extra traffic and congestion. | |
| 4151 | H54 | Objection | This site has already been dismissed as unsuitable due to limited access, pylons, electricity cables, site is important in absorbing surface water, thus protecting existing properties. | |
| 4159 | H54 | Objection | Object to the allocation H54 (49 dwellings) - contrary to paragraphs 158 & 182 of NPPF and to policy YH9 of the Yorkshire and Humber Plan (RSS). | |
| 4317 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to H54 Whiteland's Field, due to concerns for; congestion (A1237), schools and doctors being at capacity, drainage problems, concerns for the health and safety of cyclists pedestrians and horse riders, not enough leisure facilities, Brownfield land should be used before green field land, parking issues. | |
| 4429 | H54 | Objection | Should only go ahead after the required improvements to the A1237 & B1363, due to the size of the site and number of years to complete. Current infrastructure cannot support long term building work. Major changes required to A1237 and its roundabouts - also Tesco roundabout and Haxby roundabout. | |
| 4481 | H54 | Objection | Fully support the response of Haxby Town Council - Haxby is 'at capacity' in regard to parking problems, drainage, schools, and GP practice. A rise of over 20% in the number of houses is unsupportable. Unless infrastructure improvements are made before additional housing, the Plan would be totally unacceptable. Big improvements to the A1237 would be needed (dualling & roundabout improvements) and improvements to reduce congestion in the village & parking. Drainage could be a major issue. Pylons would need relocating. A new primary school and an extended bus service would be needed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 4687 | H54 | Objection | Acknowledges the need for additional housing but considers this is best located on brownfield land, or on new greenfield settlements. The number of houses proposed is too many - concerns it will change the character of the village, increased strains on infrastructure, suggests a smaller development would be better, increased traffic and congestion, schools are under pressure and should build new schools before sites are developed, health centre struggles with current population, sewage system in Haxby is inadequate, issues with surface water run off, lack of green space. | |
| 4690 | H54 | Objection | Haxby and Wigginton have now a population of approx 12,000, bigger than many local towns but there are significant problems: lack of open space, over 40 unadopted snickets, appalling drainage and limited community facilities. Very limited employment in Haxby and surrounding area. lack of affordable homes. Usher Lane and Moor Lane have little scope for widening, dangerous junctions, congestion of the northern Ring Road. If development were to go ahead, it would be essential to provide a new school, new roads east and west of the sites, linking to the B1363 and Towthorpe Lane, dualling of the Ring Road, resolving of the drainage / sewerage system, access to Council services for new communities, new medical services and staffing, pedestrian and cyclist safety improvements, consideration of health issues near power lines, respect given to ridge and furrow medieval field systems and the preservation of Crooklands Lane. | |
| 4832 | H54 | Objection | Usher Lane traffic issues need resolving - this stretch of road cannot cope with additional traffic generated by the proposed Whiteland Fields site. | |
| 5288 | H54 | Objection | Opposes site's development - was not identified during the draft publication in 2014; high density in an area of low density housing , therefore out of keeping with the area, and accessed through roads supporting low density housing; Any further development in Haxby needs to be conditional on public transport improvements, in particular a rail stop. | |
| 5315 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion and parking; lack of local amenities; drainage under capacity, lack of employment in York for new residents, congestion on A64 and A1237. | |
| 5329 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion; lack of parking; lack of local amenities; drainage under capacity. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5330 | H54 | Objection | Strongly opposed to the development of 784 houses in the Haxby area | |
| 5340 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of overly dense development and insufficient local services | |
| 5364 | H54 | Objection | This area currently floods and would require significant investment into drainage before development. Sewers are inadequate and wrongly specified. Amenities are too far away, and only acceptable distances if ST9 goes ahead. Housing density proposed for site is too high. The site runs along a railway line and crossed by power lines - these need a buffer. This density needs reducing should development proceed. | |
| 5384 | H54 | Objection | Roads in and around Haxby are already gridlocked at busy times. Delays due to railway level crossing exist and will get worse when new railway timetables are introduced. Wigginton Road already backs up at traffic lights near Mill lane. Expected additional 1500 cars from proposed developments. High schools are all within the ring road meaning all this traffic needs to cross the ring road. Investment in road infrastructure is essential. There are local shops but parking is inadequate. There is no railway station. Buses will be ineffective due to road problems highlighted above. Both sewerage and surface water drains in Haxby and Wigginton are well beyond capacity Many drains are too shallow without sufficient fall to deal with heavy rain. Major investment would be required to ensure adequate capacity to cope with additional homes. The 3 primary schools are beyond capacity since Oaken Grove Primary School was closed. The Health Centre in Haxby has a list of 20000 already and is struggling to cope with demand. There are 2 high power electric cables in the vicinity which need moving that will make the site unviable. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5386 | H54 | Objection | Usher Park Road is a quiet residential road and its character would be damaged by additional traffic on it if it were used to access the site . Concerns raised regarding effects of additional northbound traffic on Usher Lane, particularly at north end, as well as additional southbound traffic towards Haxby. This traffic would also cause increased air pollution on a key pedestrian route, particularly southbound towards Ralph Butterfield Primary School. Amenities under pressure - note lack of school space. Drainage infrastructure in Haxby is already at capacity. Prior to any development it is essential that necessary upgrades to the system (including the introduction of new drainage systems) are undertaken. Concern over proximity to overhead electric cables | |
| 5391 | H54 | Objection | Extra 781 houses in Haxby would put an intolerable strain on existing roads in Haxby and Wigginton. Local schools are already full, health centre is full to capacity. Very little parking space in Haxby. Whilst homes are needed the two sites in Haxby are not suitable. | |
| 5446 | H54 | Objection | Astounded at plans for H54. 49 homes would be squashed into this small pocket of land and at much higher density than all other sites on edge of peaceful suburb. Question integrity of those involved in the planning and negotiation with developers. The site is affected by pylons, inadequate drainage and surface water flooding. There are other sites that have been removed from the plan with much better access to bus services. H54 is a long way from a bus route, shops, dentists, school, cafe or pubs as well as over a mile from GP surgery and pharmacy and most people will need to use their cars adding to congestion and parking issues in the village. Immediately next to this site is a mixed community - streets are peaceful, traffic is at low speeds and a very important amenity area for learner drivers and horses from local stables. Various reasons are provided as to unsuitability of this site for young people (that would create noise, etc) older people (too far from amenities) and working age singles or couples (additional cars, congestion etc). The type of occupancy probably would lead to increased demands on police and/or health services and Council (drainage and sewers). | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5477 | H54 | Objection | Greatly concerned about ability of Haxby to absorb 750 new houses. Current infrastructure (roads, sewerage, local amenities, schools) are extremely stretched or not working properly. Roads where houses are to be built are already used as a rat run to Strensall to avoid the A1237 making Haxby busy at key times. Changes to road infrastructure in Haxby would be required if development went ahead. Drainage would need investment. Consider blocking off Oaken Grove half way down to stop a further rat run. A cul de sac would work and mean that only people needing to will use it. | |
| 5582 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: traffic congestion; lack of parking; drainage and sewerage issues; insufficient local amenities and services to accommodate additional residents. | |
| 5587 | H54 | Objection | We do not believe this area should not be developed, on the following grounds: pylons on site; drainage and sewerage at capacity; increased traffic and congestion; site access would disrupt residential neighbourhood; density proposed is out of keeping with local area. | |
| 5664 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: further congestion on the ring road; lack of parking in town centre. | |
| 5692 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion; lack of parking; roads in poor condition; lack of local amenities; drainage under capacity - potential for flash flooding. A 20% increase in housing is not acceptable and will alter the village feel. | |
| 5707 | H54 | Objection | I object to the size of this development. There are also issues with poor infrastructure, increased traffic, the ring road, transport links, schools, shops, parking, lack of playgrounds and playing fields, loss of agricultural land, loss of green land and lack of parking. The ring road should be made to be a dual carriageway. | |
| 5712 | H54 | Objection | Strongly oppose the development of new houses in Haxby. The roads are already congested, parking is impossible, the drains cannot cope, the schools are full. Green Belts should stay as green Belt. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5724 | H54 | Objection | The overall development (ST9 & H54) as far too big for Haxbys infrastructure to handle. It is already busy and there is existing pressure on schools, doctors, dentists, parking, drainage, traffic through the village, access to the Ring Road. The Plan does not adequately address traffic issues. It needs to consider congestion especially on York Road /traffic backing up from the railway crossing and the Ring Road. With an additional 800 houses, this will become a major problem. Traffic on Usher Lane is also a problem. Haxby is still, a village with a village infrastructure. Another 800 houses in total will mean at least another 1000 passing through the village. Haxby Station must be built before any development is considered. Infrastructure improvements needs to be undertaken before developments undertaken. Drainage is inadequate and needs improving. Why is development north of Haxby corridor necessary? | |
| 5739 | H54 | Objection | There are already too many houses in this area. The roads are already congested. Also, the area floods badly. | |
| 5756 | H54 | Objection | Against the proposal to build an extra 784 houses in total, in Haxby due to an increase in population | |
| 5777 | H54 | Objection | Strongly oppose any further house building to the north of Haxby. The services & facilities are already at saturation point, Usher Lane & York Road are already very heavily congested . The cumulative addition of 781 additional houses would cause gridlock on the roads, overwhelm local amenities & ruin what is left of Haxby's rural charm. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5796 | H54 | Objection | <p>Object to this site and ST9 as this would result in 20% + increase in population. And will affect Transport - two main roads into Haxby & Wigginton, these have problems coping now. Stationary traffic on York Road and Eastfield Ave is major problem. Proposed developments to north of Haxby will result in longer queues and there are problems with queuing at level crossing then again at junction of A1237.</p> <p>Road Safety - increase traffic raise road safety concerns in area.</p> <p>Air Quality - Stationary queuing traffic on York Road and Eastfield Ave will have impact on air quality.</p> <p>Parking - is a major problem in Haxby centre. Supermarket car parks are full with short term shoppers and attempts to encourage long stay car parking on Ethel Ward Playing Field car park have failed as too far to walk.</p> <p>Drains - problems exist with both surface water drainage and sewerage system. Serious historic flooding has occurred in Haxby and heavy rain overloads the systems in both central and northern parts of Haxby.</p> <p>Schools - 3 primary schools in Haxby & Wigginton are full.</p> <p>A full environmental impact assessment should be carried out before further development is carried out here.</p> <p>Unable to find selection criteria analysis for this site.</p> | |
| 5833 | H54 | Objection | <p>Objects to development on the following grounds: violates green belt boundary; impact on character of vicinity - density is at odds with local vernacular; flood risk, sewerage and drainage concerns; impact on traffic and highway safety; note adjacent power lines.</p> | |
| 5848 | H54 | Objection | <p>Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion/parking; need for alternative access to site; ongoing sewerage/drainage problems; the fields around this section of Haxby are used as flood plains - future flooding seems inevitable; safety/cost concerns re any power line remediation.</p> | |
| 5869 | H54 | Objection | <p>Object - inadequate access to public transport (one mile from nearest bus stop) - Haxby centre at capacity for cars & parking worsened at school times - Flooding risk will be worsened by building on drainage areas.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 5875 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about proposals for Haxby. Although scale has been reduced from 2013 version housing proposed at 784 represents a massive increase. Concerns centre on supporting infrastructure and transport for development of this size. The knock-on impacts of a development of this scale have not been adequately addressed. There will be a massive increase in size and population of the town that is already busy. Even taking into account public transport improvements that could go ahead, an increase of this size can only result in a major increase in traffic volumes. Parking is already limited and couldn't imagine impact on York Road, Haxby and Mill Lane Wigginton. This would be impacted by other proposals in this part of city. The northern ring road is already a major embarrassment. Transport and communication implications should be central to any planning exercise - this proposal is negligent in this respect. Also air quality and general safety issues. CYC have a duty to ensure infrastructure is capable of supporting additional development - there are concerns surrounding drainage and central amenities such as schools, GP etc. An increase of 20% would place massive pressures on these. Haxby and Wigginton are unable to support sustainably development of this size. | |
| 5981 | H54 | Objection | This area is at full capacity . There are issues with, increased traffic, pollution, parking, schools, children, drains and general lack of capacity. | |
| 6041 | H54 | Objection | Appreciate that there is a huge housing shortage and that all areas should take their share, however, given the limited services in Haxby and seemingly no guarantee of new services and Haxby/Wigginton have grown by more than a third over the years this development cannot be supported. Before green belt land is considered for development, brownfield sites should be utilised first. The impact on wildlife would be massive as their habitat is badly encroached upon already. Lowfields Drive area has been recognised as a flood plain by the Environment Agency - the water table is naturally high and combined with heavy clay soil surface water drainage is a problem. More than 784 houses are proposed for Haxby - this would have a huge impact on the infrastructure of the village. There's no room for expansion of existing shopping facilities and parking is very restricted now. The Health Centre is under pressure and has no room for further expansion. Primary and secondary schools are full and at least 600 new places would need to be created (is there funding?) Traffic is heavy now and the impact on the Outer Ring Road will be exacerbated by increase in cars and air pollution. The road will need to be dualled (is there funding?) | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 6155 | H54 | Objection | Object to the plan to build another 784 houses in Haxby. Reasons for objection are: The village centre cannot cope with the village population; Parking is a problem affecting residents; the roads are congested and there are not enough schools and open spaces | |
| 6233 | H54 | Objection | There would need to be major investments to the infrastructure before any houses could be built on access roads, schools, medical and sewerage systems to accommodate additional people. Where will finding come from to improve roads? Yorkshire water are not involved in the planning? Traffic problems are bad on these roads and 200 vehicles will compound the problem. Both sites are liable to flooding. They are no starters and CYC should look at brownfield sites (Nestle and Vickers) | |
| 6278 | H54 | Objection | Haxby roads are already congested. Difficulties at junction of Usher Lane and Station Road. Often no parking at shops. Difficulties getting appointments at Health Centre. | |
| 6332 | H54 | Objection | <p>Population growth in Haxby over last 45 years has seen it grow to Town status yet it has no town amenities whatsoever. No thought has been given as to how people from 700+ homes to north of Haxby are going to find employment or use two blocked exit roads, or provide new surface water drainage and new sewerage system. This is all before you ask/expect the developers to provide infrastructure to allow occupants to send their children to school and have a doctors surgery, let alone a cemetery extension, shops, bus service and widened roads.</p> <p>The whole of Haxby and Wigginton needs a new surface water drainage system and sewerage system. Access roads are at a limit and roundabouts on the ring road need attention now.</p> <p>Development should not be here, but rather on the Skelton/Wigginton border close to Clifton Moor and opposite Tesco.</p> <p>Infrastructure in Haxby & Wigginton needs improving further exit roads built and ring road dualled.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 7140 | H54 | Objection | <p>Although the new plan provides for more green space the current infrastructure of Haxby cannot cope. These are my observations;</p> <p>Traffic - York Road to A1237 at peak times is particularly bad during school terms. The A1237 cannot cope with traffic volumes now and 750+ new homes in Haxby (including this site) could equate to 1000 more cars. Local roads are clogged up making it difficult for delivery vehicles and buses. Yellow lines have only moved the problem.</p> <p>Facilities - long appointment times at the GP are experienced now. Schools are at capacity. Ongoing drainage issues in village. Library is currently in temporary accommodation - will new one be built following new developments?</p> <p>Consideration needs to be made to infrastructure e.g.. new roads, Haxby Station, public transport.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 7168 | H54 | Objection | <p>Concerned over plans to build another 700+ houses on land to north of Haxby (ST9 & H54) and a further 100+ on land north of Willow Bank, New Earswick (H46). This town and villages are very close to the outer ring road (B1237) that gets extremely congested between Old Earswick and Wigginton Roundabouts on a daily basis. Air pollution in parts of York are above average - should these developments go ahead it will further increase pollution. Haxby Railway Station should be re-developed and would be appealing to residents to leave their cars at home to commute. The Road layout near the New Earswick site could create an increased risk of road traffic accidents. If the main access road into and out of proposed development were to be located away from Haxby Road there is a possibility the smaller roads would become thoroughfares and calming measures will need to be considered.</p> <p>Building a further 700+ homes in Haxby will put a tremendous strain on the two local primary schools - it seem ludicrous that this would expand and lose outdoor space for exercise. The primary school in New Earswick is smaller than average, more pupils registering fro the new developments is only going to add more pressure on a struggling school. The local secondary school (Joseph Rowntree) has higher than average numbers and will increase also on the back of new developments and will only be a matter of time before an accident occurs as pupils walk/cycle to/from school. It is difficult to get an appointment now at Haxby Health Centre, new residents from proposed developments will only add to the problems.</p> <p>New Earswick has a population of approx 2737 with minimal shops - the majority of residents will need to travel to get provisions & groceries.</p> | |
| 7173 | H54 | Objection | <p>Haxby's roads are too congested and parking is always full near shops. There are drainage problems in Haxby, over subscribed schools and unless more infrastructure is provided Haxby cannot support any more housing developments</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 7178 | H54 | Objection | <p>Object to increase in housing in Haxby on following grounds;</p> <p>Parking is virtually impossible at certain times and the new parking area near to playing fields is no use when pushing a loaded shopping trolley.</p> <p>Waiting times for an appointment at the local doctors surgery is too long now. The number of planned new homes for Haxby will generate around 3000 new patients - do not pass the buck onto the NHS.</p> | |
| 7557 | H54 | Objection | <p>*Local Services - already Wigginton/Haxby struggles to support its current population with local services such as schools, library (recently closed) especially health centre and dentists. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic that the developments will naturally cause especially around Ralph Butterfield School with parking/transport issues with young children but also elderly persons around the village. Local road junctions are already concerning and will become worse with any development.</p> <p>*Wildlife - concerned how developments will affect local wildlife (deer, hares, foxes, and birds may lose their habitats.</p> <p>*Flooding - already problems with drainage and flooding - before development takes place assurances need to be provided that present sewerage and drainage systems could cope.</p> <p>*Parking - there is a huge problem with parking in Haxby and Wigginton this would be worsened.</p> <p>*Air quality - an increase in traffic would increase air pollution and could lead to health problems.</p> <p>*Policing - currently insufficient policing of area</p> <p>*Accessing site - No.1 Bus on Mill lane - this is where expected construction traffic would access ST9 and H54? the terminus bus stop in this case would need to be moved.</p> | |
| 7886 | H54 | Objection | <p>Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: inadequate infrastructure; likely increase to existing local traffic congestion and impact on local amenities.</p> | |
| 7902 | H54 | Objection | <p>Concerned about the lack of capacity in Haxby. There are also issues with, increased housing, roads, lack of capacity in schools, lack of capacity in schools, noise, pollution, traffic, lack of local jobs, loss of character and pressure on hospital services. There are also concerns that neither the Local Plan or the Transport Plan indicate that this site is sustainable.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 8286 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: village is full to capacity; traffic congestion; insufficient local amenities and services to accommodate additional residents. | |
| 9346 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on grounds of drainage, traffic and amenities. | |
| 9408 | H54 | Objection | This development should not go ahead until the following issues are resolved, congestion, lack of parking, lack of infrastructure, poor drainage systems and schools are full. | |
| 9744 | H54 | Objection | Very concerned about planned expansion north of Haxby & to West of Wigginton Road, Why build on green space when brownfield sites are available. Haxby and Wigginton Roads take forever to get out of as it is and the ring road is at almost constant standstill. Climate change will result in increased occurrences of flooding - why not build in areas on higher ground. How will drains and sewerage cope/ much of Haxby has problems with poor drainage and standing water at the slightest amount of rain as it. Would ask that reconsider rather than irrevocably damage this beautiful city and surrounding area. | |
| 9747 | H54 | Objection | This is a greenfield site, there are other brownfield site that should be developed first (e.g.. Haxby Road near Nestle). Site is under power lines, has a drainage problem (drains on Usher Lane regularly block and have no capacity), fields flood, haxby schools are full. | |
| 9771 | H54 | Objection | Current infrastructure cannot cope with further houses. Roads are already inadequate and congested. Parking impossible and a further car park is required in village. Exiting facilities are already stretched and massive increase will be detrimental to nature of town. | |
| 9837 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion, air and noise pollution, lack of local amenities, drainage under capacity, lack of employment in York for new residents. | |
| 9974 | H54 | Objection | Opposed to housing growth in Haxby as all services and resources are at saturation point. Village unable to cope with existing level of housing. | |
| 10019 | H54 | Objection | Do not agree with this site. Area is on low ground and flooding will occur. Drainage is inadequate. Roads will not be able to cope with increased volumes of traffic. The area will lose its village feel. | |
| 10129 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to H54 in Haxby, due to issues with; struggling facilities and services, congestion on the A1237, over loading sewers, not enough activities for young people, schools (Joseph Rowntree School) at capacity, health centre at capacity and a lack of parking | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 10171 | H54 | objection | Commenting on H54 Land to the North of Haxby, the number of houses proposed is too many, concerns it will change the character of the village, increased strains on infrastructure, suggests a smaller development would be better, increased traffic and congestion, schools are under pressure and should build new schools before sites are developed, health centre struggles with current population, sewage system in Haxby is inadequate, issues with surface water run off, lack of green space, | |
| 10292 | H54 | Objection | Opposed to any development of housing in Haxby especially on green belt land and any to north of haxby.. CYC do not appear to realise the infrastructure of Haxby is fragile. There are not enough school places, classes are full and a further increase would be detrimental. Parking provision by CYC is non existent. No car park in Haxby centre for shoppers (other than small ones provided by Sainsbury and Ryedale Centre). On street parking is major problem and danger hazard. Roads in Haxby are congested and the Main Street is dangerous with cars being parked on one side all day. There are drainage problems in Haxby especially in North lane and road outside playing field is flooded often due to blocked drains and poor drainage. The doctors surgery has long waiting times for appointments due to excessive workloads and cannot give a safe and reliable service. | |
| 10311 | H54 | Objection | Object to local plan proposals. Access to ring road is manic via Haxby or Wigginton. Heavy rain any you cannot flush toilets. Parking is bad in Haxby (we use the bus to avoid parking problems as so many others)> there are more appropriate sites within ring road that wouldn't add to congestion on ring road. | |
| 10334 | H54 | Objection | We don't want any increase in building houses in Haxby. The infrastructure is not in place such as roads, schools, drainage, doctors also an increase in traffic (possibly 1400 extra cars) in Haxby resulting in extra pollution and traffic density. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 10388 | H54 | Objection | <p>Heard Local Plan was cutting number of possible houses by half, however, this is not the case. Half the number would be devastating for Town of Haxby where it has actually increased with 784 new homes proposed. Haxby and Wigginton are already congested and with few facilities. Object on following grounds; Traffic congestion - level of homes could see 1000+ extra cars on village roads at peak times on already congested roads. As well as traffic queues road safety and air quality for residents and children in particular are concerns. Roads to north of village are narrow and busy and exits from proposed new estates would lead into Moor lane and Usher Lane both residential areas and minor roads both leading into centre of village or one of two exit roads. Exit roads from haxby and Wigginton are already a problem. Parking is also a problem in the village (especially in Usher lane and South and North Lanes). Proposed houses would be too far away for most people to walk for shopping/taking children to school etc resulting in more cars looking for parking spaces or driving through the village.. Haxby already has flooding issues and drains cannot cope with seasonal heavy rain. New residents would stretch existing facilities such as schools and health centre which would need extending or new ones built.</p> | |
| 10389 | H54 | Objection | <p>Noticed the housing proposals for Haxby are numerically identical to those in old plan. Strong objection to new proposal, existing infrastructure in Haxby and Wigginton is not fit for purpose now. Drainage is inadequate. Roads unsuitable and overcrowded as ring road regularly blocked making difficult access to or from York Road to new Earswick. Amenities: schools and health Centre at breaking point. no new homes should be contemplated until existing infrastructure updated to cater for current residents.</p> | |
| 10815 | H54 | Objection | <p>We are concerned about issues with: traffic including congestion, parked cars, the A1237 must be improved, drainage, lack of capacity in schools, extra pressure on doctors surgeries, infrastructure and lack of facilities. Infrastructure needs to be sorted before the development takes place.</p> | |
| 11000 | H54 | Objection | <p>Haxby residents have enough problems without adding to them. There are issues with, lack of parking, drainage, schools, G.P.'s, traffic and cars speeding through the villages. These issues will be worsened if new development takes place.</p> | |
| 11008 | H54 | Objection | <p>I feel Haxby is big enough. This development would could cause issues with, loss of character, loss of open fields, lack of parking and busy roads. The health centre is also very busy and this will be worsened by new developments.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 11018 | H54 | Objection | I would like to see some progress on re establishing a station before considering new housing developments. | |
| 11021 | H54 | Objection | I object most strongly to more housing within Haxby and Wigginton. The present infrastructure is unable to cope. There are issues with, drainage, lack of parking, health care, schools, roads and traffic. | |
| 11035 | H54 | Objection | This site raises concerns for lack of capacity in Haxby, lack of infrastructure, drains, sewerage, lack of parking and lack of doctors. | |
| 11044 | H54 | Objection | These new developments should not even be considered due the current issues that would be worsened. Issues include, extra traffic, pressure on primary schools, the struggling drainage system and the general lack of infrastructure. | |
| 11057 | H54 | Objection | I say no to this development, due to concerns for the following services, schools, library, bank and education. | |
| 11100 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about the proposed development increasing traffic issues and parking problems. | |
| 11383 | H54 | Objection | I would like to strongly object to this development as there are not enough facilities currently. There are also issues with: Lack of capacity in schools, health centre is at capacity, lack of parking, overloaded sewerage systems, over crowding and there are little to no activities for young people. | |
| 12155 | H54 | Objection | Commenting on H54 and its development would cause problems with, lack of capacity at the health centre and schools and parking. | |
| 12157 | H54 | Objection | There are concerns for this allocation due to issues with, increased traffic on Moor Lane, Usher Lane, lack of schools, drainage and sewerage. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12219 | H54 | Objection | A1237 is not able to cope with the volume of traffic. Mill Lane junction at Wigginton and York Road Haxby cannot take the extra traffic from further housing developments. Traffic at any time of day between Rawcliffe and Monks Cross roundabouts is so slow you could walk faster. Until a suitable northern relief road/bypass is built or A1237 dualled, no more development in Area 6. | |
| 12220 | H54 | Objection | Too much road congestion now, parking in Haxby is a nightmare, schools full, nightmare getting doctors appointment, drains a nightmare. | |
| 12225 | H54 | Objection | Further development at this scale in this area is unthinkable without further large scale infrastructure beforehand. The closure of Oaken Grove School a few years ago has put extra pressure on primary school places. Haxby & Wigginton Medical Centre is at breaking point. The Ring Road is at gridlock esp between Clifton Moor and Strensall. Tailbacks into Haxby. Dangerous junctions esp near schools, many rat runs, etc. | |
| 12228 | H54 | Objection | Object on the grounds of lack of adequate health care facilities, schools are at capacity, drainage is a problem, traffic gridlock/parking concerns, there is a need for a new playing field (but no space for one), there is a need for a new library. | |
| 12281 | H54 | Objection | The foul and surface water drainage systems currently serving Haxby are inadequate and seriously overburdened. If these new housing development proposals are to go ahead the drainage systems serving them running into and through the existing drainage systems must be reviewed and addressed before any new home development takes place. The current roads systems currently serving Haxby and the surrounding area can and do become 'gridlocked' especially at morning and evening rush hour and school start/leave times and when the level crossing barriers are down. Proposed development at ST14 and H46 will make the access and ring road situation much worse. Action must be taken to improve the capacity of the current access roads and the ring road and create new access roads to serve and take traffic from the developments and, ideally, before any new home developments take place. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12308 | H54 | Objection | Sewerage and grey water drainage systems already stretched to limits - additional housing will only make matters worse. Extra housing = 1200-1500 additional cars on already busy roads York Road and ring road already over loaded at peak times now. Loss of green fields - previous housing estates have already used enough green field sites | |
| 12314 | H54 | Objection | No more houses in Haxby! Haxby has dreadful parking as it is, drains are overflowing and schools are full now. | |
| 12316 | H54 | Objection | If schools are overcrowded as a result of future develop net this may have a negative impact on children's education. Drainage system in Haxby is already overloaded and development will lead to more traffic, parking difficulties and added dangers. Surely infrastructure needs to be taken into consideration before anymore building works take place. | |
| 12317 | H54 | Objection | Development of houses will spoil the small feel of the village environment. Usher Lane will become very busy with cars and vehicles. Schools will be affected and already have large class sizes. | |
| 12318 | H54 | Objection | Object to building of more local house due to build up of traffic, local schools being over populated and village environment changing for the worse as parking is an issue. Land around Haxby should be preserved as it is a beautiful area. | |
| 12321 | H54 | Objection | The whole sprawl of Haxby and Wigginton is quite large enough, we do not want to become any bigger we want to live in a village environment not a town. | |
| 12324 | H54 | Objection | Haxby & Wigginton have already been spoiled by huge Barratt estates, the village has been replaced by a town resulting in long waits for doctors, already full schools, difficult parking near shops and would be worse if this development took place. | |
| 12326 | H54 | Objection | We do not want any more houses in Haxby. We have always had lovely green areas. Build more houses and you will spoil Haxby, make roads more congested and take away wildlife habitat. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12331 | H54 | Objection | Extreme congestion takes place in Haxby & Wigginton now around shopping area, the roads and schools are to maximum limits. More housing is not an option. Most houses have two cars so potentially 1600 and at least 1500 children that cannot be schooled in current facilities. Drainage and sewerage problems will arise from additional homes. A1237 already has severe queues. Strongly oppose extra housing being built. Also doctors will receive impact with possible extra 2400 people. | |
| 12333 | H54 | Objection | Cannot support this site unless transport infrastructure is significantly improved. As a minimum Haxby Station should be opened and dualling of the ring road should take place. Welfare, shopping and schooling facilities must be improved and increased to compliment and increase in residential housing. | |
| 12341 | H54 | Objection | Object - are plans in place for another doctors surgery/schools/dentists etc. Roads to be improved as already cannot cope? Affordable housing provision? Better facilities such as shops? Ring road to be upgraded? Congestion now and road infrastructure cannot cope! Drainage issues now and cannot cope with existing pressures. | |
| 12342 | H54 | Objection | Potential for twice possibly three times number of cars/house. Ring road is already congested and a car park at times. Schools, sewerage issues, rain water issues and green belt should be protected. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12344 | H54 | Objection | Object to proposals - the outer ring road is congested, over prescribed health services, over prescribed education services, not enough places primary or secondary, drainage and transport links need to be improved, need more leisure facilities for children and young people, housing needs to include social housing. | |
| 12351 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this development due to the following issues: increase in population, over subscribed schools, lack of car parking, loss of character and increased pressure on roads through people commuting. | |
| 12360 | H54 | Objection | I am strongly opposed to further houses in Haxby due to issues with: lack of car parking, increased cars on the roads, pressure on the drains and services and traffic. | |
| 12361 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about housing development in Haxby for the following reasons: lack of local amenities, school places and doctors surgeries. There are also concerns for increased traffic and lack of infrastructure. | |
| 12362 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this site due to issues with: lack of parking, difficulties seeing doctors and negative impact on quality of life. | |
| 12363 | H54 | Objection | I am against more housing for the following reasons: takes weeks to get a GP appointment, lack of parking, lack of space in schools and the loss of the Green Belt. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|----|------|---------------|---------|--|
|----|------|---------------|---------|--|

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12366 | H54 | Objection | I would like to register me opposition to the proposed development of additional houses in Haxby. There are issues with the drainage system, flooding, loss of natural environment, congested roads and oversubscribed schools and doctors. | |
| 12367 | H54 | Objection | Haxby simply cannot take anymore cars on the road. There are also issues with, lack of car parking, lack of capacity in the health care centres, lack of shops, lack of capacity in schools and loss of green land. | |
| 12368 | H54 | Objection | We oppose the plan to build 784 new homes in Haxby at this and site ST9. Parking in the village is almost impossible now, roads are too busy, the drainage system cannot cope and local schools are full. Access to and from the ring road is difficult and how would the new development reach either Wigginton Road or Strensall Road without causing further chaos. The ring road itself is another problem and overloaded since the day it opened needs to be dualled to avoid major disruption. | |
| 12370 | H54 | Objection | This is s ludicrous and ill advised housing proposal (along with ST9) In Haxby the drainage system is at maximum capacity and will not take any further loading. The prospect of up to 1500 vehicles leaving and returning daily will require a new road out to the B1363 Wigginton Road and to the A64 and traffic should not be allowed to rat run through the village Main St or Oaken Grove. Where will all the hundreds of parking places be allocated in the village and where will a new junior school be located? I suggest further development is made at Stockton on the Forest where no housing has been undertaken. | |
| 12375 | H54 | Objection | I say no to any more housing in Haxby. Roads are congested enough and parking is a problem. This will affect the outer ring road which is a nightmare at the best of times. Find somewhere else for this housing. | |
| 12380 | H54 | Objection | Haxby is already stretched to the limit. There's at least a 3 week wait for a doctors appointment. Too much traffic and no parking at busy times. How is the village to support 2000-3000 people, the extra shops, schools etc will spoil the village. It will be like adding a small town to the village. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|---|
| 12399 | H54 | Objection | I would like to raise my objections to the proposal of new houses in Haxby. Concerned about, traffic, access, pot holes, rain drains, speeding vehicles, heavy buses, lorries and farm vehicles and lack of parking. GP's and Dental Surgeries unable to expand their provisions. However schools could receive support and improvements. | |
| 12405 | H54 | Objection | The village cannot take this many people. There are issues with, full schools, congested roads and the ring road will need to be dualled. The village will become an awful place to live. | |
| 12406 | H54 | Objection | Disagree with planned housing for Haxby as it will spoil our lovely village and make the bypass unusable. There are also issues with, increased traffic, drainage and loss of quality of life. | |
| 12407 | H54 | Objection | Concerns over flooding, sewers and drainage, high density housing contrary to current character. | Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 12412 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this development due to the following issues, increased traffic, increased need for local services, congestion, overflowing buses, loss of agricultural land and habitats and urban sprawl. | |
| 12416 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about over development, lack of infrastructure, poor access, lack of schools and medical services, issues with drainage, sewerage and flooding, congestion, powerlines, loss of the nature of the area and loss of open space. | |
| 12421 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about issues with roads and schools not being about to support housing development in Haxby. | |
| 12422 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about issues with roads and schools not being about to support housing development in Haxby. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12424 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about this development due to the following issues, Haxby is too busy, over stretched local facilities, degraded standard of living, loss of character, unnecessary traffic, poor sewerage systems, concerns for electrical distributions, too many children for the schools, unsustainable, lack of diversity regarding housing type, lack of public transport, lack of local amenities and concerns for the A1237. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|----|------|---------------|---------|--|
|----|------|---------------|---------|--|

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12430 | H54 | Objection | I object to the proposed building of houses in the Haxby area. There area concerns for, primary schools, secondary schools, roads, drains, flooding, lack of parking and the poor bus service. | |
| 12431 | H54 | Objection | We wish to express concern and disagreement with the proposed development of 784 houses in Haxby. The concerns are for the following issues, traffic, congestion, lack of parking, lack of affordable housing, flooding, schools, medical centres, footpaths, loss of character and loss of green space. | |
| 12437 | H54 | Objection | Building these houses will destroy Haxby. There are issues with, lack of facilities, lack of parking, extra cars on the road, lack of room in schools, antisocial behaviour, flooding, drainage and loss of wildlife. | |
| 12446 | H54 | Objection | Haxby is full to bursting point. There are problems with heavy traffic, congestion, lack of parking, environmental and noise pollution. The infrastructure is already struggling to cope without new development. | |
| 12451 | H54 | Objection | Don't build any more houses in \Haxby - Haxby is already full to capacity and have overcrowding problems, local flooding and poor drainage especially around South Lane and Abelton Grove area. Parking is a real problem here. | |
| 12453 | H54 | Objection | Development proposed is far too large. Drainage already at capacity. No car parking spaces. Full schools and doctors surgery. Already congested roads. Will ruin character of village. No employment in area. | |
| 12460 | H54 | Objection | The additional housing and population increase would place impossible strain on the already over capacity ring road. Usher Lane junction with Station Road would become even more difficult to cross for school children. Local schools already full. Insufficient parking in village. | |
| 12462 | H54 | Objection | Local facilities such as roads, sewerage etc are insufficient to support the new developments. There are sufficient brownfield sites within York area for development. | |
| 12463 | H54 | Objection | Agree with Haxby Town Council's response regarding roads, infrastructure, schools, doctors, access to village, car parking. Housing developments cannot be approved unless major improvements made to roads, drainage, and support facilities | |
| 12464 | H54 | Objection | More thought and planning needs to go into the needs of the community. All extra cars and people will put terrific train on already very stretched resources. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12466 | H54 | Objection | Haxby/Wigginton cannot cater for any additional housing developments | |
| 12469 | H54 | Objection | Against any more houses being built in Haxby | |
| 12480 | H54 | Objection | Proposals would destroy the village feel of Haxby. There was to be no more house building on green belt land if this and other development in Haxby goes ahead this will no doubt bring about congested roads, then there's the parking problem, drainage issues, schools are overcrowded, road maintenance which is bad now and will only get worse. No more housing of these numbers in Haxby! | |
| 12495 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to H54 as there are issues with, lack of amenities, schools are at capacity, heavy traffic and suggests that housing development be in a completely new area. | |
| 12499 | H54 | Objection | These developments should not go ahead due to issues with, traffic and congestion, lack of parking, un safe for cyclists, not enough road infrastructure, loss of the green belt, flooding and drainage issues, electric failure, schools at capacity, lack of green recreational space, concerns developers will not provide the correct infrastructure, electricity pylons, health centres are full, will there be a train station in Haxby, sewage issues and lack of safe guards . | |
| 12511 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: site is greenfield, and other alternative brownfield sites are available; inadequate drainage and sewerage/flooding problems; lack of services (GP/schools); local traffic congestion/parking problems; proposed site density is out of keeping with the area's character; | |
| 12518 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: inadequate drainage; likely increase to existing local traffic congestion/parking; lack of services (GP/schools) | |
| 12525 | H54 | Objection | The proposed development is ridiculous. There are issues with: drainage, roads, traffic, sustainability of the development, over crowding, loss of the village status, schools and doctors are at capacity and the loss of quality of life. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12544 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion, lack of local amenities, local congestion (during and after construction) and on A1237. Issues should be addressed prior to commencement of development. | |
| 12548 | H54 | Objection | Current infrastructure will not support additional development - upgrades should be in place before development commences. | |
| 12553 | H54 | Objection | Usher Lane continues to be at risk from flooding during heavy rain, a relief sewer has only partially alleviated the risk. Usher Lane has a history of top water flooding and sewage back up due to overloading of pumping station. Extra pressure due to proposed new housing will mean more risk of our houses flooding. An increase of at least 700 cars will add to our already overburdened Haxby roads. Cross Moor Lane, Usher Lane, Haxby Moor Road are narrow and winding not suitable for increased use. Junction at Usher Lane/Station Road is hazardous at both peak and off peak times due to parked cars. Junction of Oaken Grove/Moor Lane and Moor Lane/Village will see a significant rise in traffic. Access to Strensall via Haxby Moor Road at narrow bridge is already a bottleneck at school times. To leave Haxby either the A1237 or railway line needs to be crossed - both see traffic queues at peak times. Prospect of Haxby Station may lead to increased commuters from outside the area. Additional homes will put pressure on already overburdened health service creating extra demand for children/babies provision, elderly, ambulance services opticians, dentists, chiropodists,. Haxby facilities are already busy with car parks etc. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12569 | H54 | Objection | Personally seen Haxby turn from Village to Town status. Usher Lane continues to be at risk from flooding during heavy rain, a relief sewer has only partially alleviated the risk. Usher Lane has a history of top water flooding and sewage back up due to overloading of pumping station. Extra pressure due to proposed new housing will mean more risk of our houses flooding. An increase of at least 700 cars will add to our already overburdened Haxby roads. Cross Moor Lane, Usher Lane, Haxby Moor Road are narrow and winding not suitable for increased use. Junction at Usher Lane/Station Road is hazardous at both peak and off peak times due to parked cars. Junction of Oaken Grove/Moor Lane and Moor Lane/Village will see a significant rise in traffic. Access to Strensall via Haxby Moor Road at narrow bridge is already a bottleneck at school times. To leave Haxby either the A1237 or railway line needs to be crossed - both see traffic queues at peak times. Prospect of Haxby Station may lead to increased commuters from outside the area. Additional homes will put pressure on already overburdened health service creating extra demand for children/babies provision, elderly, ambulance services opticians, dentists, chiropodists,. Haxby facilities are already busy with car parks etc. | |
| 12573 | H54 | Objection | Too large a development and would overwhelm Haxbys amenities and transport links. Would destroy a valuable habitat for nature off Croockland Lane. Talk of improved amenities seems to be an afterthought.. Schools in the area already at capacity. We lost our Library and will take years to find a new site. Traffic is already heavy. Houses should be built on completely new sites that do not affect existing residents. | |
| 12577 | H54 | Objection | There is already congestion on Usher Lane exacerbated by parked vehicles. Additional congestion will be created by upwards of 1500 vehicles that would be unacceptable. Cycling will become a greater hazard. There are problems with the existing local drainage system an increase of 781 homes runs the risk of increasing this problem. Congestion of the A1237 to North of York will be increased by additional traffic with most residents likely to be employed in work inside the boundary of the congested ring road. | |
| 12583 | H54 | Objection | I would like to lodge my objection to this development due to concerns with, more cars using my street, the lack of parking and the heavy traffic causing problems for the older community trying to cross roads. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12584 | H54 | Objection | The core objections, previously raised, still remain: 1) Infrastructure - cannot cope with existing levels in Haxby, let alone a further 881 houses - especially the traffic flows in and out of the town combined with rising levels of on street parking causing blockages along Main Street at the junction of Usher Lane & Haxby/Strensall Road. Overload at the local GP surgery: 2) Drainage & Flooding - Haxby suffers from inadequate drainage, leading to localised flooding in a number of areas. The number of houses proposed can only lead to raised water tables creating further flooding issues - need to learn from the other flood disasters about building on flood plains. There is little credibility in Yorkshire Water's Drainage Plans - cannot cure existing problems: 3) Green Belt - Green Belt was created to prevent creeping urbanisation - its existence is pointless if local authorities ride roughshod over its basic need / requirement. | |
| 12593 | H54 | Objection | Whilst it is good that housing numbers have reduced, it is still not clear how the proposed number can be adequately catered for in Haxby. Haxby is heavily congested and parking is very difficult. Doctors, dentists and schools are over subscribed. Banks are closing. The A1237 being a single carriageway is often congested. Usher Lane is very busy, drainage and sewers are inadequate and there is often flooding. Houses should not be built before infrastructure is in place. | |
| 12603 | H54 | Objection | Site has been designated as Green Belt, why has this changed and allocated for housing? No additional access roads have been proposed. Noise, disruption, contamination will be excessive to local residents. Conflicting number of houses are proposed - 46 or 49? | |
| 12607 | H54 | Objection | Haxby/Wigginton unable to cope with current housing levels i.e. Schools, dentists, doctors and traffic congestion, never mind new proposals. | |
| 12608 | H54 | Objection | The City of York Council needs to look at building 'new villages' not expanding those that are over flowing already. | |
| 12633 | H54 | Objection | This site should not be developed until issues with, traffic and congestion on Usher Lane, full health service, drainage, car parking, and full schools are resolved. | |
| 12653 | H54 | Objection | Access down Usher Lane is inadequate, there are traffic and congestion issues, a lack of parking, shortage of medical facilities and a lack of schools. | |
| 12673 | H54 | Objection | Object to this proposal as it would overcrowd the villages of Haxby and Wigginton | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12678 | H54 | Objection | Haxby & Wigginton cannot cope with such large developments due to insufficient infrastructure. Both proposals for the area are too large. | |
| 12679 | H54 | Objection | Infrastructure in Haxby is lacking - what is being done to address this? We cannot maintain or support a library. Education, drainage, traffic, parking & green belt are all concerns. What will be done to improve access routes especially Usher Lane that is becoming an overspill car park since restrictions imposed at Ryedale Court and at school start & finish times. York Road is congested at peak times not aided by the railway crossing and ring road. Drainage is an ongoing problem in Haxby. Education will suffer with classrooms already full. The green belt should be protected. | |
| 12682 | H54 | Objection | Object to this site. I feel the infrastructure require to make this plan work is excessive. Current roads on and off site via Moor Lane and especially Usher Lane are already at capacity. Parking outside homes on Usher Lane make car travel challenging. Neither York Road or Wigginton Road can be made bigger to improve traffic flow. Residents on Usher Park Road already have problems with drainage after heavy rain as current drainage/sewer systems are at capacity. Some of the children in the new homes will require school places. Medical Centre is working to capacity. CYC need to re-think choice of land or significantly reduce number of plots planned. | |
| 12683 | H54 | Objection | Object to this site. There has not been enough local consultation between CYC and residents of Haxby and Wigginton who are threatened with massive inappropriate development of new houses on precious green belt land. The impact of this development would be unsustainable and have disastrous consequences for the villages of Haxby and Wigginton. Infrastructure of Haxby is already under secure strain and without huge investment Haxby will not cope with such a dramatic increase in numbers of people requiring such things as access to schools, GP and medical services, local public transport, traffic access and suitable road systems, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment. facilities for the young, old etc. Government recognises importance of landscape and green spaces (see George Osborne quote) - message is clear to make use of brownfield sites and regenerate existing housing estates before destroying valuable green belt land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12684 | H54 | Objection | Object to this site. Apart from huge concerns over sustainability the impact on the greenbelt around Haxby will be disastrous. Brownfield development areas should be exhausted first. NPPF Para 158 requires an adequate and relevant evidence base. Para 182 goes on to state policies have to be based on proportionate evidence and consistent with national policy. RSS was revoked except for policies YH9 and Y1C that relate to York Green Belt. YH9 states ' inner boundaries of green belt should be defined to establish the long term development limits that safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city'. To do this York would need to assess the urban capacity of the central core that could be achieved without significant adverse impact on the character and setting of the city. A long term evaluation would reasonably cover a period of 30 years. CYC have not done this. Haxby and Wigginton are outside the inner boundary and implication is that inner boundary should be first to be developed on a sequential approach. The proposals are not justified as required by NPPF. | |
| 12687 | H54 | Objection | Why is Haxby being targeted for all these new houses on green belt land? We have no room for cars to park. Schools are full. Roads have long tailbacks in term time and are likely to get gridlocked. We are running at full capacity. | |
| 12688 | H54 | Objection | Agree with everyone saying no more houses in Haxby. Appreciate country needs more housing stock however infrastructure isn't here to support such a building plan especially not on green belt land. Roads are congested locally and on the ring road. With homes being built at Clifton Grain Stores ring road will be taking more cars. The roundabouts on the ring road are frequently jammed. Parking is difficult in Haxby and driving through the village is like an obstacle course. The doctors surgery and schools are full now. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12697 | H54 | Objection | Proposed site is in Flood Zone 1 - general area of Haxby also appears to be in this low zone and has a high water table that will be exacerbated by huge number of proposed houses especially as underground infrastructure cannot cope now as there are small bore sewage pipes and inadequate rainwater drainage. Oaken Grove School was closed a few years ago resulting in other schools in area not being able to cope with all local children. Likewise Local Health Centex cannot cope with additional patients. There are too few car parking spaces outside local shops now. Public transport is inadequate. There is extreme congestion on York Road at peak times. Cars from the additional houses will greatly add to the problem especially if A1237 is not dualled. | |
| 12709 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: plans to add additional houses would allow the road to become a busy route; school is already at capacity. | |
| 12715 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: facilities in Haxby are already stretched; additional traffic congestion; drainage and flooding problems; little prospect of local employment growth. | |
| 12722 | H54 | Objection | Objection to development on the following grounds: traffic congestion and pollution; detrimental impact on existing infrastructure within Haxby/Wigginton; insufficient school places; loss of greenbelt land when other brownfield sites are available. | |
| 12724 | H54 | Objection | Objection to development on the following grounds: traffic and congestion/parking; flooding issues; scale of housing proposed. | |
| 12726 | H54 | Objection | Objection to development on the grounds of traffic congestion, particularly where investment in dualling the ring road is not made. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12732 | H54 | Objection | Major overhead cables cross H54, causing health concerns. Surface water and sewerage are running at full capacity at present and will not take any further properties. Access from both H54 and ST9 would be extremely difficult because Usher Lane is narrow, residents parking, vehicles delivering children to school etc. Amenities / doctors surgery, schools, dentist etc are all at capacity - developers must pay in full to resolve. H54 is a high density development which is out of character with the present area. There would have to be sufficient employment in this area to attract people to live there. It is suggested that 7 roundabouts could be upgraded to reduce congestion - cannot see how this could help - dual carriageway the bypass. | |
| 12733 | H54 | Objection | The area of Haxby and Wigginton is already reaching saturation point. There are issues with: access, traffic, sewerage, water, electricity and lack of employment. | |
| 12737 | H54 | Objection | Facilities are stretched to the limit. Concerned about a number of issues including, the loss of the villages identity, over crowded schools, not enough doctors, increase in traffic and strain on public services. | |
| 12739 | H54 | Objection | I oppose to this development as there are a number of issues: increased traffic and transport, sewers, drains, air quality, electric pylons, full schools, doctors at capacity, dentists full, local transport, shops, lack of parking, cyclist safety, poor acc less, wild life, road users and Usher Lane and Moor Lane are to narrow. | |
| 12746 | H54 | Objection | Not in favour of anymore development in Haxby and Wigginton. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12764 | H54 | Objection | We do not believe that any development should take place here. Concerned about H54 as, the site is dominated by pylons, poor access, increased traffic, high density development, drains and sewers and traffic on Usher Lane, Station Road and York Road. | |
| 12769 | H54 | objection | Concerned about impact of development on congestion, parking, drainage and access to amenities. | |
| 12770 | H54 | Objection | We do not believe that any development should take place here. Concerned about H54 as, the site is dominated by pylons, poor access, increased traffic, high density development, drains and sewers and traffic on Usher Lane, Station Road and York Road. | |
| 12777 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this development due to concerns for a number of issues: Haxby and Wigginton are at capacity, lack of parking, schools are full, doctors and dentists are over loaded, there is not provision for additional employment, there are high voltage pylons, increased traffic and congestion, pollution, flooding and drainage and sewage. | |
| 12792 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this development due to concerns for, increased traffic, narrow roads, the impact on services, flooding and sewage. | |
| 12794 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to development here sue to issues with: heavy traffic, flooding and drains, lack of parking and the strain on schools and surgeries. | |
| 12802 | H54 | Objection | Objecting to this site due to concerns for: the density of the site, loss of hedgerows, trees and ash trees, loss of the small rural village character, threat to heritage, threat to the village landscape, loss of grass verges, danger to wildlife, access points, loss of agricultural land, forestry, outdoor leisure, building vehicles, damage to main street, lack of parking, drainage issues, lack of conservation, land levels and roof heights, busy traffic and safety, loss of light, flooding, loss of the green belt and further infill development. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12821 | H54 | Objection | Two areas of concern are raised by potential development; drainage and road access. We do not want a poor situation made worse due to lack of appropriate action. Water table here is volatile with local flooding of gardens and the field next to H54 having standing water in winter for long periods. This site if built on will be unable to absorb its share of the water. The Environment Agency highlight potential flood risk areas. Drainage system in Haxby is at capacity. Plans to take drainage from new development to Strensall is suspect. Road access is more of concerning feeder roads to village and beyond than in the direct access roads. Usher lane is narrow and has parking issues and impedes traffic flow and visibility. Power lines are on site and would limit capacity. If a railway halt in Towthorpe Road is seriously being considered it should be a Park and Rail halt off the ring road. | |
| 12822 | H54 | Objection | Suggested developments in Haxby and Wigginton do not take into account housing infill and development already taken place over last 30 years. We have high density multi occupancy in a number of properties giving supported accommodation for older people as well as housing that now occupies many of the former gardens of larger properties. The villages are full and old road system will not cope, the drains wont cope with more effluent and rainwater, supermarkets are struggling at weekends with insufficient parking and customer queues. What is needed is a new village with access to the dualled stretch of the ring road. H54 suggests a capacity of 49 homes. this has been a haven for wildlife over the past 40 years and has provided a wild-like play area for children. It is nearly 3/4 mile away from the nearest bus stop and further still to nearest playing field. 49 homes is at odds with nature of housing in the estate more in keeping with an urban estate. Site is 1000 m from nearest school, bus stop and supermarket so not well placed for local amenities. The cars from the homes would create more noise be a more dangerous place for children meaning less would walk/cycle to school. Air quality would suffer. Parking is difficult and Haxby village centre will become a place to avoid. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12824 | H54 | Objection | Strongly object to proposals to build on this site as villages of Haxby and Wigginton are unable to sustain any further increases in housing. Increased housing would generate even more congestion in Haxby and Wigginton with local roads, Outer ring road and main East/West arterial road the A64 would be catastrophic. Appropriate and effective transport infrastructure is a fundamental requirement for economic growth and success of every village, town or city. York's setting presents unique challenges for transport infrastructure in the city and its location results in the transport network coming under increased strain. The A1237 is in desperate need of dualling - there has been a 10% increase in journeys on the road since 2012 and average speeds of less than 20 mph. | |
| 12826 | H54 | Objection | Object to proposed houses on green belt between Haxby and Strensall. There is not enough infrastructure in place to support this plan. Roads in Haxby and Strensall are overcrowded and getting onto the ring road is a nightmare at times. Drainage systems are not efficient. There will be overcrowding of local shops in Haxby. Not enough schools as it is. There must be enough brown field sites in York not to need this land. | |
| 12830 | H54 | Objection | Understand the need for houses to be built and agree that they should be provided if the infrastructure is put in place first. York and Wigginton Roads are always busy with traffic queuing at peak times and cycle lanes are narrow with increased traffic levels this would put cyclists at further risk. The doctors surgery can hardly cope now and setting aside land for a new surgery may not result in one being built due to lack of finances to pay staff. Drainage is already a problem in the area. Traffic is already busy in the village and further housing will make it worse. A railway station would help ease this but would need to be located out of the village. There is a shortage of allotments - 8 year waiting list. | |
| 12837 | H54 | Objection | 736 houses seems to be disproportionate to the size and capacity of Haxby and Wigginton. There are also issues with, traffic and congestion, lack of infrastructure and concerned that the proposed Haxby train station will never happen. | |
| 12840 | H54 | objection | Concerned about spoiling the ethos of the village of Haxby, increased traffic and incidents that have happened in recent years and lack of infrastructure. | |
| 12849 | H54 | Objection | We are opposed to this development due to issues with: loss of green belt, traffic, lack of infrastructure and the burden on schools. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12883 | H54 | objection | I have serious concerns regarding the proposed development, due to issues with: lack of existing infrastructure, additional strains on traffic, lack of parking, drainage, surface water, flooding and sewerage. This infrastructure needs to be improved to us | |
| 12917 | H54 | Objection | It would not be responsible for the council to entertain any proposal development in the area when there are exiting problems, including, surface water run off, poor drainage, flooding. | |
| 12928 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about this development due to issues with: current pressures on the health centre, lack of parking, drainage, loss of character, heavy traffic and loss of green belt. | |
| 12934 | H54 | Objection | I object to the proposed development for the following reasons: concerns for housing density, lack of schools and doctors, poor access roads and increased traffic. | |
| 12942 | H54 | Objection | This allocation should not be included in the Local Plan. There are issues with loss of Green Belt, flooding, powerlines, construction traffic, pollution, low cost housing and lack of high standards for housing. | |
| 12944 | H54 | objection | This development should be nearer to the ring road among other issues, the site is too wet, there are dangerous power lines, the development it to far from the village and would cause increased traffic. | |
| 12997 | H54 | Objection | I will appeal to our local plan because of this development. There are issues with lack of local facilities and poor road infrastructure. | |
| 13036 | H54 | Objection | Totally against any development to the north of Haxby | |
| 13045 | H54 | Objection | Proposed house building in Haxby and Wigginton will have an adverse affect on the already over stretched facilities. Particular concerned about affects on surface water, drains and flooding, already inadequate sewerage system, transport and traffic in immediate area and more widely onto northern ring road. The location of the new development will mean everyone has to travel through Haxby (York Road) to get to their place of work. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 13054 | H54 | Objection | <p>Haxby and Wigginton cannot support further development due to road sizes, drainage, school places, air quality and residents quality of life. Moor Lane is far too small to cope with extra cars and both York Road and Wigginton Road are wholly inadequate to cope with the extra weight of traffic. The two exits from the ring road are already blocked throughout the day. The sewerage system cannot cope now on rainy days so will require upgrades. Primary schools are full and have no capacity therefore a new school will be required. Who will move to the new houses and where will they work? Government has to increase the amount of houses being built though CYC needs to take into consideration where new employment opportunities are coming from before houses are built. Transport links will need upgrading to provide access to employment areas. The environmental impact and air quality will affect current residents. Power lines are a concern as no-one should live within 500m of them as can cause serious health issues. Road structures, sewerage systems, infrastructure and facilities are all inadequate to deal with further development and will all need addressing if development is to go ahead.</p> | |
| 13064 | H54 | Objection | <p>Concerned about the implications of this proposed housing development in terms of drainage and high density of housing on a relatively small site. Existing properties suffer from blocked drains which back up on a regular basis - additional housing would exacerbate this problem. The housing density proposed is way too high compared to existing housing levels. There are power lines directly over part of this site and studies raise concerns about health implications. The closest primary school is currently full to capacity.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13065 | H54 | Objection | <p>Object - Roads - additional development will add to already congested roads at peak times such as York Road, Wigginton Road, Towthorpe Road and A1237 outer ring road. If the A1237 is dualled it could give rise to further developments and increase the problems. Usher Lane/Station Road junction is particularly dangerous. Double parking is a problem in Haxby, visibility for vehicular egress is restricted. York Road suffers heavy congestion and would suffer from any additional traffic. Usher Lane provides access to the countryside and used by cyclists, walkers, joggers, horse riding and dog walkers. Development would remove residents access to open fields and rights of way. Crooklands Lane is a much used bridleway worthy of preservation as a local amenity and environmental value. Would a train station alleviate problems on local roads? Drainage and sewerage - there are serious standing water problems already that requires a radical overhaul of the drainage system before any development can take place. Schools - all very full at the present time. Health services are at capacity. Environment - how will biodiversity and preservation of wildlife corridors be maintained. Land to north of Haxby is currently farmed intensively and we have the benefit of rich and varied wildlife with long established hedgerows and mature trees. National Grid Pylons - these should be taken into account if houses are to be developed in vicinity on health and safety grounds. Cemetery - extra space should be planned. Police - resources already low.</p> | |
| 13066 | H54 | objection | <p>What is the strategic roads and transport plan and associated air pollution impact assessment, especially for the northern ring road and A64 to take pressure off the linked minor arterial routes into York? This Plan must be identified and costed first to test feasibility of housing and employment growth. large part of housing proposals for York are likely to impact on traffic volumes on northern part of current ring road which struggles to cope now. Roads such as Huntington Road are already taking too much traffic, especially HGV traffic and cycling is a perilous activity. This is not an environmentally/cycle friendly city. Employment proposals will add pressure and the combination of developments is potentially going to make living and working here unbearable.</p> | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13072 | H54 | Objection | Concerns for loss of greenfield land, flooding, drainage, power lines, increase in density of housing, loss of character, lack of services, lack of schools, lack of doctors, Lack of dental practices, increased traffic, lack of parking, congestion, poor access and lack of maintenance. | |
| 13073 | H54 | Objection | Object to the scale of development proposed for this site | |
| 13078 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about issues with, the Gp surgery, traffic, drainage, flooding, congestion, lack of retail and poor access to the site. | |
| 13079 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about this development due to the following issues; medical facilities, lack of infrastructure, lack of funding, increased traffic, narrow roads poor access, lack of parking, road safety, impact on local services, drainage, sewerage, pollution, lack of affordable housing and loss of green belt land. | |
| 13081 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about congestion, lack of parking, full schools, overloaded drainage system, full GP practices, surface water, sewerage treatment and lack of local businesses and employment. | |
| 13082 | H54 | Objection | Concerned about this allocation due to issues with, loss of green belt, inadequate infrastructure, increased pressure on facilities, lack of parking, oversubscribed health care facilities and dentists, poor drainage, over subscribed schools, loss of a local centre, over stretched caring agencies and issues with public transport. | |
| 13120 | H54 | Objection | The majority of services in Haxby (and Wigginton) are either at or almost at capacity. As an engineer I made errors assuming infrastructure would be easily adapted /modified to meet new capacity. Existing infrastructure is clearly at capacity. Road network - frequent delays on Strensall, York and Wigginton Roads as well as Haxby Town Centre and school parking. Usher Lane/Station Road junction is a cause for concern if traffic is to be directed there from new developments. School places are at a premium. Mains water & sewerage services including flood defences/alleviation from River Foss - problems have not been addressed. Health services are already under pressure. Past experience suggests there will not be enough profit for developers to fund all these infrastructure improvements. | |
| 13162 | H54 | Objection | This development is dominated by powerlines. There is poor access and there would be increased traffic. Concerned about the increase in density of the area. Drains and sewers would not be able to cope. We do not believe this area should be developed. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 13173 | H54 | Objection | This development cannot happen in Haxby as the roads will not take the pressure as they are already at capacity. Should the station be reopened it will take pressure off the roads | |
| 13175 | H54 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of: likely increase to existing local traffic congestion/parking problems and underprovided bus service; lack of amenities, particularly for young people; lack of school spaces. | |
| 77 | H54 | Support | Section 4: This consultation - agree that the site, identified in Area 6 on page 186 represents the views of residents of the parish. | Strensall with Towthorpe PC |
| 5826 | H54 | Support | Development of this site for housing is agreeable as it is well contained and would serve to nicely 'round out' this corner of Haxby. However, 49 dwellings is a gross overdevelopment in relation to the surrounding area. | |
| 12387 | H54 | Support | I support the proposed housing plan in my area. Although sorry to lose a field for dog walking I support the plan for the area H54. | |
| 12543 | H54 | Support | I am in full agreement of building more houses. It will be beneficial all extra shops, improved water and sewage and new schools. | |
| 12566 | H54 | Support | Haxby and Wigginton would be much improved by more diversity and a mix of people. I'm in favour of more houses in Haxby, preferably priced for those who might not be able to afford to buy elsewhere. We will need some help with roads, schools etc and a train station would make a big difference. | |
| 12760 | H54 | Support | I have no objection to the White Land Field Proposal. | |
| 13020 | H54 | Support | Haxby could just about cope with this development if undertaken with no other in the village. | |
| 659 | H54 | Support | As landowner of the site Persimmon homes supports the allocation of this site for residential development. Planning application to follow as Plan progresses towards adoption. | Persimmon Homes |
| 5323 | H54 | Support | General support for development | |
| 10297 | H54 | Support | Completely agree that new houses are built on this land and more should be found to build even more houses particularly for first time buyers. Though services such as schools and proper drainage are also essential. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 13012 | H55 | Objection | This area should be retained as commercial ... Once its gone its gone. If converted to housing surely there is a need to have some amenities in the area? | |
| 2765 | H55 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |
| 12135 | H55 | Support | Supporting the site for housing - commenting that no parking for the site should be allocated on Redeness Street. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12702 | H56 | Comment | Support the Heslington Trust's view on this proposal and that it should be restricted to family and affordable housing and exclude student housing and that consideration be given to landscaping to protect as many trees as possible. | |
| 13013 | H56 | Comment | These playing fields are popular for sport with adults and children whilst residents use them to walk and run in, they are also used by dog walkers and by students as a route to the University. Concerned about the stretches of woodland along both Windmill Lane and facing Hull Road - these are important corridors for the movement of a wide variety of wildlife. Also concerned about the number of houses proposed, 190 suggests apartment blocks are to be built that will quickly be sub-let to students in an that already has high density of student homes. CYC should carefully consider the type of housing and density planned and the woodland if possible should be extended rather than extended. The entrance to the site should be off Hull Road as Windmill Lane is a narrow residential road. | |
| 349 | H56 | Comment | We note that the playing field will be replaced and equal in terms of quality, quantity and access. In respect of any proposals to replace playing field, replacement must represent a genuine replacement i.e. creation of a new playing field. Improvements to existing playing field do not represent a genuine replacement because the quantity element of the exception has not been addressed only the quality element. The quantity element can be addressed by bringing into use areas of an existing playing field that are currently incapable of supporting a pitch or pitches without significant works, or creating new playing field on land that is not currently playing field | Sport England |
| 670 | H56 | comment | Concerned about the lack of testing of the cumulative impact of sites, including H56, on the environmental capacity of York. | |
| 863 | H56 | Comment | Commenting on H56 Land Adjacent to Hull Road: development on this site should be limited to domestic properties, should include affordable housing and development should not increase traffic. | |
| 2412 | H56 | Comment | Would insist existing TPOs adhered to and that the proposed construction that would cause 'impact on Hull Road junctions' but does not state how this problem would be overcome apart from stating that a traffic impact assessment would need to be carried out. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 5602 | H56 | Comment | This development should be limited to domestic properties with a good proportion of affordable houses. Action should be taken to ensure development does not increase traffic flows through Heslington Village | |
| 1358 | H56 | Objection | It is considered that both the developable area and density outlined in the PSC document would not be achievable and that a further assessment of the site should significantly reduce the net developable area from the 3.8ha assumed in the PSC. It is calculated that a realistic developable area is 2.13ha. The Masterplan indicates the site capacity is circa 80 dwellings. | York St John University |
| 5793 | H56 | Objection | Formally object to the allocation of H56. The loss of playing fields is contrary to NPPF and Sport England guidance, as insufficient justification has been made to warrant the loss of a much needed facility which is still used for recreational use. The recent loss of playing pitches across the City has simply not been balanced out by the creation of new facilities. Particularly facilities that are available for wider community use. Therefore, the Hull Road site should be retained for recreational use. | City Of York Hockey Club |
| 6521 | H56 | Objection | Objection to development on the following grounds: loss of sports pitches without adequate local replacement in an area already deficient in accessible public open space; traffic on Hull Road makes residential use untenable (see Inspector's comments re Sainsbury's/B+Q); | Cllr Mark Warters |
| 12663 | H56 | Objection | Even if site is suitable for housing, which I don't, I cannot believe it could accommodate 190 homes. Hull Road is very busy and prone to long traffic queues. Additional 190 cars attempting to exit onto the main road is unthinkable. The plan states there is access to local health and education amenities, however, I believe these are at capacity. Document states area scored negatively in relation to air quality to add the emissions of a further 190 cars would be something the belt of protected trees could not negate. Playing fields are regarded by the local community as a valuable resource and provide a safe play area away from the main road. Providing playing fields in Haxby would not compensate for loss in this area. There is a wide range of wildlife within the site. It is also a huge concern the protected trees would be damaged during construction works. Urge the council to find other uses for this site rather than housing. Could the David Lloyd Centre not take over the land and continue its use for sport and recreation? Also unsure if there is a covenant on land restricting its use for sport and recreation ? | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 12728 | H56 | Objection | Developing site H56 is unnecessary in the context of ST4. Building on playing fields should be a last resort. Traffic congestion is already an issue. | |
| 12905 | H56 | Objection | We object to the proposals in the current state and urge the council to reconsider the density of properties to a more appropriate allowance. There are also issues with: density, loss of character, over shadowing, loss of light, loss of visibility, access, traffic and congestion. | |
| 12922 | H56 | objection | Concerned about this site due to issues with: loss of character, student accommodation including flats, private homes, loss of football pitches, loss of trees on site, loss of the ancient wood land, impact on wildlife and traffic. | |
| 13012 | H56 | Objection | Too big! Leave some space for wildlife. | |
| 13129 | H56 | Objection | This is an oasis amongst houses, University and Science Park, used by dog walkers, walkers, runners and children. The trees and fields are a haven for wildlife. 190 houses is far too many. Traffic is already bad on Hull Road and Field Lane. | |
| 46 | H56 | Support | Support proposal if development for family and affordable housing, not student housing. Must consider landscaping and protect trees. | Heslington Village Trust |
| 48 | H56 | Support | Generally support site provided there is no vehicular access onto Windmill Lane or to York Science Park and University Road. Support continued preservation of mature trees around site. | Heslington PC |
| 5671 | H56 | Support | Support - this is a block of land with good shielding by mature trees and connected to existing infrastructure ideal for family housing | |
| 13014 | H56 | Support | Support this proposal for residential development provided it be family and affordable housing, not student housing and consideration be given to landscaping to protect as many trees as possible. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 1189 | H56 | Support | Residential on this site would be ideal but not for student housing. | |
| 1358 | H56 | Support | The allocation of the site for residential development is supported by the York St John University. It is accepted by the Council the University's Hull Road and Heworth Croft sites are surplus to requirements [for sports facilities] following development of the Sport Park. All local teams that historically used the Hull Road pitches have now relocated to Haxby Rod, moved there matches elsewhere or disbanded. The science Park and the University of York have confirmed there is no interest in delivering an extension to the Science Park, and the site is undeliverable for this use. Any future development of the site will have to retain significant tree belts on the northern and eastern boundaries, and existing tree planting on the west boundary. In addition new tree planting will be required to achieve an effective screen between the new development and the tennis centre. Retention of the existing access road will also be needed to maintain access to the tennis centre and to serve the proposed residential development. This would, in effect, divide the site into two developable areas separated by a shared access. | York St John University |
| 2556 | H56 | Support | Site would be perfect for residential housing rather than students, who are already well provided for. | |
| 2765 | H56 | Support | Preferable to building on Greenfield land. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 4039 | H56 | Support | A good site for family and affordable homes but there should be no access by vehicles onto Windmill Lane or the Science Park to protect Heslington Village. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 71 | H57 | Comment | There is a need for houses but also for sustainable employment, which is currently provided by the existing garden centre. A recent planning application for ancillary activities at the garden centre has been refused on the grounds of impact on green belt, protecting historic character and setting and views of the Minster/Villages. Concern is raised about the impact of urban sprawl on this rural area. Note the need to provide services/safe routes for children living in the new development. Planted rows of cherry trees provide a wildlife corridor. The A59 is considered by Planners as a green corridor, linking the rural areas to the city centre (see refs to Green Belt papers and earlier local plans). At present there is severe flood risk on the road created by paving and large non-porous surfaced areas. Carr Dyke runs at capacity, increasing the risk of flooding to York. Increased housing in this area will only add to the risk of flooding. Sustainable transport using the P+R scheme is unrealistic as it is time-limited and not routed through the village where services are located. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 78 | H57 | Comment | There is a need for houses but also for sustainable employment, which is currently provided by the existing garden centre. A recent planning application for ancillary activities at the garden centre has been refused on the grounds of impact on green belt, protecting historic character and setting and views of the Minster/Villages. Concern is raised about the impact of urban sprawl on this rural area. Note the need to provide services/safe routes for children living in the new development. Planted rows of cherry trees provide a wildlife corridor. The A59 is considered by Planners as a green corridor, linking the rural areas to the city centre (see refs to Green Belt papers and earlier local plans). At present there is severe flood risk on the road created by paving and large non-porous surfaced areas. Carr Dyke runs at capacity, increasing the risk of flooding to York. Increased housing in this area will only add to the risk of flooding. Sustainable transport using the P+R scheme is unrealistic as it is time-limited and not routed through the village where services are located. | Upper Poppleton PC |
| 12382 | H57 | Comment | Implementation of a housing scheme would incur job losses on an existing employment site and would lead to coalescence. If viewed with ST19 the effect on the adjoining roads and junction with the A59 would be huge. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12782 | H57 | Comment | There is a need for houses but also for sustainable employment, which is currently provided by the existing garden centre. A recent planning application for ancillary activities at the garden centre has been refused on the grounds of impact on green belt, protecting historic character and setting and views of the Minster/Villages. Concern is raised about the impact of urban sprawl on this rural area. Note the need to provide services/safe routes for children living in the new development. Planted rows of cherry trees provide a wildlife corridor. The A59 is considered by Planners as a green corridor, linking the rural areas to the city centre (see refs to Green Belt papers and earlier local plans). At present there is severe flood risk on the road created by paving and large non-porous surfaced areas. Carr Dyke runs at capacity, increasing the risk of flooding to York. Increased housing in this area will only add to the risk of flooding. Sustainable transport using the P+R scheme is unrealistic as it is time-limited and not routed through the village where services are located. | |
| 12889 | H57 | Comment | Concerned about large lorries, cars, increased traffic on the roads, BREXIT, loss of character, access, lack of facilities and roads being removed by bus lanes. | |
| 192 | H57 | Comment | Housing for this site is much more preferable to being designated as a general employment site. However there are concerns for, high density of the site, site relationship with the A1237 and A59, traffic and congestion. The site needs good design and landscaping as well as to maintain the general attractiveness. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 671 | H57 | Comment | There is a need for houses but also for sustainable employment, which is currently provided by the existing garden centre. A recent planning application for ancillary activities at the garden centre has been refused on the grounds of impact on green belt, protecting historic character and setting and views of the Minster/Villages. Concern is raised about the impact of urban sprawl on this rural area. Note the need to provide services/safe routes for children living in the new development. Planted rows of cherry trees provide a wildlife corridor. The A59 is considered by Planners as a green corridor, linking the rural areas to the city centre (see refs to Green Belt papers and earlier local plans). At present there is severe flood risk on the road created by paving and large non-porous surfaced areas. Carr Dyke runs at capacity, increasing the risk of flooding to York. Increased housing in this area will only add to the risk of flooding. Sustainable transport using the P+R scheme is unrealistic as it is time-limited and not routed through the village where services are located. | |
| 2412 | H57 | Comment | There are no schools in 800m of site - no problem children walking 10 mins as long as sufficient facilities are in place for safe access and pavements and road crossings. | |
| 5408 | H57 | Comment | Housing growth on this site is acceptable due to good transport links. However, only journeys into York are catered for by existing public transport. Cars will be used for shopping at Clifton Moor, Monks X and Vanguard as well as to schools. Schools and health centres in Poppleton are already stretched (can this extra demand be absorbed?) | |
| 9509 | H57 | Comment | No building over two storeys should be allowed as it would spoil the visual appearance of one of the major entries into the historic city of York. | |
| 10189 | H57 | Comment | What are the plans for infrastructure - roads, schools, healthcare, sewage and flood control? Traffic management? Recreational facilities? | |
| 238 | H57 | Objection | It is likely that this allocation would cause harm to a number of elements identified as contributors to the historic character and setting of York - reducing the gap between Northminster Business Park and the perceived southern boundary of Poppleton. Mitigation measures should include reducing the scale of the site to remove land to the south of the existing buildings. Historic England have no objection to redevelopment of the part of the site currently occupied by existing buildings. | Historic England |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 659 | H57 | Objection | This site needs to be deleted, as it would be a remarkable interpretation to conclude residential development can be expected to come forward in the near or medium term. As owners of the site suggested it is a very successful centre for Wyevale and the existing use far exceeds alternative residential use. | Persimmon Homes |
| 1605 | H57 | Objection | Do not believe this site should be considered in isolation from ST1 and ST2 culminating in 1190 houses. Opposed to this site as it removes employment opportunities from area and appears to have resulted in an increased site proposal for Northminster Business Park that uses greenbelt and grade 1 agricultural land. No mention is made of impact on road network though it will have significant impact on ring road and A59. There will be a need for car use because of locality and will result in more congested road network. There will be a lack of school places at local primary and secondary schools along with pressure at medical facilities. Houses at this site breaks the separation between houses on A59 and those at other side of ring road. The current garden centre is in keeping with the green belt area and separates the current developments. Other brownfield sites should be developed first. | |
| 3029 | H57 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of increased traffic, residential amenity, impact on Poppleton's amenities and the loss of local employment. | |
| 3447 | H57 | Objection | Site should be retained for retail & employment use as it is a well used thriving business which supports local ancillary businesses. It is an appropriate use in this part of the A59 corridor, protecting the approach to the City. Support the comments made by Upper Poppleton Parish Council on H57. | |
| 3494 | H57 | Objection | Objects to development of the site on the grounds of increased traffic and potential pedestrian safety issues | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 3559 | H57 | Objection | Existing garden centre well used, site lies outside village settlement line, concern of urban sprawl, use of park and site unrealistic, A59 is a green corridor, Carr Dyke at capacity which increases risk of flooding, children living on proposed site would have to cross A59 to get to school, local schools at capacity. Must be looked at alongside ST19 in terms of impact on access to A59. Sustainable transport using the P+R scheme is unrealistic as it is time-limited and not routed through the village where services are located. At present there is severe flood risk on the road created by paving and large non-porous surfaced areas. Carr Dyke runs at capacity, increasing the risk of flooding to York. Increased housing in this area will only add to the risk of flooding. Planted rows of cherry trees provide a wildlife corridor. The A59 is considered by Planners as a green corridor, linking the rural areas to the city centre (see refs to Green Belt papers and earlier local plans) | |
| 3561 | H57 | Objection | The new P&R, the new roundabout and traffic lights makes area much louder and busier than previously experienced- building new houses will make it even worse. Closing of the Garden Centre will not be popular | |
| 4088 | H57 | Objection | This site is within the green belt. Pedestrian access to site is difficult and dangerous. Children walking to Poppleton Ousebank and Manor Schools would be at considerable risk. Stresses on infrastructure particularly health and education services will need to be addressed. Previous manor School site should be retained for infrastructure development. Traffic access and egress needs full consideration. | |
| 5826 | H57 | Objection | Site should not be allocated for housing. It is separated from Poppleton by a busy A road. Housing here would not be part of a cohesive community because residents would be isolated from their neighbours. Access to the site for residents is likely to be frustrated by the volume of traffic produced both by the A59 P&R site opposite and Northminster Business Park. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|--|--|
| 9509 | H57 | Objection | The site is on the very edge of the Green Belt. The junction on which this site is situated is already under heavy stress at certain times of the day and would possibly be further impacted by the development. There is no route to Poppleton Primary or Manor School without having to cross the A59. The effect of this will probably mean more car journeys down Station Road to take children to various schools. 93 houses on this 2.8 hectare site seems very high. There is already an on-going problem with drainage in this area. | |
| 9634 | H57 | Objection | Object because; It floods- the car park was under water after a flash flood last year. Flood plains should not be developed on. Traffic congestion on Northfield lane/A59 93 homes appears to be very high density and out of keeping Coalescence - housing is a very different development to a garden centre Will affect adversely veterinary practice and horse stables next door. this is green belt and two applications for the car park have been refused in last few months. | |
| 10836 | H57 | Objection | The Northfield Lane/A59 junction has become busier due to the P+R - no developments that add any further traffic onto Northfield Lane should be contemplated. Residential development on the site is likely to adversely affect the veterinary practice and horse stables next door, land uses that are compatible with the green belt and which should be encouraged. 93 houses appears to be very high density out of keeping with the surrounding area. No development should be allowed on flood plains or anywhere else liable to flooding. | |
| 11357 | H57 | Objection | I strongly object to the proposal to build 93 houses on the Wyevale Garden Centre site. There is no evidence that brownfield sites have been investigated that would not require the demolition of existing businesses. Concerned about increase traffic and HGV's including the noise, road safety and vibrations caused. The development of this site would have a further detrimental impact on my standard of life and that of my neighbour. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12075 | H57 | Objection | I am opposed to this development for the following reasons: There is existing development close by (British Sugar) providing enough housing for the area. Schools are already under significant burden. There are concerns for increased traffic and congestion on the A59 and road safety. Loss of employment is also an issue. | |
| 12204 | H57 | Objection | No mention of how the planning process will address the need for schools, GPs, dental surgeries, shops, libraries, open space and how transport will be managed. Boroughbridge Road corridor is very busy and congested. Poppleton Ousebank Primary School continues to be oversubscribed - the overcrowding has a negative impact on learning support and is bad for children. Whilst policies allow children from across York to attend the school if there are vacancies, this will not be acceptable when there are hundreds of new homes in the area. | |
| 12211 | H57 | Objection | Unclear if Poppleton Garden Centre will be retained when H57 is developed - presume not as covers 1/3 of the proposed site. The Garden Centre should be retained as it contributes to the look and feel of the village as it enables keen gardeners access to tools and plants. It is a source of local jobs and is used particularly by the older residents of the village as an important aspect of their social life. Query the logic of building more houses in an area subject to traffic congestion -adding more houses will make it worse. The addition of the McDonalds on Poppleton roundabout was a one of the worst decisions made by the Council - promoting poor health and undermining the Green Belt, with a very clear encroachment. Combined with H57, this would greatly erode the area between Poppleton and the City. | |
| 12384 | H57 | Objection | Object to this site being used for residential use for a number of reasons including: loss of the garden centre, lack of road safety, poor pelican crossing, lack of capacity in schools, car parking and the site is too far for people to walk. | |
| 12443 | H57 | Objection | Existing garden centre well used, site lies outside village settlement line, concern of urban sprawl, use of park and site unrealistic, A59 is a green corridor, Carr Dyke at capacity which increases risk of flooding, children living on proposed site would have to cross A59 to get to school, local schools at capacity. Must be looked at alongside ST19 in terms of impact on access to A59. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|-------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 12609 | H57 | Objection | This site should not be developed in the proposed manner as there are issues with, the park and ride, traffic, there is currently a lack of occupancy on sites, traffic cause endanger school children, the garden centre provides employment opportunities, would cause un acceptable urban sprawl, strain on infrastructure, loss of green belt and this site should be guarded and protected as is an important historical site. | |
| 12610 | H57 | Objection | Haxby is already over populated and there are further issues with, lack of infrastructure, poor drainage systems especially for surface water run off, heavy traffic, poor road structure and insufficient parking. | |
| 12611 | H57 | Objection | If sites ST2 and ST1 go ahead then H57 would be too much development and cause further issues with regard to congestion and traffic. | |
| 12690 | H57 | Objection | Object to this site because It floods Traffic congestion - would be generated at Northfield Lane/A59 junction Housing density proposed appears very high and out of keeping Coalescence would be a danger Likely to affect local businesses (vets and horse stables) that are compatible with the green belt This is green belt land and two earlier planning applications have been refused in last few months. | |
| 12707 | H57 | Objection | Objects to development on the following grounds: flood risk; increased traffic congestion and associated highway safety issues; development density is out-of-keeping with surrounding area; coalescence; creation of urban sprawl; impact on existing infrastructure and services; impact on adjacent veterinary practice and horse stables; site is green belt. | |
| 12929 | H57 | Objection | I strongly object to this development for the following reasons: road layout, lack of infrastructure, increased traffic and lack of services. | |
| 13059 | H57 | Objection | Strongly object to H57 - it would create more traffic problems at this already busy junction. Extra families would only make it worse particularly for children attending the Primary School and adults wishing to take advantage of the facilities in the village. It would be hazardous to cross the road especially in the mornings. | |

| ID | Site | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (names of individuals removed) |
|------|------|---------------|---|--|
| 1338 | H57 | Support | Support proposed allocation of site for residential purposes that will make a positive contribution towards meeting the Council's identified housing need. Housing on this site is consistent with one of core planning principles of NPPF that local authorities should encourage re-use of brownfield sites provided not of high environmental value. Pressure would be removed from green field development. Accessibility is excellent due to proximity of P&R and is well located in relation to Poppleton village, whilst recognised that connectivity to existing community can be improved as a result of development of site. The scale, bulk and massing of existing buildings together with traffic generation and activity associated with the site would all be reduced as a result of a residential development. Enhanced landscaping would lead to significant visual improvements to site and countryside beyond. | |
| 2765 | H57 | Support | Support redevelopment of Brownfield land. | |