

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
61	SP1	Objection	The previous inspectors decision was clear on this site. Until CYC has determined position on unlawful occupation and a continued use (application 16/01443/FUL) the site should be withdrawn from the Local Plan.	Elvington PC
657	SP1	Objection	<p>Object to site on number of grounds</p> <p>*Following Appeal Inspector reached a marginal decision to allow temporary use of site for period of 5 years to June 2016 due to then lack of sites. Inspector was clear after this period it should revert to green belt</p> <p>*Elvington is classed as a rural village community. National Planning Policy states that 'mixed use 'sites 'as required by Travelling Showpeople) are not permitted in such rural locations.</p> <p>*the site was rejected during Technical Site Assessment Process (June 2013 Annex 23, Fig 13) as being unsuitable for residential/employment purposes.</p> <p>*If granted it sets a precedent for future rural green belt applications against NPP and Inspectors decision.</p>	
1008	SP1	Objection	Object to the temporary or permanent use of the site for Travellers. Site has poor access and is currently green belt.	
1666	SP1	Objection	This site proposal should have been withdrawn from the Local Plan.	
1667	SP1	Objection	As The Stables was subject to a planning order from a national and legally binding source it should not have been included in the Local Plan of 2014 and should now be removed. Locals have expressed there wishes and objected to this site on greenbelt land. A reasonable solution would be to locate it on the edge of ST15. The Stables is part of an existing open space and should be protected under this rule and is part of a historic landscape being part of the original grounds of Brinkworth Hall. year residence was granted 5 years ago, it was and still is green belt and should be returned to agriculture as conditioned in the approval. The site is not screened as stated	
2765	SP1	Objection	I object due to Green Belt location, access from a dangerous bend and close to residential properties.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
5153	SP1	Objection	If CYC has refused permission before site(s) should be excluded from the Plan. The site has been recognised a Green Belt since the early 1980s and a Planning Inspector was clear that from June 2016 the land should be returned to Green Belt. NPPF identifies this type of site as being unsuitable for travellers and travelling showpeople. NPPF requires equal treatment to Travellers - including this site amounts to preferential treatment and sets a dangerous precedent	
5237	SP1	Objection	Objects to use of the site as it is currently green belt and should be retained as such (note Planning Inspectorate ruling).	
5259	SP1	Objection	CYC should not include this site in any Local plan until it has enforced the Planning Inspector's ruling and rejected the current Planning Application for continued use (16/01443). NPP[F] requires 'fair and equal treatment for travellers' - not preferential treatment. No member of the settled community would be given planning permission / residency rights to occupy the green field site. The site has already been rejected for residential development	
5535	SP1	Objection	This is a green belt site and has been refused for development for years. Against development here unless it would help the young people of Elvington with starter homes.	
5536	SP1	Objection	This is a lovely prime spot that has been allowed for mobile homes, fairground rides and caravans - now proposals for more.	
5571	SP1	Objection	Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt and should revert to green belt (existing use given temporary consent'	
5572	SP1	Objection	Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt and should revert to green belt (existing use given temporary consent'	
5738	SP1	Objection	Object on grounds of loss of Green Belt, Land should have reverted to Green Belt earlier in 2016, increased traffic from cars, vans and trailers, extra traffic on main road would cause a hazard, existing site is untidy - additional caravans / chalets would make it worse.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
9803	SP1	Objection	General objection on the grounds that the site has previously been refused planning permission by CYC and the Planning Inspectorate.	
10463	SP1	Objection	Two previous applications were refused by CYC here for change of use of buildings/land to travelling show persons site. The proposal is considered inappropriate development in greenbelt and therefore conflict with national policy advice in PPG Note 2, Policy GB1 of CYC Draft Local Plan and plan would erode open, rural character of site and have a significant visual impact on character and appearance of area contrary to national advice in PPS 1, PPS7 and policies GP1 and H16 of CYC Local Plan and not aware of any circumstances that have changed. Site had previous temporary consent for 5 years for single occupancy that terminated in June 2016 and should one revert back to green belt. There are significant traffic and road issues with site located on corner of busy road (B1228) and use would interfere with free traffic flow creating significant traffic hazard. Existing building is inadequate in size for use associated and larger buildings would be inappropriate in green belt location. This site should be removed from CYC draft local plan.	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
10527	SP1	Objection	<p>Use as is stands was only granted as use for a single travelling showperson site at appeal with express intent of Planning Inspector that it should be vacated and revert back to green belt by June 2016. Elvington is classified as a rural village. National Planning Policy specifies that 'mixed use' sites (required by Travelling Show people) are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. There are no special circumstances that outweigh harm that would be inflicted on the green belt, the protection of which should be CYCs over riding planning consideration. The site is not fully screened by vegetation throughout the year and use has eroded the open and rural character of the site. Original objections raised concern consent would lead to expansion and permanent dwelling on site, this is becoming a reality. In order to be treated as travellers' under Planning law they must demonstrate a nomadic lifestyle - the occupiers do not fit this description. The Planning Inspector granted temporary residency because CYC failed to provide alternative appropriate Travelling Show Person plots. This status expired in June this year. The Stables Site should be returned to its green field status. CYC should find appropriate site for travelling show people external to the green belt.</p>	
10632	SP1	Objection	<p>Elvington is classified as a rural village. National Planning Policy specifies that 'mixed use' sites (required by Travelling Show people) are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. There are no special circumstances that outweigh harm that would be inflicted on the green belt, the protection of which should be CYCs over riding planning consideration. In order to be treated as travellers' under Planning law they must demonstrate a nomadic lifestyle - the occupiers do not fit this description. The Planning Inspector granted temporary residency because CYC failed to provide alternative appropriate Travelling Show Person plots. This status expired in June this year. The Stables Site should be returned to its green field status. CYC should find appropriate site for travelling show people external to the green belt.</p>	

ID	Site	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (names of individuals removed)
10697	SP1	Objection	This should return to green belt status in line with planning inspectors ruling 5 years ago and not suitable for movement of vehicles and equipment on a dangerous and busy bend. Site currently has Park Home building onsite that is not mobile as has a plumbed in central heating oil tank. CYC should find an alternative site as being used illegally.	
11367	SP1	Objection	The original application for a single family site was refused twice by CYC, but only allowed on appeal based on an officer confirming that an alternative site would be found in 5 years, rather than there being any exceptional circumstances. Now, 5 year later, the fact that CYC haven't found an alternative site, doesn't justify its retention and expansion.	
12902	SP1	Objection	This site should be withdrawn from the plan as there are issues with the current temporary use of the site.	