

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
80	E2	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
13066	E2	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.	
2484	E2	Objection	Objects to development of the site on the grounds of likely increase to existing local traffic congestion and congestion on A64 and A1237.	
13154	E2	Objection	Very concerned about extra traffic on Malton Road which will affect residents around Elmfield Grove, Terrace etc. The park and ride buses are now too full to pick up residents en route from Monks Cross. This will only worsen.	
77	E2	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)
2765	E2	Support	Infill development in existing built-up area.	
5826	E2	Support	Site is ideal for employment use, but the derelict land immediately west of the access road to this plot should also be allocated for employment use.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
6166	E5	Comment	Agree with development constraints. 900sqm reasonable given existing floorspace and density of circa 45%. Concerned that permission of alternative uses in the area making the less attractive for employment. Removal of permitted permission 15/01571/FULM from boundary reduces site size to below threshold.	Yorvale and Maple Grove Developments
6166	E5	Objection	Land at Layerthorpe/James Street. Site should remain unallocated to maximise flexibility. There has been a gradual loss of employment use in the area driven by natural changes in the market. Site scores below Employment Land Review 'moderate' score. Saving for employment use would be contrary to NPP in this context.	Yorvale and Maple Grove Developments
2765	E5	Support	Support infill development in existing industrial area.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
79	E8	Objection	The proposed expansion would have adverse impact on primary gateway to village as it will be dominated by industrial type buildings. Conservation area is close to proposed area.	Wheldrake PC
1200	E8	Objection	This area of grassland greatly enhances the main approach to the village and makes industrial estate less intrusive. Development of the site would degrade value of historic village street & Conservation Area. Only green space in the village.	
2765	E8	Objection	Green site with trees contributes to village character. Risk of overdevelopment at village edge.	
12304	E8	Objection	Wheldrake is already suffering from blocked drains and ditches, the sewage station is not able to cope now. Services would be under extreme pressure i.e. Schools, doctors, roads etc. Should traffic exit onto Back Lane South this would be problematic as used by dog walkers, cyclists, runners and pedestrians together with horse riders.	
12539	E8	Objection	I hope that this could be re considered as we would lose green space, the buildings would be obtrusive and the development would be out of keeping compared the rest of the village.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
11367	E9	Comment	Site commentary is incorrect. The site is not part of the existing industrial estate, but it is a green field behind residential houses - the field offering a break between houses and businesses. It is described as brownfield, but is clearly greenfield and used for animal grazing.	
5535	E9	Objection	We will be directly affected by any development on this site that will only add to the present level of noise and air pollution and add to levels on York Road and the village. We will also get more speeding lorries, vans etc using York Road.	
5536	E9	Objection	We are already surrounded by industrial units and will be directly affected by this proposal. Already we suffer from noise and air pollution and huge volumes of traffic. This proposal will only add to the misery with more noise, pollution etc. Suggest proposal be dismissed on these grounds as well as on safety to children walking this route to school and playground and doctors surgery.	
9726	E9	Objection	Industry is hidden from the village at the moment. However, unsure why there is a need to extend both this and site ST26 as there are a number of empty spaces/units. No evidence is provided of demand. Work force will need to commute increasing traffic as there is scant public transport main objection is amount of traffic that would go through village of Elvington with additional dangers etc.	
9937	E9	Objection	Potential creation of 50-200 new jobs will inevitably create much more traffic (commercial and private) for the village and surrounding area. Traffic, congestion, pollution and noise for nearby residents is likely to result. Proper access will be required with sewerage and drainage facilities.	
11367	E9	Objection	The inclusion of this site would be to the detriment of the amenity of nearby residents.	
13163	E9	Objection	Objects to development on the grounds that it takes no account of its relationship to existing properties, their access or the view and impact on residents.	
61	E9	Support	Supports E9 - but points out this is a greenfield not brownfield site.	Elvington PC

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
657	E9	Support	No objection to this site - provided restricted to light industry and limitation on movement of HGVs in village	
1674	E9	Support	We are writing to offer support to the allocation of the site E9. We strongly support its inclusion as it forms a natural extension to the existing business parks at Elvington Airfield. There is already interest in the site. Therefore the site may be developed and occupied before the Local Plan process has been completed. We believe that further land should be allocated to for development to respond to the on going demand for land in this location.	William Birch and Sons
2765	E9	Support	I support redevelopment of this Brownfield land but need to address issues e.g. Access.	
5153	E9	Support	Including this site is sensible - development should be limited to small units for small, high value businesses	
5259	E9	Support	Support the site being included in the Local Plan	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
1056	E10	Objection	Empty units already so why build more?	
59	E10	Support	Supported as it develops currently derelict site within the industrial estate.	Dunnington Parish Council
2765	E10	Support	Support infill development in existing built-up area.	
13155	E10	Support	E10 seems OK.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
13066	E11	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.	
12208	E11	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.	
2765	E11	Support	Support redevelopment of Brownfield land.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
2765	E12	Support	Infill development in existing built-up area.	