

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York | | | | |
| 4 | SS1 | Comm | The evidence in the Transport Topic Paper indicates a substantial increase in pressure on the A64 leading to a need for physical mitigation in addition to sustainable transport measures. In the HE's response to the 2016 consultation it anticipated capacity issues on the A64 and at junctions with the primary road network | Highways England |
| 7 | SS1 | Comm | The Spatial strategy is predicated on the delivery of 867 dwellings per year over the Plan period and post plan period to 2037/38. The housing need figure identified through the SHMA follows the same methodology as the assessment carried out for Hambleton District Council. It is considerably lower than the 1070 new homes per annum calculated using the proposed formula in the White Paper 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'. Therefore, depending on the outcome of the consultation, and progress on the City of York Local Plan, it may be necessary to consider reviewing the figure or providing more evidence to support it. | Hambleton District Council |
| 9 | SS1 | Comm | Selby District Council notes the policy states that the plan will deliver a minimum of 867 dwellings per year but it needs to be confident that undertaking a policy-on approach to housing need would identify no more than this. Whilst Selby District Council believes that CYC is confident that it can realise the growth aspirations in the plan it is concerned that any increases in the 867 dwelling per annum as a result of the proposed methodology for the calculation of housing requirements set out in the DCLG consultation on 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places', which if taken forward would increase the housing requirement to 1070 dwellings per annum, could raise significant cross-boundary issues. | Selby District Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 42 | SS1 | Comm | Clarification of bullet point three of Policy SS1. Locally significant nature conservation sites could be changed to 'locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or SINC'. This should help to distinguish between SINC and SLI's. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 145 | SS1 | Comm | <p>The housing supply makes an allowance for windfall sites of 169 dwellings per annum from year 4. This is evidenced by the Windfall Technical Paper. However, it is noted that the use of historic windfall in an area where there has been no adopted Plan may not provide the most appropriate basis for windfall development going forward. Policy SS1 states that where viable and deliverable, the re-use of previously developed land will be phased first. It is not clear how this will work in practice. The council's monitoring as set out in paragraphs 15.22 to 15.30 and Table 15.2 highlights risks including the non-delivery of sites, and sets targets in relation to the delivery of sites. The HBF recommends that specific monitoring triggers are introduced. It is not clear from the table how quickly action will be taken if targets are not met, and if the proposed solutions do not lead to targets being met how long it will be before the final resort of reviewing the plan is considered. Taking into consideration the timeframe for preparing the current plan it is considered that the production of a revised plan may not be a quick solution to the non-delivery of sites and may therefore not be an appropriate resolution. The HBF recommends as large a contingency as possible (circa at least 20%) to the overall housing land supply to provide sufficient flexibility for unforeseen circumstances and in acknowledgement that the housing requirement is a minimum not a maximum figure.</p> | Home Builders Federation |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 187 | SS1 | Comm | The Chambers' 2016 Representation comments remain relevant. The Local Plan identifies a requirement for only 34 hectares of employment land over the 15-year plan period plus the additional 5 years for the period 2033 to 2038. | York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce |
| 192 | SS1 | Comm | The colours in Figure 3.1 do not tally well with what it is depicting | |
| 238 | SS1 | Comm | Suggested text amends to refer to both impact of location and <u>scale</u> of growth, and to recognise the contribution of the rural landscape to the special character and setting of the City, as follows: Para 3.5, "...are illustrated in Fig 3.1. However, the open countryside beyond the ring road also makes an important contribution to the wider rural setting of the historic city", and Policy SS1, "The location and scale of development through the plan...etc". | Historic England |
| 386 | SS1 | Comm | Replace third bullet as follows: 'Preventing any additional exceedences or increases in illegal levels of air pollution'. | York Green Party |
| 1299 | SS1 | Comm | Supportive of spatial principles but concerned with how the strategy has been interpreted in the Plan in particular the scale of growth and provision of new dwellings over the plan period. The 867 annual dwelling figure is not based on evidence base and does not reflect national policy/guidance. | Spaworths on behalf of Lucienne M Bleasdale |
| 1498 | SS1 | Comm | Acknowledge urban area will not support all growth required in York and that land will need to remain out of green belt to meet housing requirements. Both types of development are equally important to achieve sustainable development. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |
| 2412 | SS1 | Comm | Queries timeframes used to determine annual job growth figures (2017-2038) vs annual housing figures, which are apportioned across 15 year timeframe. | |
| 12655 | SS1 | Comm | The policy should provide clarity that the development is specific to the York Local Authority Area. | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC |
| 13408 | SS1 | Comm | Better maps should be supplied to enable analysis against the factors which shape growth. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13637i | SS1 | Comm | <p>CPRENY are concerned about the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan. This policy states CYC will deliver a minimum of 867 homes pa over the Plan period and up to 2038. The GL Hearn SHMA Addendum 2017 is of a concern on deliverability grounds. Recognising CYC should significantly boost the supply of housing (paragraph 47 of the NPPF) it is also recognised that this should be realistic and achievable. Housing targets have been amended over the various iterations of the Local Plan, the latest of which has been calculated at 867pa - this is a significant increase compared to the average that has been delivered. CPRENY are concerned this may not be achieved and a more realistic figure should be used. We welcome the Executive decision to not adopt a 10% uplift allowing for market signals as it does not give weight to the special character and setting of York and important environmental constraints.</p> | CPRE - North Yorkshire |
| 13637i | SS1 | Comm | <p>Land supply across the York Housing market is discussed in paragraph 5.16 and is of concern to CPRENY as CYC has worked with all neighbouring authorities under the duty to co-operate as required by NPPF. It is welcomed that York does not need to make additional land available to address shortfall elsewhere. However, the impact of housing developments elsewhere will impact detrimentally upon the setting and infrastructure provisions of the City. Some population figures used by GL Hearn to provide the OAN may result in residents using York to commute elsewhere, CPRENY are concerned about potential double counting and an artificially high OAN has been produced, CYC should ensure this is not the case.</p> | CPRE - North Yorkshire |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13641 | SS1 | Comm | Understands that CYC needs to identify more sites as part of the new proposed housing methodology to meet demand. Site supports this. Paragraphs 3.4-3.12 identify development constraints around York, however hard to determine where a site/ constraints are located on map. Requests better quality maps. | ID Planning |
| 42 | SS1 | Obj | Support in principle to this policy, although the indefinite continued future growth of the city cannot be sustainable in the longer term. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 62 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The pre-publication draft states in various policies that the intention of the plan is to meet the development requirements of the city in full within the York local authority area. CYC appears to have taken this policy position without any detailed consideration of the impacts of meeting development needs in full upon the setting and special character of the city. FPC contends that this approach is contrary to national policy. The NPPF sets out a two-stage approach, the first of which is to assess the development needs of the city, as is done in the SHMA and ELR. The second stage is to assess the impacts of meeting these needs and deciding whether the impacts are acceptable or not. There is no documentary evidence that CYC has carried out this second stage exercise. If it had done so it is likely CYC would have reached a different decision about fully meeting needs. FPC considers that the cumulative impact of the developments proposed would greatly harm the open land setting of the City which makes such an important contribution to the setting and special character of York, furthermore the additional traffic generated will make York a less attractive place to live, work and visit, further undermining its special character. FPC considers that the Local Plan development requirements should be reduced to levels that would not cause significant harm to the setting and special character of the city or its environment more generally. Such a reduction would be fully in line with NPPF paragraph 14.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 145 | SS1 | Obj | In light of the GL Hearn SHMA Addendum 2017 and past shortfall in housing delivery the Council should reconsider its position with regard to the overall level of housing provision which does not reflect market signals and affordability, and is not considered to be in the spirit of positive planning and the NPPF objective to significantly boost the supply of housing. If the Plan is found subsequently not to be NPPF compliant it may, again, be rejected by the Secretary of State, leading to further delay in York having a plan in place. Mentions new proposed methodology figure of 1,070 and how DCLG stated there should be very limited grounds for adopting an alternative method which results in a lower need than the proposed standard methodology. | Home Builders Federation |
| 244 | SS1 | Obj | The 20 acre site to the south of the York Designer Outlet should be removed from being defined as part of the green infrastructure corridor (Figure 3.2: York's Green Infrastructure - Nature Conservation, Green Corridors, Open Space). | NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet |
| 431 | SS1 | Obj | The Council's estimate of the housing requirement is significantly flawed and consequently significant additional allocations are required to address that shortfall. | O'Neill Planning Consultants Representing Shepherd Homes |
| 528 | SS1 | Obj | Not enough sites have been allocated for residential development. | Savills on behalf of the York Diocesan Board of Finance Limited and The York and Ainsty Hunt |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 540 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The provision currently included in the draft Plan does not reflect the evidence provided by the Council's own consultants or the recently published national methodology for calculating housing need. Additional housing sites will almost certainly be needed to meet the requirement when properly recalculated, particularly since the Plan proposes that housing needs should be met entirely within the Council's administrative area. Additional small and medium sized sites need to be allocated to ensure delivery of the requirement. Rep has attached presentation pack delivered to the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee in September 2016 on behalf of Daniel Gath Homes and a Press Notice of the Committee Report (29th April 2017) which consider the issues.</p> | Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant |
| 554i | SS1 | Obj | <p>A full assessment of the Councils approach to its assessment of housing need has been submitted in a separate report by Lichfields (City of York Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft - Technical Report on Housing Issues, October 2017). It is against the back drop of the findings in this report and the councils failure to plan for it OAHN that the comments are made. Policy SS1 aspires to deliver a minimum of annual provision of 867 new dwellings over the plan period 2032/33 and post plan period to 2037/38. This figure falls significantly short of what a full assessment of OAHN would likely to include. The true need is nearer to 1150 units per annum, a figure 25% higher than the unevidenced figure. The 867 figures incorrect and ignores both the NPPF and GL Hearn evidence base. The plan will be found unsound on this alone. The creation of green slithers adjacent to allocations are not justified. These spaces must be meaningful. in terms of their size, location and benefits. There is no evidence of this at Huntington and East of Metcalfe Lane.</p> | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 1352i | SS1 | obi | The Plan does not set out a clear spatial strategy and framework for the future development of the city. It is considered that this policy fails to demonstrate how the policy is based on and reflects the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development. The document does not contain how it arrived at this approach, how/why the housing requirement has been distributed or implications of this pattern of development. It is considered more appropriate to focus growth in urban extensions and expansion of existing settlements. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakeford P |
| 1498 | SS1 | Obj | Object to OAHN as they consider that this needs to be higher when considered against the evidence base. SHMA makes it clear that that housing should focus on market and affordable housing with a response to market signals. More sites, including alternative site at earswick, should be included to meet the higher required figure. Important that there are appropriate policy mechanisms to ensure delivery of appropriate supply. Current approach to housing growth is not in conformity with NPPF; The 867 pda is a 'policy-on' intervention by the Council which should not be applied to the OAHN. It has been confirmed by the courts that OAN is a 'policy off' and does not take into account supply pressures. The current approach is susceptible to legal challenge and should be changed to policy off approach. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |
| 1498 | SS1 | Obj | The Plan does not set out a clear spatial strategy and framework for the future development of the city. It is considered that this policy fails to demonstrate how the policy is based on and reflects the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development. It also does not set out the implications for development in this spatial pattern. It is more appropriate to focus growth on extensions to the York urban area and the expansion of existing settlements. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1661 | SS1 | Obj | The housing figure of 867 dpa is flawed as it doesn't fully reflect the findings of the SHMA. | Lichfields on behalf of Linden Homes |
| 1675i | SS1 | obi | This policy wrongly references the housing number for the plan period and seeks a housing number not supported by evidence base. This is unsound as the housing requirement is too low, the evidence base supports a higher figure, the housing fails to deliver the full requirement and fails to conform to national policy. Unclear how trajectory support brownfield first if all sites are being released in single phase. Concerned that the council have taken a political route in selecting the lowest possible housing number available. The policy is unsound on the basis it ignores evidence base. Do not consider that the spatial strategy approach is evidenced and that there is a lack of an overarching spatial strategy for development. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor |
| 1705 | SS1 | Obj | Object to the housing requirement included in the local plan as it does not fully reflect the latest evidence set out in the SHMA Addendum. Consider that as a minimum, the figure should be 953 dpa as set out in the Council's own evidence. | Gladman Developments |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 1718 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Surprising decision of the Local Plan Working Group to not accept GL Hearn's 953 dwelling per annum figure. The 867dpa figure is not realistic to adequately satisfy the future housing needs of the city. The position will be further exacerbated if the governments 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' consultation document becomes formal government advice (new formula shows 1070dpa as opposed to the current 867dpa). There is still an overriding need for additional housing land to be identified in the city. There is an over reliance on the proposed strategic allocations and this will also place too much reliance on volume house builders to deliver new housing. A number of these sites require significant infrastructure investment and all are subject to long lead times, which means the Council's expectations for delivery within the plan period are unlikely to be realised. This in turn will exacerbate current short term (5 year supply) problems. In sufficient encouragement is given in the plan to small and medium sized house builders who have local interest. This should be remedied by allocating a wider range of general housing allocations at a wider range of locations. The housing location strategy does not recognise the sustainability credentials of the settlements around York such as Poppleton and no attempt has been made to apportion future growth on the basis of locally identified housing need. The proposed distribution of new housing should ensure that these settlements have a sustainable future by identifying land for future village expansion including the release of Green Belt land where necessary.</p> | Yew Tree Associates on behalf of Daniel Garth Homes |
| 1733 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Do not consider that plan supports existing leisure businesses at Clifton Gate Business Park given its washed over by green belt status.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1741 | SS1 | Obj | There is a clear and pressing need to deliver more development across the city and an adopted plan is well overdue. There is a requirement to serve the latent demand for homes and encourage growth and diversification of the economy by broadening the supply and availability of employment land and premises. Previous draft plans have failed to allocate sufficient housing sites - the current draft follows a similar path. | Carter Jonas on behalf of client |
| 4355 | SS1 | Obj | Mentions DCLGs proposed new methodology and the figure of 1,070 dwellings per annum, recommends York's housing figure is adjusted upwards from the current 867. The key implication from any upward adjustment of housing need will be a need to promote either denser forms of development on those sites identified as strategic / housing allocations in the plan and / or to identify additional sites to meet the shortfall. The latter will inevitably mean that the Council will need to revisit proposed inner green belt boundaries around the city to identify locations where further releases would allow further housing allocations without compromising Green Belt objectives. | ELG Planning on behalf of Henry B |
| 5710 | SS1 | obi | Consider that 867 dpa is not a realistic housing growth figure to satisfy future requirements. This is likely to be an 'unsound' approach at examination. This will be exacerbated should the DCLG consultation standardised methodology be implemented. The timescale for producing the plan will mean that the new approach will apply. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 6355 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The proposed housing target is expected to be delivered from a combination of allocation (14,863) some of which are to be delivered after the Plan period, windfall sites (2,704) and extant permissions (3,758). Given that some of the proposed growth is expected to be delivered outside the Plan period, but from allocations identified as part of the Plan period, it means it is not possible to make a direct comparison between the identified housing need and the actual target. Therefore, the way in which the Plan notes housing delivery beyond the Plan period of 2033 is confusing and not in conformity with the NPPF because it intends to allocate land for development beyond the scope of the time frame in which the planning policies set out in the Plan are intended to apply. This approach is unsound. The SHMA Update (September 2017) prepared by GL Hearn uses a baseline figure of 867 dwellings per annum for the Plan period, and recommends a 10% allowance to take into account market signals and affordable housing need, which has the effect of increasing the housing figure to 953 per annum. Table 5.2 of policy H1 sets a minimum annual target of 867 dwellings.</p> | <p>Directions Planning Consultancy OBO Askham Bryan College</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 6355 | SS1 | Obj | <p>This is well below the figure recommended by GL Hearn and as a result, it is considered that the minimum target needs to be revised upwards in order to address the identified housing need. No reasoned justification is made for the lower figure. Additionally, it is noted that the housing delivery of 867 per annum would only meet the demographic need of the City and would not address the City's affordable housing issues - by failing to meet this demographic, the Plan will only serve to exacerbate current imbalances in the population profile of the City. The Government published a White Paper on 14th September 2017 entitled 'Planning for the right homes in the right places: Consultation Proposals', which includes a standard methodology for calculating local authority housing need - in York's case, the requirement will rise from 867 dwellings per annum to 1,070 (17,120 dwellings for the Plan period). It is strongly suggested that the Council should revise its figures to match the requirements in the White Paper, as the White Paper will come into force in March 2018, before the Plan is submitted. In its current form, the Plan will be found unsound unless the Government's calculations are integrated in the Plan now. It will therefore be necessary to allocate additional land for housing.</p> | <p>Directions Planning Consultancy OBO Askham Bryan College</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 6663 | SS1 | Obj | The Local Plan has not identified a sufficient supply of sites to meet the future development needs of the District. An insufficient supply of sites to meet the City's development needs and the complete absence of any safeguarded land policy and safeguarded land allocations will mean that there would be nowhere else within the district where the City's development needs could be met. This would be exacerbated if the delivery from some of the allocated sites were delayed by the planning process or not brought forward at all. Plan should allow for a safety net of safeguarded land to ensure that the green belt does not need to be amended at an early stage. | DPP obo Linden Homes Strategic Land |
| 9883iv | SS1 | Obj | The Council's estimate of the housing requirement is significantly flawed and consequently significant additional allocations are required to address that shortfall. | O'Neill Planning Consultants representing SBO Lands Ltd. |
| 9888 | SS1 | Obj | Policy wrongly references housing number for plan period and seeks a number that is not supported by evidence base or sustainability appraisal. Policy seems to suggest that brownfield will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. This is inconsistent with the NPPF and unclear how it would work in reality given that the allocations in the local plan are all released at the same time. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development Ltd |
| 10018 | SS1 | Obj | There are not enough homes being built to fulfil requirements | |
| 10121 | SS1 | Obj | Policy wrongly references housing number for plan period and seeks a number that is not supported by evidence base or sustainability appraisal. Policy seems to suggest that brownfield will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. This is inconsistent with the NPPF and unclear how it would work in reality given that the allocations in the local plan are all released at the same time. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Vernon and Co. |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12656 | SS1 | obi | <p>Object to the annual housing provision of 867 dpa. The population projections should be seen as a starting point and would not address affordability issues. Council need to plan for a higher OAHN exemplified in the DCLG release and SHMA. Important to note that the governments method does not take into consideration employment growth which may result in a figure higher than 1070 dpa. Current figure may result in adverse impacts on elements of the population including younger generations through lack of affordable housing.</p> | Pegasus on behalf of Level Develo |
| 12998 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The plan falls short of the houses we need as estimated by the government, which means that the plan may be rejected and the green belt left unprotected. There is insufficient emphasis on affordable housing for local families, which is causing many to move out the area. Additional sites for housing should be identified that offer a better chance of providing homes in a reasonable timescale as much is proposed for difficult brownfield sites requiring extensive infrastructure.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13030 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The Plan does not contain an equivalent to Policy SS3 of the 2013 Draft Local Plan. Instead Policy SS1 outlines what considerations will determine the location of new development, without any reference to the requirement to achieve a specific spatial distribution of development. It is critical to the soundness of the Local Plan that the equivalent of Policy SS3 of the 2013 Draft Local Plan is reinstated into the plan. In the absence of any update to the Sustainability Appraisal to reconsider options for the spatial distribution of development, this should continue to reflect the output of the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal; that being that prioritising development within and / or an extension to the urban area represents the most sustainable approach to the growth of York. Changes to the Local Plan since 2013 means that the Draft Local Plan as presented is now not consistent with the preferred spatial distribution approach, fully tested and proven to represent the most sustainable approach through the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13030 | SS1 | Obj | <p>A review of the sites in the Plan by the representor shows 62% of units will be provided within the urban area of York and as extensions to the urban area, with 38% being provided as standalone new settlements (3 of) or extensions to outlying settlements. This is a significant deviation from Policy SS3 of the 2013 Draft Local Plan with a 10% swing away from the urban area and urban area extensions plus the introduction of two new standalone settlements. The distribution of sites is now too disbursed and has moved away from the preferred option adopted by the Council. Given the relative sparsity of the population outside of the ring road, there is a significant degree of uncertainty as to whether the transport and community infrastructure exists to accommodate the level of growth proposed in this area. At the very the least, the Council has failed to undertake any appraisal to consider this issue. Developing in areas where the existing infrastructure can accommodate growth, either based on existing capacity or extending and improving existing infrastructure, is a fundamentally more sustainable approach to growth.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13030 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The Local Plan must be subject to substantial amendments to bring it in line with Policy SS3 of the 2013 Local Plan as reflective of the spatial distribution fully tested and resolved to represent the most sustainable approach to growth through the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal. This conflict is a critical deficiency in the Plan. The evidence base to support the spatial approach is entirely absent. The Local Plan cannot be justified and is unsound as a result. The Plan will need to increase the proportion of residential development that is directed to the main settlement of York (defined by the ring road). Two of the three proposed new settlements will need to be removed from the Plan to bring the Plan in line with the selected spatial strategy and spatial distribution of development as set out in the 2013 Draft Local Plan and determined to be the most sustainable through the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |
| 13043i | SS1 | Obj | <p>Annual housing provision is too low (867/annum). Inherited shortfall should not be annualised but put into the next 5 years as they are homes that are needed now. Without doing this would mean carrying an undersupply until the end of the Plan period.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13102 | SS1 | Obj | <p>As drafted, Policy SS1 wrongly references the housing number for the Plan Period and seeks a housing number that is not supported by the evidence base or the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). SS1 contains a lower than required housing number and is therefore unsound for the following reasons: 1) Not positively prepared – housing requirement is too low, the 867 dpa will act as a brake on economic growth and harm the delivery of affordable housing. 2) Not justified – the evidence base and SA supports a higher figure. 3) Not effective – the housing fails to deliver the full requirement and fails to align with the Plan Period for the Green Belt boundaries up to 2038. 4) Not conforming with National Policy – it fails to carry forward the guidance in NPPG (para ID 2a 002 onwards). Furthermore, the policy seems to suggest that brownfield/PDL will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. While this approach is inconsistent with the balanced approach taken in the Framework, it is also unclear as to how this would work in reality given the allocations in this York Local Plan are all released in a single phase. Para 3.3 needs to align with Table 5.2 in the Plan and recognise the fact that the shortfall since 2012 has been rolled into the new Plan Period commencing 2017. The introduction text in the Plan states the Plan Period commences 2017. If that is the case the housing requirement is $867+56 = 923$ as per the trajectory table. Goes into detail on SHMA and GL Hearn, concludes: From all the material available, it would appear only the unqualified Elected Members are of the view the 867 dpa figure should be maintained.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13102 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Having reviewed the portfolio of sites set out in Local Plan, it appears that the Council's strategy is a combination of urban expansion, the provision of isolated new settlements and restricted growth in existing settlements. The document contains no narrative as to how, or why, the Council has arrived at this approach, nor does it set out the implications of this pattern of spatial distribution or discuss the alternative options considered. In sustainability terms, we consider it more appropriate to focus growth in the York urban area and expand existing settlements. This approach would make best use of existing infrastructure and resources, as well as ensuring that the needs of the local community are met. In particular, the failure to allocate land in existing settlements will increase affordability pressures in the City. The proposed spatial strategy for the City, and how this will be achieved over the lifetime of the Plan (up to 2038), should be set out clearly in the Plan. Without this context it is not possible to consider the suitability of the revised portfolio of sites. The absence of an overarching spatial strategy is apparent as the Plan identifies two strategic housing allocations in isolated locations, significantly separated from the main urban area. Such an approach does not promote sustainable patterns of development as required by the Framework, and therefore conflicts with national guidance.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS |
| 13103 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Policy wrongly references housing number for plan period and seeks a number that is not supported by evidence base or sustainability appraisal. Policy seems to suggest that brownfield will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. This is inconsistent with the NPPF and unclear how it would work in reality given that the allocations in the local plan are all released at the same time.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13104 | SS1 | Obj | Policy wrongly references housing number for plan period and seeks a number that is not supported by evidence base or sustainability appraisal. Policy seems to suggest that brownfield will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. This is inconsistent with the NPPF and unclear how it would work in reality given that the allocations in the local plan are all released at the same time. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. |
| 13106 | SS1 | Obj | Concerned the Council has taken political route in selecting the lowest possible housing number available, contrary to the Framework, evidence and SA. Plan fails to provide sufficient land for housing. OAHN does not accord with NPPF/PPG; it does not incorporate the latest projections on household formation and jobs growth. The City's unmet housing need has not been addressed. We are mindful of housing requirement work undertaken by NLP and are supportive of its findings that conclude the housing requirement for the Plan period should be at least 1,150 dwellings per annum. In any case, para 2.5 needs to be re-worded to show the quantum of housing inclusive of its 56 dwelling/year 'backlog', i.e. the requirement for 1st April 2017 - 31st March 2033 is 923/annum. Policy is unsound. further, policy suggests brownfield first, contrary to the balanced approach taken in the Framework and unclear given the allocations in the Plan are all released in a single phase. Housing growth figure should also reflect the LEP's ambitions for growth. Given past delivery rates and affordability signals, PPG requires an upward adjustment to planned housing numbers (a market signals uplift). Rep suggests that given these signals an uplift of 20% is warranted. | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13182 | SS1 | Obj | By omitting the 10% uplift, and not progressing with a housing requirement of 953 dwellings per annum, the Council is failing to meet its full OAN, as required by the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the representor's client strongly objects to this approach, and the housing target outlined in Policy SS1 of the Plan. This is a fundamental issue to the entire Plan as the approach fails to meet the any of the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 182 of the Framework. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13526 | SS1 | Obj | The figure of 867 dwellings per annum has not been properly informed by the SHMA Update and is flawed. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakefield Properties |
| 13539 | SS1 | Obj | The housing market in York has become overheated through lack of new development. The tightly drawn draft green belt and lack of an adopted plan has restricted new housing opportunities. Housing figure of 867 too low and is not supported by evidence base and is much lower than the indicated figure from DCLG in 2017. Council should seek to over-allocate land to provide a robust supply and add flexibility. | Carter Jonas on behalf of Picton Capital Ltd |
| 13550i | SS1 | Obj | Object to this policy on the grounds that it promotes the creation of 867 dwellings in what is claimed to be sustainable communities without making reference to the types of property, the dwelling density or the provision of district heating or renewable energy provision. Economic growth is being used as a justification. Economic growth drives carbon emissions. No reference is made in the policy that links housing, transport and commerce to the UK Climate Change targets. Also object to any construction on agricultural land. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13601 | SS1 | Obj | <p>In terms of sustainable growth the Plan provides insufficient housing and relies on population growth seen previously but doesn't take account of the enormous need for housing in York. This can be seen by the soaring house prices. Failing to meet the demand house prices will continue to rise and make affordability as a place to live and work more unachievable, rather it will become a retirement city and tourist attraction. Rates of enterprise are low and York needs to attract entrepreneurs as well as keeping the talent it has brought up. Undersupply of suitable building sites will add premium to land and encourage the squeezing of more properties on available land resulting in unaffordable, undesirable new build properties. Government figures suggest the current housing figure to be too low to meet housing need, this has been ignored so as to become as attractive as possible current conservative voters.</p> | |
| 13633 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Objects to proposed target of 867 dwellings per annum as it does not represent the full objectively assessed need and as such fails to meet the tests of the NPPF. The requirement should be increased to 953.</p> | Barton Willmore on behalf of Equibase Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13635 | SS1 | Obj | <p>The local plan identifies a requirement for only 34 hectares of employment land over the 15 year plan period plus the additional 5 years for the period 2033 to 2038. The plan allocates 57 hectares of strategic employment land. Of this 10 hectares is already allocated for Autohorn at Whitehall Grange and 21 hectares is allocated for the knowledge based activities at the York University but is only expected to accommodate 21,500 sq m of floorspace. Much of the land allocated for employment is already committed or will realise only very small amount of floorspace.</p> <p>The identified employment land supply is inadequate to meet York's future needs. A report submitted as an appendix to the representation concluded that demand way outstrips supply. Further land should be identified to broaden the portfolio of sites available to cater for York's diverse commercial and industrial businesses, many of which cannot be accommodated in the York Urban Area.</p> | O'Neill Associates on behalf of Malton Road Developments Ltd. |
| 13653 | SS1 | Obj | <p>Policy wrongly references housing number for plan period and seeks a number that is not supported by evidence base or sustainability appraisal. Policy seems to suggest that brownfield will be phased ahead of greenfield sites. This is inconsistent with the NPPF and unclear how it would work in reality given that the allocations in the local plan are all released at the same time.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Yorvik Homes |
| 4 | SS1 | Supp | Supports the sentiments of Para. 3.12 | Highways England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10 | SS1 | Supp | Policy SS1 makes provision for 867 dwellings per annum which is identified in paragraph 3.3 as the full objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing in York. ERC strongly supports the provision of sufficient housing within the York Local Plan to enable the full need for housing to be met within the York HMA. This will ensure the most sustainable pattern of development can be delivered across the wider York sub-area. It will maximise the potential use of high quality public transport services, as well as walking and cycling, within the city to access employment opportunities, services and facilities, whilst limiting impact on the surrounding highway network. | East Riding of Yorkshire Council |
| 11 | SS1 | Supp | Support the general thrust and intent of Policy SS1 : Delivering sustainable growth for York | North Yorkshire County Council |
| 42 | SS1 | Supp | Support in principle to this policy. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 77 | SS1 | Supp | Support the figure of 867 dwellings per annum, as highlighted in Policy SS1 and other parts of the Plan. The most recent DCLG figure in September 2017 of 1070 dwellings for York is perverse, in view of the likely effects of Brexit, which may result in a reduction in inward migration and a reduced housing need. If the latest figure suggested DCLG figure of 1070 per annum is implemented, it would lead to excessive strain on the City's infrastructure. There is also doubt about whether the local building industry could cope with that level of building. | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |
| 98 | SS1 | Supp | Support for the spatial strategy components of the Plan, noting that the overall policy advantages of achieving an adopted plan are so very great for the common good. Urges the Council to ensure proposed satellite settlements are connected in transport/economic terms to the City Centre, for the benefit of York as a whole. | York Civic Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 238 | SS1 | Supp | <p>Welcome the spatial approach, limiting growth on the periphery of the City. This will help safeguard a number of the key elements which have been identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as contributing to the special character and setting of the historic City, including its size and compact nature, the perception of York being a free-standing historic city set within a rural hinterland, views towards the City from the ring road and the relationship of the main built up area of the City to its surrounding settlements. The Plan will need to demonstrate that identified strategic sites can deliver the scales of growth anticipated in a manner commensurate with safeguarding these elements which make York a special place. Suggests that the Council undertake a comprehensive assessment of each site to ascertain what scale and density of development each can accommodate without harming the special character and setting of the City and what the implications would be if development was brought forward which did not conserve York's special character.</p> | Historic England |
| 244 | SS1 | Supp | <p>Support the exclusion of the York Designer Outlet and the 20 acre land to its south from the Extension to the Green Wedge (Fig 3.1: Historic Character and Setting of York).</p> | NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet |
| 1733 | SS1 | Supp | <p>Support Local Plan to positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth, including tourism and leisure.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 2846 | SS1 | Supp | Support the figure of 867 dwellings per annum, as highlighted in Policy SS1 and other parts of the Plan. The most recent DCLG figure in September 2017 of 1070 dwellings for York is perverse, in view of the likely effects of Brexit, which may result in a reduction in inward migration and a reduced housing need. If the latest figure suggested DCLG figure of 1070 per annum is implemented, it would lead to excessive strain on the City's infrastructure. There is also doubt about whether the local building industry could cope with that level of building. | |
| 12655 | SS1 | Supp | The DIO support this policy, particularly the fifth spatial principle which encourages re-use of previously developed land. | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC |
| 13408 | SS1 | Supp | Support the factors which shape growth (paras 3.4-3.12). | |
| 13520 | SS1 | Supp | Support this policy particularly the guidelines for the locations of developments throughout the plan period and the new dwelling numbers of 867. | Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS2: The Role of York's Green Belt | | | | |
| 7 | SS2 | Comm | The draft document identifies sufficient land to meet the development needs of the City and establishes a Green Belt enduring 20 years. It does not safeguard land for development and recognises the build out time of the strategic sites will extend beyond the plan period. The proposed detailed boundaries of the Green Belt offer little opportunity to accommodate the increased level of growth proposed in the White Paper, should this be required. If the City of York does not ensure that its longer term development needs are met this will place pressure on areas in neighbouring authorities. | Hambleton District Council |
| 11 | SS2 | Comm | In defining the Green Belt boundary it is important that the evidence underpinning the decision is clearly presented and included within the narrative accompanying the policy. NYCC recognise that the Plan makes provision up to 2038, providing for an additional 5 years beyond the plan period. In adopting this approach it is acknowledged that in the longer term consideration will need to be given to how future growth needs will be managed to provide confidence in relation to planning for infrastructure and services including within neighbouring parts of North Yorkshire. | North Yorkshire County Council |
| 1705 | SS2 | Comm | When setting green belt boundaries for the first time, it must be recognised that this should be done with a view that the full needs for housing and employment growth needs to be delivered both within this plan period and for some length of time beyond. | Gladman Developments |
| 13099 | SS2 | Comm | The commentary on Green Belt speaks from a position that assumes the boundaries are fixed in an adopted plan. This is erroneous as the boundaries are being defined and therefore para 85 of the NPPF is key advice. | O'Neills Associates on behalf of G |
| 13346 | SS2 | Comm | Please protect the green belt as much as possible. | Greenpeace/Green Party? |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13520 | SS2 | Comm | Whilst supporting this policy, the steering group are concerned that in the explanation, the comment does not include any contribution to the special character of the village of Strensall and the hamlet of Towthorpe. | Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 5826iv | SS2 | Comm | Green Belt permanence of only five years after the plan period is totally insufficient given how long it has taken to deliver the current local plan. Needs to be much longer to ensure that a shortage of developable land after the plan period has passed does not undermine the green belt. | |
| 5826iv | SS2 | Comm | Broad brush green belt outside urban area is inconsistent with NPPF guidance which states that local authorities should "not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open". Green Belt boundaries should be reduced to introduce safeguarded areas which can be used to meet "long term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period". | |
| 9 | SS2 | Obj | Question whether a Green Belt boundary enduring for 20 years is sufficient to meet the NPPF as it pertains to the intended permanence of Green Belt boundaries in the long terms so they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period. | Selby District Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 145 | SS2 (policy) | Obj | SS2 states that sufficient land will be allocated for development to meet the needs identified in the plan and a further minimum period of 5 years to 2038. The HBF recommends that the Plan period is extended until 2038, and that an additional 20% buffer is provided in relation to allocations to allow for flexibility. Therefore it is likely that further land will need to be identified. It is also considered appropriate to identify Safeguarded Land to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period, and to ensure the Council is satisfied that the Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. | Home Builders Federation |
| 238 | SS2 | Obj | A green belt which might need to be amended only 5 years after the end date of this local plan does not appear to have the degree of 'permanence' expected by national planning guidance. (re NPPF para 79). Further, whilst the development strategy of the Plan is influenced by the need to define a green belt which safeguards the special character and setting of the historic city, the primary purpose of the green belt is not to deliver the Local Plan strategy. Ref should also be made to safeguarding the special character and setting of the 'historic' city. Amend first para of SS2 to read: <i>"The primary purpose of the green belt is to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city of York. New building in the green belt etc..."</i> | Historic England |
| 262 | SS2 | Obj | Question the tightness of the proposed inner green belt boundary, and the decision not to safeguard any land. The area excluded from the Green Belt makes no allowance for G&T needs. It is essential that a supply of specific deliverable sites are removed from the Green Belt. | York Travellers Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 528 | SS2 | Obj | Further assessment should be made with regard to deleting land south of Foxwood Lane from the Green Belt. Doesn't serve Green Belt purposes and it's removal from the green belt would follow clearly definable boundaries on the ground. | Savills on behalf of the York Diocesan Board of Finance Limited and The York and Ainsty Hunt |
| 540 | SS2 | Obj | Do not accept that a 20 year 'life' for the Green Belt is consistent with the NPPF intention that boundaries should have permanence in the long term (NPPF para. 84). SS2 refers to a 'degree of permanence' for the Green Belt. The Plan's current approach to the life of the Green Belt is not what the NPPF envisages. The absence of safeguarded land, together with the tight Green Belt boundaries currently proposed and the reliance on development needs in the longer term being met from the remaining (unimplemented) part of large development allocations will lead to an inflexible Plan which is unlikely to be able to meet all the needs of the City for an extended period. This approach is fundamentally flawed and the need for safeguarded land should be reconsidered before the Publication draft is produced. The comments by DPP on safeguarded land in their submission is endorsed. No policy stating that Green Belt boundaries are as shown on the Proposals Map. | Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 554i | SS2 | Obj | <p>A full assessment of the Councils approach to its assessment of housing need has been submitted in a separate report by Lichfields (City of York Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft - Technical Report on Housing Issues, October 2017). It is against the back drop of the findings in this report and the councils failure to plan for it OAHN that the comments are made. It is difficult to support the approach set out in policy SS2 at present. The plan seeks to suppress the level of development it intends to accommodate, it must follow that any assessment about where the Green Belt boundary should be drawn must be flawed. Without a proper assessment and attempt to accommodate the fully OAHN the Green Belt boundary cannot be justified or evidenced.</p> | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |
| 554iii | SS2 | Obj | <p>Objection to the inclusion of land known as Pond Field, Field Lane as Green Belt as it does not meet any of the five Green Belt purposes. Explanation given as to why the five purposes of the Green Belt cannot be applied to this site. The site is surrounded by development land and it cannot have any role in checking unrestricted sprawl. The Historic Character and Setting Map (Figure 3.1 page 28) does not identify Pond Field as being an area preventing coalescence. It is an artificial argument to suggest that keeping Pond Field open will prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Pond Field does not adjoin the countryside. Pond Field has no role in preserving the setting and historic character of York. The removal of Green Belt designation from Pond Field will not have any impact on assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land being achieved. It is inappropriate to seek to retain a field in agricultural use when it is surrounded by development.</p> | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 866 | SS2 | Obj | Disappointed Council ignores the need to safeguard the green belt, and that the plan intends for the boundaries to last 21 years rather than the NPPF recommended 25 years+. This invites a review of the green belt boundaries and a lack of protection. Advises to identify land that could be safeguarded for future development to ensure green belt boundaries can endure for some time. In terms of safeguarding land for future development, asks that the land adjacent to the proposed allocated at Northminster Business Park to be considered for removal from the green belt. | Northminster Business Park |
| 1352i | SS2 | Obj | The council has previously followed the guidance in the framework which emphasises that land which is unnecessary is kept permanently open should not be included within the greenbelt. However, the current approach does not do this. Former allocations H30 and SF1 should be omitted from the green belt. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakeford P |
| 1498 | SS2 | Obj | The council has previously followed the guidance in the framework which emphasises that land which is unnecessary is kept permanently open should not be included within the greenbelt. However, the current approach does not do this. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |
| 1661 | SS2 | Obj | Land at Brecks Lane is currently identified as being in the green belt. It should be removed as it does not serve a green belt function. If it is not allocated for housing, it should be identified as safeguarded land for future development. The principle and designation of safeguarded land should be included in the local plan. | Lichfields on behalf of Linden Homes |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1674 | SS2 (policy) | Obj | <p>Concerned that the plan will be found unsound at examination due to the rather unorthodox approach to designating a green belt boundary that only lasts for 21 years up until 2038 and that lacks safeguarded land. Identifying land for a further five years beyond the end of the Plan period is not an approach endorsed by the NPPF. The Framework makes clear that Local Plans should only allocate sufficient land for the length of the Plan period. It also sets out how Green Belt boundaries should have a degree of permanence to the designation, which is usually determined by the expectation that boundaries will not need to be reviewed for at least 25 years, but preferably longer. It would be advisable to identify land that can be safeguarded for future development as part of the current process so as to ensure Green Belt boundaries can endure for a reasonable period of time in accordance with national policy. If the Council were to review their approach to safeguarding land for future development then we would ask for land adjacent to the proposed allocation at Elvington Airfield Business Park to be considered for removal from the Green Belt, given the continued demand for land in this location that is likely to continue well beyond the end of the Plan period. We have set out in previous representations to earlier stages of the Plan process comments on this same matter.</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy L |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------------|-------------------|--|---|
| 1674 | SS2 (policy) | Obj | <p>Concerned that the plan will be found unsound at examination due to the rather unorthodox approach to designating a green belt boundary that only lasts for 21 years up until 2038 and that lacks safeguarded land. Identifying land for a further five years beyond the end of the Plan period is not an approach endorsed by the NPPF. The Framework makes clear that Local Plans should only allocate sufficient land for the length of the Plan period. It also sets out how Green Belt boundaries should have a degree of permanence to the designation, which is usually determined by the expectation that boundaries will not need to be reviewed for at least 25 years, but preferably longer. It would be advisable to identify land that can be safeguarded for future development as part of the current process so as to ensure Green Belt boundaries can endure for a reasonable period of time in accordance with national policy. If the Council were to review their approach to safeguarding land for future development then we would ask for land adjacent to the proposed allocation at Elvington Airfield Business Park to be considered for removal from the Green Belt, given the continued demand for land in this location that is likely to continue well beyond the end of the Plan period. We have set out in previous representations to earlier stages of the Plan process comments on this same matter.</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy L |
| 1718 | SS2 | Obj | <p>The Council's Green Belt Strategy is considered flawed by failing to identify opportunities for continued growth at sustainable settlements, such as Poppleton around York.</p> | Yew Tree Associates on behalf of Daniel Garth Homes |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 3221 | SS2 (policy) | Obj | <p>The NPPF is clear that “once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of a Local Plan” (NPPF, Para. 83). However, the NPPF is equally clear that “Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs...unless specific policies...indicate development should be restricted” (NPPF, Para 14). Given the commitment as part of the Local Plan process to review the Green Belt and the development requirements for the district, it is considered that exceptional circumstances apply. Further assessment should be made with regard to deleting land south of Foxwood Lane at Acomb from the Green Belt and be allocated for housing to help meet the housing needs for the City in a sustainable and suitable location.</p> | Savills on behalf of York Diocesan |
| 6046 | SS2 | Obj | <p>Disappointed that the Council continues to ignore the need to safeguard land from the Green Belt. Identifying land for a further 5 years beyond the end of the Plan period is not an approach endorsed by the NPPF. The Framework makes it clear that Local Plans should only allocate sufficient land for the length of the Plan period. We are therefore concerned that the Local Plan intends for the boundaries to only last 21 years, until 2038. The Council's approach actively invites a future review of the Green Belt boundaries because they are unlikely to last much beyond the end of the Plan period and no provision is made to provide any degree of protection or source of development land. It would be advisable to identify land that can be safeguarded for future development as part of the current process. As it stands, we are concerned that the Plan will be found unsound at examination.</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12656 | SS2 | Obj | Concerns are raised in relation to the spatial strategy and failure of the plan to define its green belt boundary consistent with the NPPF. It is considered that a number of the allocations do not meet the purposes of the green belt and should not be allocated for this reason. Loss of Green belt at ST14 and ST15 key concern as they serve green belt function; Extension at Strensall would be more appropriate. | Pegasus on behalf of Level Develo |
| 13350 | SS2 | Obj | Welcomes the delivery of a defined, recognised green belt, which should have its own map in the Plan. | |
| 13526 | SS2 | Obj | The sites at Southfield Road and Princess Road should not be included in the green belt. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakefield Properties |
| 13550i | SS2 | Obj | Object to any development on farmland, woodland and open areas outside the City Centre. Too much valuable agricultural land is disappearing. It should be preserved for growing food and to be as self sufficient as possible to limit carbon emissions through transport. New houses should be high density and built on brownfield land The Green Belt should be preserved. Housing development leads to loss of habitats. The character of the landscape is being ruined by over development. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13594 | SS2 (policy) | Obj | <p>Local Authority has failed to establish any exceptional circumstance that would necessitate the removal of land from the Green Belt which fulfils Green Belt function in NPPF 80. The Green Belt boundary put forward in this plan is based on the 2003 York Green Belt Appraisal. This did not assess all 5 functions of Green Belt in NPPF 80 and must be considered as an unsound basis upon which to define the inner Green Belt boundary. Links to a Pegasus Planning group review of the document. The RSS revocation order set the Local Authority the task of 'defining' the inner boundary of the green belt in a local plan. It did not require the LA to 'revise' the inner boundary. The inner boundary of the Green Belt can be defined without the need to remove land from the Green Belt.</p> | |
| 13594iv | SS2 (policy) | Obj | <p>H56 is located in the Green Belt when determined by the RSS, this site should be retained in the green belt. It is the role of the Local Plan to define the inner boundary of the Green Belt, this action does not necessitate the removal of land from the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary put forward in this plan is based on the 2003 York Green Belt Appraisal. This did not assess all 5 functions of Green Belt in NPPF 80 and must be considered as an unsound basis upon which to define the inner Green Belt boundary. Links to a Pegasus Planning group review of the document. The LA has failed to establish any exceptional circumstance which would necessitate the removal of land from the Green Belt which fulfils Green Belt function in NPPF 80.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13601 | SS2 | Obj | The Local Plan is too protective of the Green Belt. Greenbelt land is important to prevent urban sprawl and to provide residents access to the outdoors. However, it is protecting agricultural land of limited access and biodiversity. CYC should focus on a greenbelt that transforms inaccessible universe fields into woodland and wildlife rich communities with fantastic housing and facilities, improving diversity creating woodland walks and CO2 collection alongside housing sites. By overly protecting greenbelt, development is being pushed away from York City centre resulting in people not being able to walk or cycle and makes viable public transport more difficult and expensive. There will be more car use resulting in more congestion and poor air quality. The outer ring road should be used as a barrier to contain development. | |
| 11 | SS2 | Supp | Policy SS2: the Role of York's Green Belt - defining a clear and detailed inner boundary of the York Green Belt is welcomed and supported. | North Yorkshire County Council |
| 59 | SS2 | Supp | Support the proposed Green Belt around Dunnington. The openness of the approach as you enter Dunnington from any direction and the rural setting of Dunnington are important to the amenity of the village and its residents. | Dunnington Parish Council |
| 69 | SS2 | Supp | The Parish Council welcomes the bold statement 'The Green Belt's prime purpose is that of preserving the setting and special character of York'. | Murton Parish Council |
| 74 | SS2 | Supp | Fully support the principles set out in this policy. | Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council |
| 220 | SS2 | Supp | Supportive that the Green Belt should be protected whilst taking a proportionate amount of land to allow for appropriate levels of growth to be supported by suitable infrastructure. | |
| 1498 | SS2 | Supp | Principles of green belt and policy is endorsed. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12655 | SS2 | Supp | The DIO support this policy, subject to boundary amendments at ST35 and ST36. | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC |
| 12656 | SS2 | Supp | Agree in general with this policy. | Pegasus on behalf of Lovel Develop |
| 13637i | SS2 | Supp | Support SS2 that sets out the role of the York Green Belt and the intention to give the Green Belt a degree of permanence to 2038. Noted that the Green Belt is to serve specific purposes including prevention of urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and encouraging reuse of derelict and other urban land along with preserving the setting and special character of York. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS3: York City Centre | | | | |
| 71i | SS3 | Comm | Loss of shopping from the city centre and increasing number of vacated shops is a disgrace and will deter visitor footfall. Possible temporary art exhibitions or displays from schools/colleges would be better than empty premises. Civic Trust done a great job bringing the historic value of sections of the city to everyone's attention. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 198 | SS3 | Comm | In order to allow for greater flexibility for the development of York Central and given the interconnected nature between the allocation and the rest of the city centre it is requested that the city centre boundary is extended to all of the proposed allocation of ST5. Policy SS3 should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community both within and around the ST5 site is recognised. The policy could clarify that requirements for sequential and impact assessments are not required for the other uses referred to in the policy, in line with the NPPF, where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. Support the provisions within Policy SS3 to promote accessible movement particularly those that prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements and improve linkages between key places. Improved accessibility between the NRM, York Central and the rest of the City is very important. | National Railway Museum |
| 210 | SS3 | Comm | Welcomes the policy principle under part vii. To enhance the setting of the Ouse and access to the riverside. | Canal & River Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 386 | SS3 | Comm | <p>Generally supportive of the principles in this policy but disappointing there is no mention of city centre residents. The Plan should be more clearly ambitious about seeking a largely car free city centre and further strengthen the requirement to protect and provide green space for city centre residents, workers and visitors. See suggested text amends re promoting accessibility and movement; moving towards a largely car free city centre and improve linkages between key places such as the railway station, York Central and the National Railway Museum, the Minster, Castle Gateway, Hungate and the universities; enhance the gateway streets leading into the city centre, ensuring that new developments balance the needs of residents, traders and visitors to the city. v) Reword as follows; strengthen the daytime and evening economies. Encourage early evening opening.’ x)Reword to read as follows: “Provide community and recreational facilities including the protection and additional provision of green amenity spaces in the city centre, essential to enhance the physical and emotional health and well being of city centre residents and workers, promote active lifestyles and provide an attractive city centre for visitors. Green amenity space also helps to combat the effects of higher temperatures, air pollutants, flooding and climate change.’ Add an additional policy principle regarding the use of upper floors eg. ‘Proposals that bring upper floors in York City Centre back into an appropriate use, particularly residential use, are encouraged to ensure that upper floors do not become a wasted resource.’</p> | York Green Party |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 5167 | SS3 | Comm | Agrees with the principles for city centre development as set out in Policy SS3 but considers that there should be emphasis on the scope of the City Centre to deliver more new homes. In relation to this policy the policy sets out Hungate has been allocated for 328 dwellings which implies that this is the total figure for the whole development site. Whereas this is just the figure for phase 5+. Policy SS3 should be updated to make it clear that this is a minimum number to ensure consistency with Policy SS17. | Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd |
| 10379 | SS3 | Comm | Objects to development in city centre. Parliament Street is empty, a great place for markets, 10 shops in Coney Street are empty and too many cafes. People won't visit York when you can find what you want in Monks Cross, which is hard to access due to traffic. Should maintain the uniqueness and history of York. Suggests developing taxi boats and a monorail. Objects to shipping containers. | |
| 12659 | SS3 | Comm | Support for Policy SS3, however would welcome the inclusion of all the proposed York Central site within the policy area. This would allow for consistency and greater clarity for the policy application across the site. | Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership |
| 13022 | SS3 | Comm | Intension of masterplan is that it will be adopted as a SPD. If a standalone Minster policy cannot be included, suggests amendments to policy SS3, including deleted text and adding a 'masterplan approach' to the principles. | York Minster |
| 13417 | SS3 | Comm | Superb buildings in York City Centre these should be kept maintained including the upper stories. Floors above shops should be used. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13592 | SS3 | Comm | Plan acknowledges York is a special city, valued for its history, archaeology and fine buildings. This inheritance owes much to traditions of craft and conservation skills that are very much alive in the city today, without the businesses employing these craftspeople the historic infrastructure could not be maintained and the city would lose some of its special character. Would like to suggest that these businesses are included in the development types which are acceptable in principle in the city centre (policy SS3). Would bring a vibrancy and richness to mix of activities in the city, suggests craft studios could be accommodated in the York Central site. Would also bring vibrancy to the proposed garden village. These comments could potentially extend to a number of sections within the plan but did not feel it necessary to comment on every possible section. | York Consortium for Conservation |
| 192 | SS3 | Obj | Stating in Policy SS5: Castle Gateway specific locations of development and including the possibility of development on the Castle Car Park does not give full scope to the principles on page 33 of SS3 which gives as an aim 'to improve settings to showcase important assets such as the Minster and Clifford's Tower'. | |
| 1466 | SS3 | Obj | Principle xi should be more robustly and accurately worded . Suggest wording that seeks delivery of enhancements to the existing bus interchange facilities which shall provide a seamless journey, a clear less congested transition for passengers and demonstrate good urban design. | Network Rail |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 2456 | SS3 | Obj | York is a city of culture and a major tourist destination. However, the City whilst making provision for tourists should also meet the needs of residents. Too many retail shops have/are closing to be replaced by restaurants and coffee shops. The council needs to consider, in the Local Plan, a reduction in rent to encourage more retail shops. Tourists like to see the attraction but they also like to shop and not all residents can get to retail centres on the edge of York and look to the City Centre to fill their needs. | |
| 13022 | SS3 | obi | Supports specific reference to Minster but concerned over lack of status afforded to Minster as a principle area of York, and absence of a supportive policy in plan. Provides suggestion of policy for the Minster, including maintaining a high quality Minster Quarter, enhancing the setting, supporting improvement of the precinct and any new development to be of outstanding quality and design. Explains character of Minster and development of master plan. Notes boundary of Minster Precinct in the proposals map does not accurately reflect extent of land owned by Minster. Includes an appendix which shows the accurate boundary. | York Minster |
| 13213 | SS3 | Obj | In order to allow for greater flexibility for the development of York Central and given the interconnected nature between the allocation and the rest of the city centre, the HCA requests that the city centre boundary is extended to all of the proposed allocation. The policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised and weighs in favour of a future planning application. The policy should also be amended to clarify that similar requirements for sequential and impact assessments are not required for the other uses referred to in the policy, in line with the NPPF, where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. | GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13416 | SS3 | Obj | A comprehensive approach is required that improves pedestrian and cycle connectivity. City centre road space should be reallocated in favour of sustainable transport whilst ensuring the centre continues to be accessible for businesses, residents and visitors. The city centre should reduce congestion and improve air quality. Concern over the wording in the policy regarding York Minster. It is not accurate to refer to York as having a single 'religious life'. | |
| 13550i | SS3 | Obj | Generally support the objectives apart from where the policy makes it clear that the objective for York City Centre is primarily for the growth of tourism, leisure and culture - objection strongly to this. There is no place for the ordinary residents of York. The residents of York should be put first. Too many shops have closed and opened as restaurants, pubs and cafes catering for tourists, the policy should limit these and concentrate on attracting quality shops back. Out of town retail has killed the centre and increased car journeys and increased carbon emissions. | |
| 238 | SS3 | Supp | Supports proposals for the city centre, including stated development principles. Together these should help safeguard and enhance those elements which contribute to the special character of this part of York. | Historic England |
| 386 | SS3 | Supp | Supports 'Change of use of existing Use Class A, B1(a) and town centre leisure, entertainment, and culture uses will be resisted.' | York Green Party |
| 2456 | SS3 | Supp | The proposals for Castle Piccadilly the railway station and National Railway Museum are welcomed. | |
| 2765 | SS3 | Supp | Support the re-letting of vacant shops and the conversion of the upper storeys of buildings. | |
| 5167 | SS3 | Supp | Agrees with the principles for city centre development as set out in Policy SS3. | Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|---|
| 12659 | SS3 | Supp | Support for Policy SS3. | Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership |
| 13022 | SS3 | Supp | Supports specific reference to Minster but concerned over lack of status afforded to Minster as a principle area of York. | York Minster |
| 13213 | SS3 | Supp | The HCA is generally supportive of the intent of this policy and welcomes its inclusion within the Local Plan. The HCA supports the provisions within Policy SS3 to “promote accessibility and movement etc.. | GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) |
| 13550i | SS3 | Supp | Generally support the objectives. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS4: York Central (ST5) | | | | |
| 4 | SS4 | Comm | Any further increase in site capacity will increase the traffic on the A64. | Highways England |
| 11 | SS4 | Comm | Policy SS4: York Central- The Development of this site will provide new economic and residential uses and activity in the centre of the City in a location well connected to sustainable transport which will benefit from regeneration. | North Yorkshire County Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 71 | ST5 | Comm | This site has potential for a transport hub where a bus/train interchange might be possible. Shopping has changed its profile but this is not reflected in the Local Plan. At present, many of York offices are being converted into flats so question whether offices are needed here. If they are, then other out-of-centre employment sites should be reduced. An extension of St Peter's Quarter would be most suitable for this area. It could act as a template for the teardrop site. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 78 | ST5 | Comm | This site has potential for a transport hub where a bus/train interchange might be possible. Shopping has changed its profile but this is not reflected in the Local Plan. At present, many of York offices are being converted into flats so question whether offices are needed here. If they are, then other out-of-centre employment sites should be reduced. An extension of St Peter's Quarter would be most suitable for this area. It could act as a template for the teardrop site. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 100 | ST5 | Comm | Policy should note the site's historic context, namely its railway heritage (comment refers to previous consultation documents 'Heritage as an Asset' and Heritage Audit. Suggested amendments: commitment to use the railway heritage on the site as one of its "...principles of development at York Central..."; amend para 3.24 as follows - "...this former rail yard will build on the City's existing assets <u>and existing heritage assets</u> on the York Central site to become an exciting new urban quarter for York residents", and "...Conservation Areas". Comment queries to which conservation area appraisal para 3.24 refers. Queries assumed figure of 1,500 dwellings. Queries relevance of references to Primary Shopping Area. | York Georgian Society |
| 187 | ST5 | Comm | The Chambers' 2016 Representation comments remain relevant | York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 372i | ST5 | Comm | <p>Policy should note the site's historic context, namely its railway heritage (comment refers to previous consultation documents 'Heritage as an Asset' and Heritage Audit. Suggested amendments: commitment to use the railway heritage on the site as one of its "...principles of development at York Central..."; amend para 3.24 as follows - "...this former rail yard will build on the City's existing assets <u>and existing heritage assets</u> on the York Central site to become an exciting new urban quarter for York residents", and "...Conservation Areas". Comment queries to which conservation area appraisal para 3.24 refers. Queries assumed figure of 1,500 dwellings. Queries relevance of references to Primary Shopping Area.</p> | Conservation Areas Advisory Panel |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 198 | SS4 | Comm | <p>Amendments should be made to Policy SS4 reflect the updated quantum of 2,500 dwellings and 100,000sqm of office uses alongside a variety of supporting uses including retail, leisure and a hotel provision. The importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community both within and around the site should be recognised. Policy SS4 could be amended to include an indicative floorspace provision and clarify that similar requirements for sequential and impact assessments are not required for the other uses referred to in the policy, in line with the NPPF, where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. Point i. of the policy could include retail and hotel amongst the range of uses. As a minimum it is expected that the development includes space for a food store and other retail uses necessary to support a major new residential community, an employment cluster and national museum, the cumulative space of which is likely to exceed 2,500 sqm. Welcome and endorse points iii, and iv. of policy SS4 which supports the expansion of the museum, the creation of high public realm around the museum and improved connectivity with the rest of the city. Suggest an alteration to ix, whilst York Central is an opportunity to meet local infrastructure needs, it must be allowed to succeed in its primary objective of delivering significant housing and employment space in a sustainable location and supported by infrastructure necessary to meet its own needs, alteration to policy suggested.</p> | National Railway Museum |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1466 | SS4 | Comm | <p>Supports, as part of the York Central Partnership, ARUP's letter which makes specific representations in relation to York Central. Support, in particular, their concern that development on brownfield land may not be viable if the requirement for housing and other policies cannot be more flexibly applied to brownfield sites. Land at the 5 acre site will soon be the subject of a an application for a new track fan to facilitate better train access arrangements into the depot. The Council's response to a pre-application enquiry supported the principle of the development. Note that the [5 acre] site has been show on the Proposals Map as a site of local interest to nature conservation. Recent biodiversity surveys at the site did not observe any rare or uncommon plant species. The site has previously been in railway use and is important operational land needed to safeguard the employment at the depot and rationalise the railway operations at the York Central Site. Clarification is sought on the reason for the site's designation.</p> | Network Rail |
| 1675i | ST5 | Comm | <p>There is a long history of non-delivery on ST5, Whilst envisage that some residential development on ST5, concerns are raised in relation to over reliance and the quantum to be delivered in the plan period.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Tayl |
| 5826iv | SS4 | Comm | <p>York Central should have an article 4 direction across the whole site to remove permitted development rights from any new grade A office constructed to prevent future conversion e.g. To residential or hotel uses as has happened in recent years to Yorkshire House, Roman House and Hudson House (ref policy EC2). Space should be retained adjacent to the train station for future extension necessary to deliver HS2 (or HS3 / Northern Powerhouse Rail) connectivity.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 9432 | ST5 | Comm | Concerned about future congestion along Strensall road. Supports Strensall Parish Councils traffic management scheme, such as an upgrade of the junction between Towthorpe Moor Lane and the A64, road realignment, a new link road between Strensall Barracks housing site to Towthorpe lines commercial site, widening and improvement to Towthorpe Moor Lane, and a full off road cycle track down Strensall Road. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 10379 | SS4 | Comm | Support idea but concerned it may not take place. | |
| 12640i | SS4 | Comm | Point vi states to conserve and enhance special character of area, which should include proposed access points across railway line and historic railway buildings. Historic England have recommended conservation area to be extended to cover St Paul's terraced estate. | |
| 12659 | SS4 | Comm | Support for the principles of Policy SS4. The York Central Partnership is now confident that the site can accommodate up to 2,500 dwellings and 100,000sqm of office use alongside a variety of supporting uses including retail, leisure and a hotel provision. Policy SS4 should be updated with these revised quantum. It would be unduly prescriptive to refer to the sequential and impact assessments in relation to town centre uses on this site. It seems unnecessary to stipulate broadband requirements to be stipulated in the policy framework for York Central. Suggest an alteration to ix, whilst York Central is an opportunity to meet local infrastructure needs, it must be allowed to succeed in its primary objective of delivering significant housing and employment space in a sustainable location and supported by infrastructure necessary to meet its own needs, alteration to policy suggested. | Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership |
| 12803 | ST5 | Comm | Rather than housing it would be better to use the site to create a central bus station / transport interchange that is linked to the train station. A multi-story car park could also be built here to solve some of the city's parking problems. | |
| 13102 | ST5 | Comm | We have expressed concern over the over-reliance of delivery from the York Central site. York Central has a long history of non-delivery. While we envisage some residential development on the York Central site, it will not be at the amount envisaged in this Plan. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13211 | ST5 | Comm | <p>Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required.</p> | Northern Power Grid |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13213 | SS4 | Comm | <p>Policies SS3, SS4, R1 and R3 currently require all A1-retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area (PSA), specifically including York Central (ST5), to be subject to a sequential and impact assessment. Whilst this is strictly in accordance with the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such an approach could harm the ability of YCP to allow for a comprehensive and sustainable development [at ST5] that meets the needs of its future community, including its residents and workforce. As a minimum, the representor would expect the development to include space for a food store and other retail uses necessary to support a major new residential community, an employment cluster and a national museum, the cumulative space of which is likely to exceed 2,500sqm. The Proposals Map identifies a number of small areas of existing open space within the site. These areas generally comprise either self-seeded groups of trees or small areas of space with limited function. Further clarification is therefore sought from CYC as to the value of these areas. The York Central development is expected to include major new areas of open space including a green park and a new civic square. It is therefore important that any restrictive designations are necessary and do not harm the ability to deliver the York Central site [ST5].</p> | GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) |
| 13230 | ST5 | Comm | <p>States that building new homes is necessary but infrastructure such as roads, schools, shops and parking need to be considered.</p> | |
| 13455 | ST5 | Comm | <p>Ok, with development but needs houses to be affordable at £100K mark.</p> | |
| 13459 | ST5 | Comm | <p>As a city-centre resident they are used to housing being densely concentrated, they appreciate the council's efforts to ensure provision of green space and protection of trees. Appreciates the efforts to build more housing.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13492 | ST5 | Comm | Keen to see York Central developed as long as the development does not hinder or compromise the future development of the railway infrastructure. Secondly the issue of access must be addressed. All three options will require access to and egress from the site onto the existing road system all of which are subject to congestion. Opposed to the southern access option and feel that the Water End option (option 1) will inflict the least damage on the city. | |
| 13510 | ST5 | Comm | It is important to preserve the Railway Institute and its related buildings as these are a valuable community asset. | |
| 13551 | SS4 | Comm | In favour of developing the site but ensure the development will benefit existing residents. Welcome the proposal for mixed use development that creates a thriving community and high quality of life. A detailed Masterplan will be needed with significant investment in co-design and collaboration with York residents. B1(a) Offices (Para 3.26) - no significant up to date modelling of office requirements, is it all needed? B1(b) and B1(c) uses should also be considered. Residential uses (viii) - development should include a mix of housing, the greatest need is for affordable housing. Ideal location for smaller houses. Welcome the commitment to a mixed tenure development. A breakdown of the 80% affordable and social rented is needed. Space should be made for self and community building. Residential uses should extend C2 and C2A. Concern if holiday homes lie empty, should restrict second homes. The architecture and landscaping should be inspirational and built to lifetime home standards. (cont...) | York Central Action |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13551 | SS4 | Comm | (cont...) The built environment should be connected to the heritage of the railways and to the rest of York centre. iii) iv) NRM Welcome the NRM in the heart of the development with associated high quality public realm which should connect to City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods. Conserve and enhance Holgate Road Conservation Area. Maximise the benefits of job creation vii) this statement fails to ensure a focus on the type of companies and jobs and how local people can benefit from the new opportunities. It should be a Living Wage development. Social infrastructure ix) welcome sports, leisure, health education, community facilities and open space these should be secured via CIL and be on-site. Transport and infrastructure x), xii, and xiii) and Para 3.27 welcome the focus on integration with existing transport infrastructure. Emphasise the importance of connectivity with neighbouring areas with upgraded walking and cycling routes - Leeman Park and Clifton Ings warrants more consideration. Modal shift to zero to low emission transport infrastructure. Minimise use of private vehicles. Upgrade existing arrival and interchange. Local facilities required. SUDS required. | York Central Action |
| 13595 | ST5 | Comm | Concern over the deliverability of the site within the plan period. | PB Planning on behalf of Mr K Chan |
| 13627 | ST5 | Comm | Hurry up with development, hopes for a good proportion of affordable homes. | |
| 13628 | ST5 | Comm | This site has potential for a transport hub where a bus/train interchange might be possible. Shopping has changed its profile but this is not reflected in the Local Plan. At present, many of York offices are being converted into flats so question whether offices are needed here. If they are, then other out-of-centre employment sites should be reduced. An extension of St Peter's Quarter would be most suitable for this area. It could act as a template for the teardrop site. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 13637i | SS4 | Comm | Welcome the fact 78ha of brownfield land at York Central is to be redeveloped via this policy. However, concern raised as the policy does not refer to the need to deliver an appropriate mix of housing. Reference to the SHMA would make point viii) stronger and assist the delivery of housing mix within this city location. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |
| 13640 | SS4 | Comm | Supports development of infrastructure and reference to education. Would be helpful if plan could safeguard land for provision of new schools to meet housing demand. Would like key national policies relating to this to be referenced in document (listed, from NPP, ESFA, Joint Policy Statement from Secretary of State). Encourages co-operation with ESFA with council to meet demand for primary and secondary schools. | ESFA |
| NDM 4 | ST5 | Comm | If the southern option for road access goes ahead it will drive traffic down an already busy route. Families will need to travel out of York for large supermarkets etc. Southern option into York central should be rejected. There is still a question mark over the road access and whether the Southern Option might go ahead - if this is the case, then this would channel a lot of traffic along this already busy route. Although the residents of this new development may not need cars to enter York, families and individuals need cars for out of town shopping, to travel to large supermarkets, designer outlets, out of town attractions, day trips, holidays etc. It is another reason why the Southern Option into York Central should be rejected if all these housing developments in Area 1 go ahead. | |
| 86 | ST5 | Obj | Hopes that the proposed access roads will not destroy any existing community facilities such as the shared garden in the St Paul's area. Concerned about the access between York Central and the centre of York, as it is not clear how it is going to be facilitated. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 187 | ST5 | Obj | <p>Given the continued uncertainty surrounding the delivery of housing on Site ST5 - which the Plan acknowledges, the housing provision from the site should be treated as windfall to the housing supply. The Chamber believes the net developable area on the site could be considerably less than 35 hectares and a plan providing a clear indication of what land can be developed at the York Central site would help clarify this. The Chamber believes the net developable area on the site could be considerably less than 35 hectares and a plan providing a clear indication of what land can be developed at the York Central site would help clarify this.</p> | York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce |
| 238 | ST5 | Obj | <p>Query the deliverability of the quantum of development proposed within the site's heritage context, both in terms of impact on the site's many heritage assets and also potential knock-on to the city centre. Suggests a lot more work is needed to demonstrate how 1,500 dwellings and 61,000 sqm of office floorspace can be created on the site in a manner which would also be compatible with the need to safeguard the significance of the numerous heritage assets in its vicinity and the other elements which contribute to the special historic character of the City. Doubt that the quantum of development being proposed for York Central is deliverable in a manner which will safeguard the numerous heritage assets in its vicinity but also not have significant knock-on effects upon the remainder of the historic core of York. Given this, the impact of the development of this site upon SOA14 should be amended to uncertain. The HIA should recommend that a masterplan is produced for the site to demonstrate whether the scale of development proposed for the area is consistent with the conservation of the elements which contribution to the special character of the historic city.</p> | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 262 | SS4 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 431 | ST5 | Obj | Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan. Therefore, until the allocation at York Central is supported by this level analysis, the projected housing yields for the site are considered to be purely aspirational. | O'Neill Planning Consultatnts Representing Shepherd Homes |
| 456 | ST5 | Obj | Transport studies have not been published which demonstrates that issues relating to this site have been addressed. York Central cries out for tram/rapid bus links between the city centre and edge of town but it seems that road transport is the priority. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 554ii | SS4 | Obj | <p>The development of ST5 has been the subject of much work over many years none of which has resulted in any consents or meaningful work taking place on the site. It is unclear what form the proposed 1500 dwellings will take (size, type, tenure etc) or whether the 1500 dwellings can be realistically accommodated whilst respecting the character and form of the city. There is no indication of delivery rates to understand how many units the site will realistically deliver or any clarity on how the costs of accessing the site can be overcome and by when. Technical work is still ongoing to understand the deliverability. The numbers may increase or decrease due to this work. The work to understand what this can accommodate and by when is incomplete and whilst the site may come forward there is no evidence to support the timings, capacity and mechanisms for delivery.</p> | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1466 | SS4 | Obj | <p>If the policy definition of main town centre uses is applied all new office and leisure space as well as retail development will fall to be sequentially tested against the city centre and district and local centres. Sites available in these locations will be sequentially preferable to York Central;. Network Rail support ARUP's view that the sequential testing of proposals that are part of an up to date local plan would not be in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 24 and 26. The policy wording could be updated to reflect the change in rail priorities. Amend 4th bullet to read 'Rail uses associated with operational rationalisation and function and catering for HS2 and all other future rail capacity projects'. Concerned that principles x,xi and xii are seeking the same objective, are a reiteration of overarching policies in the plan and need to be built upon in this more detailed policy. The policy should be more proactive in supporting innovative design based solutions to sustainable transport objectives by favouring design consistent with achieving a low speed traffic environment, emphasising place making over vehicle movements and creating high quality walking and cycling links with the city centre and York Station . Paragraph 3.27 should be updated to 'general rail capacity schemes designed to improve and enhance all routes on the network affecting York' with the reference to York Leeds Harrogate deleted. The wording in relation to broadband should be clarified with the emphasis on the site developer facilitating broadband in those areas of the site that will support office and residential development</p> | Network Rail |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1668 | ST5 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST5 in relation to uncertainties over the timescales associated with infrastructure works and the quantum of homes. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | PB PLanning on behalf of Barratt a |
| 8985ii | ST5 | Obj | Concerned about additional traffic generated by new residents. Suggests low cost housing would reduce number of cars and that it should be made car-free with provision of electric bus routes. | |
| 9381i | ST5 | obi | This site is extremely challenging to bring forward and given the length of time it has been trying to come forward, there is doubt over the site's viability and deliverability. This concern is exacerbated by lack of developer interest due to high risks of development. This scheme is reliant on high rise, apartment driven development which is new for York. Concerns are raised in relation to the impact on York's skyline and whether high storey development will be suitable. In addition, the type of accommodation offered may offer a particular type of lifestyle which will push up costs of homes, depress the market and take a considerable time to develop. Currently there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that ST5 is suitable, available and achievable in the timescales of the plan. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan such as the 410 dwellings set out in 2014. | DPP Planning on behalf of Linden |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 9883iv | ST5 | Obj | Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan. Therefore, until the allocation at York Central is supported by this level analysis, the projected housing yields for the site are considered to be purely aspirational. | O'Neill Planning Consultatnts representing SBO Lands Ltd. |
| 9888 | ST5 | Obj | Concern over the over-reliance from the York Central site. It has a long history of non-delivery. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development Ltd |
| 10097 | ST5 | obi | This site is extremely challenging to bring forward and given the length of time it has been trying to come forward, there is doubt over the site's viability and deliverability. This concern is exacerbated by lack of developer interest due to high risks of development. This scheme is reliant on high rise, apartment driven development which is new for York. Concerns are raised in relation to the impact on York's skyline and whether high storey development will be suitable. In addition, the type of accommodation offered may offer a particular type of lifestyle which will push up costs of homes, depress the market and take a considerable time to develop. Currently there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that ST5 is suitable, available and achievable in the timescales of the plan. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan such as the 410 dwellings set out in 2014. | DPP Planning on behalf of Shephe |
| 10121 | ST5 | Obj | Concern over the over-reliance from the York Central site. It has a long history of non-delivery. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Vernon and Co. |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12273 | ST5 | Obj | The Southern option should not be considered, it would mean demolishing the community garden and ruin the lives of people who live in that part of Holgate. | |
| 12560 | ST5 | obi | This site is extremely challenging to bring forward and given the length of time it has been trying to come forward, there is doubt over the site's viability and deliverability. This concern is exacerbated by lack of developer interest due to high risks of development. This scheme is reliant on high rise, apartment driven development which is new for York. Concerns are raised in relation to the impact on York's skyline and whether high storey development will be suitable. In addition, the type of accommodation offered may offer a particular type of lifestyle which will push up costs of homes, depress the market and take a considerable time to develop. Currently there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that ST5 is suitable, available and achievable in the timescales of the plan. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan such as the 410 dwellings set out in 2014. | DPP on behalf of landowner |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12885 | ST5 | Obj | <p>This site is a key space for increasing employment opportunities in York, sited next to the railway station ,a transport hub for busses and trains allowing access without the need for car parking. Emphasis should be focussed on sustainable movement patterns of walking, cycling and using public transport. York needs more high quality employment opportunities in the city centre and needs a mix of employment types not just tourism allowing creative industry to flourish and deliver on the UNESCO Creative Cities Network promises. The railway carriage buildings could be converted for new uses and preserving the heritage of the city. The city needs a medium sized multifunctional venue. A mix of studio and office space with gallery/exhibition space and cafes would allow a cultural quarter to develop and compete with larger cities. Employment allocation should be 30% of the site. Sustainable housing should be created with access to car share schemes and cycle storage sheds and no more than one car per house allowed. Infrastructure should allow residents to walk to school, shops and work. Schools and shops need to be provided with outdoor play space for children, teenagers and adults.</p> | |
| 13026 | ST5 | obi | <p>Concerned with inclusion of ST5 in relation to uncertainties over the timescales associated with infrastructure works and the quantum of homes. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|---|
| 13027 | ST5 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST5 in relation to uncertainties over the timescales associated with infrastructure works and the quantum of homes. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | PBPlanning on behalf of David Wi |
| 13093 | ST5 | obi | Until York Central is supported by a evidence and analysis to underpin a masterplan, the projected housing yields are for the site are aspirational. Plan is placing reliance on high rise blocks of flatted development in an area important for the historic setting of the city which is an important design consideration. Furthermore, reliance of high density apartment living goes against the SHMA demand requirement for 2/3 bedroom family homes. | O'Neill Associates on behalf of Jor |
| 13099 | ST5 | obi | Until York Central is supported by a evidence and analysis to underpin a masterplan, the projected housing yields are for the site are aspirational. Plan is placing reliance on high rise blocks of flatted development in an area important for the historic setting of the city which is an important design consideration. Furthermore, reliance of high density apartment living goes against the SHMA demand requirement for 2/3 bedroom family homes. | O'Neills Associates on behalf of G |
| 13103 | ST5 | Obj | Concern over the over-reliance from the York Central site. It has a long history of non-delivery. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |
| 13104 | ST5 | Obj | Concern over the over-reliance from the York Central site. It has a long history of non-delivery. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. |
| 13106 | ST5 | Obj | Concern re over-reliance of delivery on a site with a long history of non-delivery. Delivery is likely to be much less than that envisaged in the Plan. | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13161 | ST5 | Obj | Urging the council to protect Holgate community Garden and Park from development as part of the York Central "southern option" access road. Mentions the ward lacking green space, that the garden is an Asset of Community Value and its importance for recreational amenity. | Friends of Holgate Community Ga |
| 13205 | ST5 | Obj | Increased flexibility in approach to use of employment sites is welcome but there is a concern over the planned target of only 60000 sq m of B1a office space at York Central given the significantly higher figure in the EZ proposal. | York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP |
| 13213 | SS4 | Obj | YCP is now confident that the site can accommodate up to 2,500 dwellings and 100,000sqm of office uses alongside a variety of supporting uses including retail, leisure and hotel provision. The HCA would be grateful for amendments to be made to Policy SS4 to reflect this up-to-date quantum. The policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised and weighs in favour of a future planning application. The policy should also be amended to clarify that similar requirements for sequential and impact assessments are not required for the other uses referred to in the policy, in line with the NPPF, where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. The policy should include an indicative floor space provision. Key Principle (i) should include retail and hotel amongst the range of uses. Alter key principle (ix) so that it reads <i>“Ensure provision of social infrastructure which meets the needs of York Central and, where feasible, the wider city communities including sports, leisure, health, education and community facilities and open space”</i> . | GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 13257 | ST5 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: increased traffic congestion - the area is already busy and noisy/polluted at junction Acomb Rd/Boroughbridge Rd; risks to cyclists and pedestrians; increased noise and environmental damage; access to site should not use this area (Acomb Rd/Boroughbridge Rd junction). | |
| 13261 | ST5 | Obj | Concern for the high density/commercial development proposed, potentially leading to a major increase in traffic to the centre, problems of site access and increased levels of pollution. | |
| 13268 | ST5 | Obj | Objecting to development on grounds of increased traffic to/from Water End. Suggests potential for another 2 stations on the rail line from Harrogate to York, providing a shuttle service to Poppleton. | |
| 13301 | ST5 | Obj | Objects to the impact of development on the already congested A1237 ring road. | |
| 13336 | ST5 | Obj | Apart from destruction of a local park/Greenspace at ST5, the road will just clog up Holgate Road even more. | |
| 13355 | ST5 | Obj | The favoured access option (option E) will destroy the Holgate Community Garden, an important local amenity. The justification for this decision and the data on which it was based have never been fully disclosed. | |
| 13392 | ST5 | Obj | Believes that allocating office space in the 'teardrop' York Central site is a waste of time and money as there are other office structures in York which have been unused for decades. Suggests leaving construction of business spaces until they are guaranteed to be used. | |
| 13427 | ST5 | Obj | ST5 must include a commitment to a significant proportion of car free living. This is essential to avoid increasing traffic on already congested roads surrounding the site. | |
| 13458 | ST5 | Obj | Need for more affordable housing/social housing on ST5. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13462 | ST5 | Obj | Roads are already inadequate so it is not feasible to add more traffic to the network. Congestion and related costs or delays and health effects of pollution are already major issues. Major investment in radial routes (especially A59) and ring road should be a priority. | |
| 13470i | ST5 | Obj | The reliance on cars should be actively reduced. This development should include a commitment to support car-free living. Concern over congestion now on surrounding roads. Air quality will get worse. | |
| 13550i | SS4 | Obj | Generally in support of the policy for York Central and high density housing. However objection relates to renewable energy and district heating as these have been excluded from the policy. There is also no mention of access or infrastructure provision. The stated intent to promote a modal shift from the car will not work unless consideration is given to viable public transport solutions. Consideration should be given to underground parking with electric charging points. Concerned that the policy's focus is on housing and jobs and everything else is back fitted around them. The road, transport and infrastructure planning should be done first then fit housing and jobs to it. | |
| 13551 | SS4 | Obj | The SHMA update introduced a new formula for assessing housing need. Based on this formula York's OAN is inadequate. A 20% uplift on OAN is required. There is a need for at least 30% affordable housing on sites > 15ha on brownfield land and these should be affordable for sale, via shared ownership, help to buy etc. There is no justification for why brownfield affordable housing percentages is lower than Greenfield. | York Central Action |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13552 | ST5 | Obj | Against York Central. This is railway land and should be kept for transportation uses. The mixed use development can go anywhere in the city but the railway cannot. If York wants connection to HS2 there will have to be room for the trains and their specialist lines. | |
| 13585 | ST5 | Obj | York Central has three proposed access options, the chosen access option will affect significantly which local facilities will bear the brunt of the new community demands, notably, the road network and education capacity local to the chosen option. DTC Table 4.3 quotes the Highways Agency "will only consider improving SRN to meet traffic generated by new development as a last resort". Thus road quality in existing communities must be expected to deteriorate at an accelerated rate and to a poorer level of quality. The plan should adopt all three proposed access options in order to share the load. Water End would be the logical main route in and out with minor restricted capacity routes in and out at the other two sites, importantly without impact on existing community, without creating a new rat run or increasing safety hazards for children and without Holgate Community of its garden. Table NTS3 Education: significant negative effect yet to be considered - 1500 new homes will bring potentially 1500 new families, even 300 new families cannot be accommodated in the existing primary and secondary schools. Gives no detailed comment on York Central transport provision. The Holgate Road access option introduces safety issues, congestion issues and loss of existing community benefits. These negative effects on the existing community should be compensated. Potentially overwhelming effect of car traffic into and out of the site, onto roads already that are already over-capacity. Specifically mentions Holgate Road and concerns about road safety for school children. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13624 | ST5 | Obj | Appears to include the current commuter (apoca) car park for the station, this facility is very well used and is essential for people who need to travel further afield for work by train. Commuters such as these require parking near the station, they often leave early and return late and are therefore unable to use other methods of travel to and from the station. Building here will decrease the availability of parking for these users and may increase traffic flow into the city (increase in air pollution), with residents of any new properties expecting at least one parking space each. Any residential properties planned should be affordable and sustainable, the city centre location means they will likely be a premium price and unaffordable for York residents who wish to remain in the city. | |
| 13639 | ST5 | Obj | Should be considered for mixed-use development, with strong community, arts sport and recreational focus. Should also include a high level of affordable and social housing. However the site will be used to build what suits corporate and developer interests, not what is in the best interest of York citizens. | |
| 13653 | ST5 | Obj | Concern over the over-reliance from the York Central site. It has a long history of non-delivery. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Yorvik Homes |
| 4 | SS4 | Supp | Considers development principle (xii) to be satisfactory | Highways England |
| 238 | ST5 | Supp | Support for the principle of development on this large brownfield site, as part of a wider development strategy designed to achieve the protection of key elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting of York. Support requirement for development within principles designed to: enhance the quality of the cultural area around NRM; create a distinctive new place; conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the adj CHC Conservation Area/St Paul's Sq/Holgate Rd CA; maximise sustainable economic growth. | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|---|---|
| 1466 | ST5 | Supp | Network Rail is pleased to note that the potential access to York Central from the 5 acre land has been removed from this iteration of the local plan. | Network Rail |
| 2765 | ST5 | Supp | Support the development proposals for York Central and the expansion of the National Railway Museum including the former railway works site. | |
| 5167 | ST5 | Supp | Support for the strategic site ST5 York Central which is a brownfield site and occupies a sustainable city centre location. This site can help support substantial levels of development and an appropriate mix of uses including many new homes. Support the encouragement of high density mixed use development that respects the historic setting of the city. | Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd |
| 12252 | ST5 | Supp | Supports introduction of electric buses and improvements to scarborough bridge for cyclists and pedestrians. Suggests cycle path from cinder lane inadequate for extra numbers of people going into town from ST5. | |
| 12640 | ST5 | Supp | Supports use of large brownfield area for development. Figure 14.1 shows access points. Asks whether there is only one road over railway planned and if there are more walking routes planned as the figure shows none. Current bridge over railway needs improving for access. Questions destruction of Holgate park and play area. | |
| 12659 | ST5 | Supp | Support for ST5 | Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership |
| 12659 | ST5 | Supp | Support the detail within the Open Space and Green Infrastructure Update (2017) | Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership |
| 13213 | SS4 | Supp | The HCA is generally supportive of the intent of this policy and welcomes its inclusion within the Local Plan. | GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13294 | ST5 | Supp | As these sites have already been used in the past this is ideal land. Using land that has had past development on it is the best land to use . It helps land that hasn't been developed to help stop flooding in York and surrounding areas | |
| 13346 | ST5 | Supp | Supports development at York Central | Greenpeace/Green Party? |
| 13379 | ST5 | Supp | Car free development ideal on this site. | |
| 13404i | ST5 | Supp | Support this brownfield site being used for housing and employment. It should be sustainable given its location, especially in terms of transport. Support the expansion of the NRM. | |
| 13514 | ST5 | Supp | Access to site needs to be improved to allow double decker buses and HGVs. Apart from public transport and provision of services this development should be pedestrianised and traffic free zone. Requests social housing in development. | |
| 13550i | SS4 | Supp | Generally in support of the policy for York Central and high density housing. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS5: Castle Gateway (ST20) | | | | |
| 42 | SS5 | Comm | Support for the overall concept of improving this area. Protected species e.g. Otters, will need to be considered if the banks of the River Foss become more open to the public. There may also be some possibilities of re-naturalising some of the concrete and metal reinforcement of the river banks in some places. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 210 | SS5 | Comm | Welcomes the principles to enhance the public realm along the Ouse Riverside. Believe the document would be more precise if more guidance was provided on how it would be enhanced (i.e. Access). | Canal & River Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 386 | SS5 (policy) | Comm | <p>Regarding Castle Piccadilly: The form and design of any building along the western bank of the Foss is crucial. The limitations on what is acceptable should be clearly defined from the outset. i)Add the following ‘The building should be highly legible and maximise opportunities for full and open (non-paying) public access to the river frontage (required at v) directly from the Castle site, facing both the river and the new civic open space; it should maximise views of the Foss from the Castle site, preserve the current view of Clifford’s Tower from Piccadilly and facilitate an awareness of being between two rivers on the Castle site ; it should be no more than one storey high for a significant part of its length; and it’s footprint should take up less than one third of the area between the Foss and the bottom of the Castle mound. ii)Replace with ‘Deliver a contemporary new car park if required to meet evidence based city centre parking needs, for example on the site of existing surface level parking at Castle Mills.’ The principles should include some kind of definition of what is required on the Castle car park site. Add new principle ‘Create a new city centre park on the former Castle car park, connecting this area with the Eye of York to provide a flexible civic space that includes green infrastructure, informal open space, more formal space for small and large events, reflects the heritage of the area and better connects the city centre to the Castle Museum.</p> | York Green Party |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 456 | ST20 | Comm | A new building on the banks of the river Foss has not been specifically flagged up as a wish through community engagement. Tree planting on Piccadilly might be a good idea but there is no reason why it would be, in the absence of other consideration of redesign of Piccadilly as open space. Should assess whether a replacement car park is need rather than planning for it automatically. An underground car park would be a missed opportunity for pulling vehicle access away from the Eye of York and would also be at risk of flooding. | |
| 1944 | ST20 | Comm | The Castle Gateway area could be an example to the rest of York. A place where pedestrians and cyclists are given priority and small-scale is prevalent. | |
| 2765 | ST20 | Comm | Support the development proposals for the Castle Piccadilly Masterplan but feel that the design of any proposals should be in-keeping with the setting of heritage assets including Clifford's Tower and the Castle Museum. | |
| 13513 | ST20 | Comm | If regeneration is going to "Radically enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower" the whole area needs "radically" re-working, lack of city centre bike parking puts people off cycling in and limits how / where they cycle in the centre. As such, is disappointed by the council's insistence on the need for the Castle Car Park. High density, covered, cycle parking with 24/7 CCTV would be better and would benefit businesses in the city centre (as opposed to out of town retailers) as more people feel comfortable cycling / leaving their bikes in the city centre. | |
| 71 | ST20 | Obj | Total contradiction as most of the Plan talks about reducing cars in the city centre etc but this policy includes plans for car park. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 78 | ST20 | Obj | Total contradiction as most of the Plan talks about reducing cars in the city centre etc but this policy includes plans for car park. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 100 | ST20 | Obj | <p>Policy needs extensive redrafting: should the plan established such detailed principles when community consultation is actively underway? Policy content is in conflict with the outcomes and recommendations of Castle Car Park public inquiry, namely its reference to "(i) create a development opportunity for a contemporary new building of exemplary architecture alongside the western bank of the River Foss on the site of the existing Castle Car Park". Such a principle would be contrary to the outcome of the Public Inquiry held in 2002 and should not be included here; the whole of the Castle Gateway development site lies within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area - comment suggests that the recognition of this designation should be acknowledged as the first of the 'purposes(s) of the regeneration' by quoting the definition of the conservation area designation, viz: "to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area". This would comply with the Inspector's recommendation at the end of the Public Inquiry in that " a site with such historic associations and heritage value...the historic environment should have been the over-riding consideration in the formulation of the scheme." This should be included as a 'purpose of the regeneration'; the contents of the 2006 Castle Piccadilly Planning Brief do not appear to have been taken into account in this policy. Note other detailed text changes.</p> | York Georgian Society |
| 192 | SS5 | Obj | <p>Object to the wording on page 38 of the main document as it is too specific: 'new building alongside west bank of River Foss' this pre-empts the master plan. Also objects to the wording in the first bullet point under the purpose of regeneration on page 38: '....development opportunity on the Castle Car Park'. The inclusion of the word development pre-empts any decision as to what is best for the site.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 372ii | ST20 | Obj | <p>Policy needs extensive redrafting: should the plan established such detailed principles when community consultation is actively underway?; policy content is in conflict with the outcomes and recommendations of Castle Car Park public inquiry, namely its reference to "(i) create a development opportunity for a contemporary new building of exemplary architecture alongside the western bank of the River Foss on the site of the existing Castle Car Park". Such a principle would be contrary to the outcome of the Public Inquiry held in 2002 and should not be included here; the whole of the Castle Gateway development site lies within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area - comment suggests the the recognition of this designation should be acknowledged as the first of the 'purposes(s) of the regeneration' by quoting the definition of the conservation area designation, viz: "to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area". This would comply with the Inspector's recommendation at the end of the Public Inquiry in that " a site with such historic associations and heritage value...the historic environment should have been the over-riding consideration in the formulation of the scheme." This should be included as a 'purpose of the regeneration'; the contents of the 2006 Castle Piccadilly Planning Brief do not appear to have been taken into account in this policy. Note other detailed text changes.</p> | Conservation Areas Advisory Panel |
| 12662 | ST20 | Obj | <p>Castle Car Park should be kept as open space. No underground car park or building should be allowed as it would squander an opportunity for short term gain. More should be made of the Castle's historic context including excavation of the car park and interpretation of remains.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12885 | ST20 | Obj | Development on this site should face the Foss on Piccadilly and the current car park site. The river should be the focus of the area. It should link the historical buildings and create a cohesive area. A footbridge over the Foss should open up the site from Fossgate. There should be a winter garden accessible all year with exhibition space, cafes, independent small shops and a medium sized venue - with a focus being cafe culture, family friendly not bars. Piccadilly should be developed to face the river and allow access to the water, enabling small rowing boats on the river or punting. Piccadilly should be developed to enable linking of the spaces along the Foss. | |
| 13487 | ST20 | Obj | Concern about Clifford's Tower Motte. The space at the base of the four steps removed from green space land. Open space land cannot be apportioned, removed or its status altered without following the terms of the 1972 Local Government Act. Section 123 on disposal of land. It should be returned to open space land. | Cllr Hayes |
| 13628 | ST20 | Obj | Total contradiction as most of the Plan talks about reducing cars in the city centre etc but this policy includes plans for car park. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 11 | SS5 | Supp | Policy SS5: Castle gateway - The proposals to better link the Castle Museum / Clifford's Tower site with York's main shopping centre and potentially support improvements on Piccadilly are welcomed as they further strengthen the city's role as a retail and commercial centre serving a wider hinterland. | North Yorkshire County Council |
| 42 | SS5 | Supp | Support for the overall concept of improving this area. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 86 | ST20 | Supp | It is widely agreed that the current car park around the base of Cliffords Tower is visually unappealing and may not be the optimum use of space in such a historic area. Support the suggestions that the car park is relocated or put underground. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST20 | Supp | General support for the policy principles guiding regeneration, with the provision that, reflecting the distinct areas either side of the Foss (Clifford's Tower/Eye of York and Piccadilly) each have its own policy framework. | Historic England |
| 386 | SS5 (policy) | Supp | Support much of this approach with the following provisos: We support the removal of the Castle car park. We believe the option of replacing it with an underground car park should be discounted immediately – apart from the expense, the likely difficulties regarding flooding and potential impact on the structural integrity of Clifford’s Tower itself, the key reason is that retaining a car park entrance/exit on the Castle site will totally undermine the objective to remove the majority of through traffic from this area and enhance the setting of Clifford’s Tower and other historic buildings in the area through creating a high quality pedestrian space. We would also strongly suggest that the plan doesn’t specify that replacement car parking space should necessarily be provided at Castle Mills. Whilst this may turn out to be the case, specific assumptions about the most appropriate replacement parking shouldn’t be made until a detailed review of all the city’s off road parking capacity has been completed. | York Green Party |
| 2765 | ST20 | Supp | Support the development proposals for the Castle Piccadilly Masterplan. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS6: British Sugar/Manor School (ST1) | | | | |
| 4 | SS6 | Comm | It is likely that a development of this scale will require capacity enhancement on the A64 west of York, particularly if the cumulative impact of other sites around the A1237 is considered. | Highways England |
| 71 | ST1 | Comm | 500 houses should be completed on this site before any consideration is given to the opening of the ST2 site. Access to the site should be with a dual carriage split entrance onto Boroughbridge Road. Concerned that access to site could be considered near level crossing on Millfield Lane. Should consult with Parish Council re bollard on Millfield Lane. Consideration should be given to an exit using a bridge across the Harrogate railway and linking to A19 or A1237 by new roads. Parking on double yellow lines need to be addressed. Provision should be made for the elderly as well as starter homes for young people. Bungalows and the potential for sheltered housing is not mentioned in the policy. Garages should be big enough to fit modern cars and there should be off-street parking for 2-3 cars per house. Provision should be made for adequate replacement of playing fields at the former Manor School and Former British Sugar Site cricket pitch. Large trees and hedgerows on the site should be preserved. Concern about the noise from the railway for the new residents of this site. Local businesses which currently enjoy the ambience of a rural setting should be considered. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 78 | ST1 | Comm | <p>500 houses should be completed on this site before any consideration is given to the opening of the ST2 site. Access to the site should be with a dual carriage split entrance onto Boroughbridge Road. Concerned that access to site could be considered near level crossing on Millfield Lane. Should consult with Parish Council re bollard on Millfield Lane. Consideration should be given to an exit using a bridge across the Harrogate railway and linking to A19 or A1237 by new roads. Parking on double yellow lines need to be addressed. Provision should be made for the elderly as well as starter homes for young people. Bungalows and the potential for sheltered housing is not mentioned in the policy. Garages should be big enough to fit modern cars and there should be off-street parking for 2-3 cars per house. Provision should be made for adequate replacement of playing fields at the former Manor School and Former British Sugar Site cricket pitch. Large trees and hedgerows on the site should be preserved. Concern about the noise from the railway for the new residents of this site. Local businesses which currently enjoy the ambience of a rural setting should be considered.</p> | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 386 | ST1 | Comm | <p>Should be subject to the same standards as the nearby York Central in terms of requirement for affordable housing, sustainable building and traffic minimisation. Much of this seems to be missing from the current site principles. Amenity and recreational open space in the area for existing and new residents should also be protected. The potential for a tram/train/light rail link through this site to the railway station shouldn't be a long term possibility but an immediate strategic transport priority. It should be mentioned here in SS6, not in SS7.</p> | York Green Party |
| 456 | ST1 | Comm | <p>All the indications are that housing on the British Sugar site will be of a mediocre quality. What is 'social heritage' in this instance?</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 1077 | ST1 | Comm | Questions the logic of demolishing Manor School when the residents of new housing will create demand for education. Has previously commented on the mental and physical benefits of trees and green spaces, wishes to stress the importance again. | |
| 1333 | ST1 | Comm | Query regarding the amount of cars created by the proposed development at the British Sugar site and in particular how these additional cars will get on and off the A59 which is often gridlocked now at peak times. This could be compounded by the new houses proposed at ST2. | |
| 1466 | ST1 | Comm | Millfield Lane [Level] Crossing continues to be a high risk crossing which is likely to see the number of trains increased in the short to medium term. Transport Assessments should assess likely vehicular and pedestrian movements over the crossing where the number of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements require improvements to the level crossing. | Network Rail |
| 12129 | ST1 | Comm | The proposed residential site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. | Amec Foster wheeler on behalf of National Grid |
| 13230 | ST1 | Comm | States that building new homes is necessary but infrastructure such as roads, schools, shops and parking need to be considered. | |
| 13269 | ST1 | Comm | 1,200 homes on a site which has limited access/egress will put a lot of pressure on Plantation Drive and Boroughbridge Road. The latter is already a busy and at times congested main road. | |
| 13393i | ST1 | Comm | Including British Sugar will not be available in time. | |
| 13454 | ST1 | Comm | Ok, with development but needs houses to be affordable at £100K mark. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13455 | ST1 | Comm | <p>500 houses should be completed on this site before any consideration is given to the opening of the ST2 site. Access to the site should be with a dual carriage split entrance onto Boroughbridge Road. Concerned that access to site could be considered near level crossing on Millfield Lane. Should consult with Parish Council re bollard on Millfield Lane. Consideration should be given to an exit using a bridge across the Harrogate railway and linking to A19 or A1237 by new roads. Parking on double yellow lines need to be addressed. Provision should be made for the elderly as well as starter homes for young people. Bungalows and the potential for sheltered housing is not mentioned in the policy. Garages should be big enough to fit modern cars and there should be off-street parking for 2-3 cars per house. Provision should be made for adequate replacement of playing fields at the former Manor School and Former British Sugar Site cricket pitch. Large trees and hedgerows on the site should be preserved. Concern about the noise from the railway for the new residents of this site. Local businesses which currently enjoy the ambience of a rural setting should be considered.</p> | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 13628 | ST1 | Comm | <p>Whatever number of dwellings and volumes of business space that result from developments along the A59 York will suffer from a rise in pollutants as traffic levels increase. It is vital therefore that these playing fields are preserved as green open space for the community. Please maintain this green lung to offset the impoverished air quality. Do not allow housing on this site - leisure facilities, exercise, clean air and better health for the community should be taken into consideration.</p> | |
| NDM 4 | ST1 | Comm | <p>Concerned whether there is provision for schools, doctors, open spaces and play areas for development. Road infrastructure may not cope with traffic increase, children walk down to school.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4 | SS6 | Obj | Add the following to the list of key principles: 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.' | Highways England |
| 262 | SS6 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 430 | ST1 | Obj | Objects as site has been extended and now included Manor playing fields, which is an important green space in Acomb, which has a deficit of green spaces. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 434 | SS6 | Obj | <p>Proposed new wording given for the policy. Criterion ii. Delete and surrounding communities - agreed that there is no requirement for local retail or healthcare facilities, Any specific reference to these must relate to the Manor School part of ST1. This should be clarified. Criterion iv. deleted reflecting the site historic use and social heritage. This is unclear and should be deleted. The existing landscape will be reprofiled as a result of the remediation work and whilst every effort has been made to ensure views towards the city centre are maintained where appropriate this as to be done inline with the engineering works. This should be made clearer in the policy. Criterion v. delete including existing landscaped areas. The existing landscape will be reprofiled as a result of the remediation works. This should be recognised accordingly. Para 3.37 delete the wording 'This may include phasing development around the site to correspond to the lifecycle of the species'. A buffer has been put in to ensure protection of the SIN. The suggested wording regarding life cycle of bees and wasps should be deleted.</p> | Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC |
| 706 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Main objection due to extra traffic onto already congested A59 and S1237. Concerned about closure of recycling centre as people have to travel to James St which causes more congestion.</p> | |
| 1231 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Old Manor School playing fields must not be built on, left open for recreational value. Number of houses proposed seems excessive and there is little detail on supporting infrastructure.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1305 | ST1 | Obj | <p>From the council's own evidence it is clear that the Acomb ward is in a significant deficit of green space of all kinds. This is detrimental to the well-being and health of residents. Disappointed to see the old Manor School site is to be fully developed and playing fields there are to be lost. Appreciates the need to build housing but the loss of much needed green space here should be cause for review or reconsideration. Serves much of the Acomb ward, it has been long recognised the local of local green space. Very concerned by the proposed development of the old Manor School site and the subsequent loss of open green space. Would be supportive of some re-development as they appreciate the need to build housing but a significant area of the site retained for open green space for public use.</p> | Church of the Holy Redeemer Par |
| 1466 | SS6 | Obj | <p>The policy wording should where this is possible, given the advance stage of the planning considerations on this site [ST1], acknowledge the need to restrict vehicular and pedestrian movements over the crossing. Network Rail would object to any proposals which increases unmitigated level crossing risk.</p> | Network Rail |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1568 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Urban West - Acomb Ward has a deficit in green open space currently and that is even when the data includes Old Manor CE Secondary School fields (planned for housing), Craven Sports Ground (privately owned so not accessible to the public and also planned for housing) and Carr schools area which is a great green space used by the schools but will be locked out of school hours and again not accessible to the public. Accepts development on the brownfield sites of British Sugar and even the old Manor School site but objects to the inclusion of playing fields for housing. The space should be left for community use. The area has a number of mature chestnut trees lining the road which should be preserved as they are rare for the York area and provide a habitat for wildlife. A tree preservation order should be placed on them immediately to prevent felling in any window of opportunity that may arise during the transfer of ownership from council to developer.</p> | |
| 1574 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Boroughbridge Road is often gridlocked at peak times, concerned about additional traffic here and the lack of a plan to alleviate congestion. Wishes for the trees along the edge of the old Manor School to be retained, also notes the lack of green space in the local area and wishes for it to be retained rather than built on.</p> | |
| 3045 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Land should be retained as green belt, as available Grade 2 agricultural land and sports facilities.</p> | |
| 3178 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Notes change to previously publicised plans (designating Acomb Park as suitable for housing) - the council's actions at a gathering of Friends of Acomb Park were perceived to be unfair, high handed and indicative of a generally dismissive attitude towards the residents of this area. Objects to development on the grounds that this is vital green space, in deficit in the Acomb area.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4437 | ST1 | Obj | Objecting to the number of proposed houses at ST1 due to the increase in the number of vehicles (at least 1200) on a local road system. Namely A59/ A1257, Millfield Lane and Poppleton and A59 Roundabouts. The local road system is struggling to cope more and more now. | |
| 5263 | ST1 | Obj | Reduce congestion in an imaginative way, such as by banning car ownership. | |
| 5264 | ST1 | Obj | Congestion around the site needs to be reduced. | |
| 5380 | ST1 | Obj | The Old Manor School grounds as part of ST1 needs to be formally and permanently retained as public open space for the recreational use of their communities. | |
| 5412 | ST1 | Obj | Acomb is already short on green space - development on Manor School playing fields reduces green space further. | |
| 8985 | ST1 | Obj | Concerned about provision of community facilities / social spaces - skate parks, playgrounds, community centres, places of worship. More housing means more air and noise pollution, impacts on public health and less open space. Mentions loss of the sugar beet site and has concerns about employment for those who will live in the new housing. | |
| 9773 | ST1 | Obj | The proposed site at British Sugar (and at the Civil Service Sports Ground ST2) will alone change the area totally and put excessive strain on local services and infrastructure. | |
| 12131 | ST1 | Obj | Road network already at capacity, development will exacerbate existing congestion. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 12535 | ST1 | Obj | Development will worsen congestion on the A1237. Recent upgrade to A1237 roundabout has not improved congestion. Development should be put on hold till the road is duelled. Recently adopted neighbourhood plan for Upper and Nether Poppleton has been ignored by council, questions why this is encouraged if not taken into account. | |
| 12640 | ST1 | Obj | Manor School/British Sugar - glad SINC area is for bees and wasps. Asks for this to be left alone. Asks to ensure retention of community open space | |
| 13003 | ST1 | Obj | Questions the availability of the British Sugar site as there are issues with land contamination which may not be addressed within the time span of the Local Plan | Rachael Maskell MP |
| 13238 | ST1 | Obj | Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237). | |
| 13301 | ST1 | Obj | Objects to the impact of development on the already congested A1237 ring road. | |
| 13323 | ST1 | obi | Object to the Manor School openspace being included in the development site boundary. Consider that openspace deficit in Acomb will be made worse through loss and loss is not justified through evidence base. Deficit in Acomb ward is compounded with this openspace lost. | Councillor |
| 13332 | ST1 | Obj | Feels the plan provides an ambitious number of houses for residents that the city will not be able to support. Borougbridge Road is already congested and is difficult for the residents. Disagrees with the number of employment opportunities stated as a way of justifying so many houses. Concerned as to why there is no mention of schools or GPs in the area to support proposed new residents. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13350 | ST1 | Obj | Transport provision should be a front and centre priority. It is a key enabler in delivering new social infrastructure. Note the impact of congestion from c.1200 new dwellings. Developers should not be allowed to look at each site in isolation in regard to the impact on local facilities and infrastructure. | |
| 13383 | ST1 | Obj | Lives near the site, understands current plans are for 1,100 houses and supports development of the brownfield site but with serious reservations about the new access road planned off Millfield Lane. The new road would cause the destruction of a natural border habitat that supports a range of wildlife. Asks why not use one or two of the existing roads. Understands the need for an access road from Boroughbridge Road. Also recognises that the Old Manor School building is likely to be built on but has concerns about the height, density and usage of any building on this area and wonders why it cannot be used as a school. Main objection to development of the site is the planned inclusion of the former Manor School playing field area (Old Acomb Park) into the ST1 Building Plan as the green space is used extensively by dog walkers, children playing football, cyclists and young families. There would be even more people use it if the site wasn't fenced off. As an already extensively used open green space, in an area with no other easily accessed provision, this green space meets the criteria for Policy HW 1 - Protecting Existing Facilities. Also stresses that most of the trees on the Manor School site are very old and vital to the health and well-being of the environment, the wildlife and the local and greater York community. Asks for confirmation that the trees on Poppleton Lane and Boroughbridge Road will be fully protected. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13386 | ST1 | Obj | The original plan stated there would be green space left on the manor school site and development of the school footprint only. Now the whole site is going to be developed. Acomb has some of the fewest green spaces of any ward in the city - we need a place for people to exercise, children to play and walk dogs. Realise there will be a plan to provide green space within the development but it does not create green space for the rest of the ward as developers invariably provide minimal amounts. Green space proposes health and wellbeing and there is opportunity here to provide community space for Acomb. | |
| 13389 | ST1 | Obj | Concerned over lack of space for recreational activities on manor playing fields. Acomb has insufficient open space. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13395 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Friends of Acomb Park is a new and growing organisation with more than 80 members. We are committed to the conservation and enhancement of Acomb Park, the ‘amenity green space’ on the site of the former Manor School’s Playing Fields, Boroughbridge Road, Acomb. OS maps dating back to the 19th and early 20th Century show that this site was a park long before it became the location for Manor School between 1965 and 2009. The age of the Sweet Chestnut trees along the southern boundary of the fields, adjacent to Boroughbridge Road, indicate that they date back to the original park. The Council’s own Green Space assessment which forms part of the evidence base for the draft Local Plan shows that the Manor School ‘amenity green space’ accounts for more than 50% of all amenity green space in Acomb. The original site boundary for Strategic Housing site 1 (shown in this draft local plan documentation as ‘909 PSC alternative boundary’) did not include the playing fields of the former manor school. We are calling on the Council to revise the draft local plan to revert back to this PSC boundary, enabling the playing fields to remain as amenity green space. Acomb has one of the largest, if not the largest, per-capita deficit of amenity green space in York, a petition submitted to the council in 2016 had 540 signatures asking for the park to be protected. All three elected representatives for Acomb (Cllrs Barnes, Myers and Rachael Maskell MP) wish to see the park retained as well. Preservation of the park is crucial for public health, community and well-being. Residents views must be respected.</p> | Friends of Acomb Park |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13397 | ST1 | Obj | Lives on Beckfield Lane and there is a shortage of open space locally for recreational activities. Boroughbridge Road is already congested and development will exacerbate this, previous ring road "improvements" have made matters worse causing traffic to back up along Beckfield Lane. Air quality will decline, impacting public health and increased traffic will make the road more dangerous for children going to Manor School. | |
| 13402 | ST1 | Obj | Acomb already has one of lowest proportions of public green space, despite the deceitful inclusion of non-public land, planned development sites and sites that are currently inaccessible in the published statistics. As a ward Acomb is also going to grow significantly with the British sugar site accommodating over 1000 houses. It seems therefore only sensible to put aside the Manor playing fields which were formerly known as Acomb Park to serve as a community asset and to preserve the trees around it. It is known that the council are delaying the prepared preservation order on these trees and this appears to be a cynical tactic to allow the destruction of these valuable community assets. From recent indications it appears that there will be no significant green space, affordable housing or community assets on the British Sugar site. York council has failed to address the increasing traffic problems, and lack of quality public transport and this is bad enough without destroying what we already have and further deteriorating the air quality from more homes and more cars. I therefore request that the council protect the trees as their age, rarity and status demands and preserve and re-open the small quantity of green space we have at the old Manor school fields. | |
| 13414 | ST1 | Obj | Green space is vital for the residents of Acomb. The plans to remove the green space by the Old Manor School would be detrimental to the residents on the east side of Acomb. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13415 | ST1 | Obj | The green area provided at Manor School should be preserved and used as a community asset. Concern that there isn't enough open space in Acomb at present. There should also be adequate parking as part of ST1 | |
| 13427 | ST1 | Obj | Concern about the loss of green space in this area of York that already has very little green space. The former Manor School playing fields should be kept green and opened up for public use. Increasing housing means an increase in cars and consequently air pollution so maintenance of green space is all the more essential. | |
| 13431 | ST1 | Obj | Objects to changing the local plan to include development on the playing fields. States there is a shortage of green space in Acomb and suggests that this space should be used to create a new park rather than a loss of green space. Requests improved public transport connections. | |
| 13436 | ST1 | Obj | The Manor field needs to be left alone for the community. There is no need to have an access road as there is an ideal entrance where the Sugar Beet lorries entered the site. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13438 | ST1 (Manor Sch | Obj | <p>Strongly object to the proposal to build on the old Manor School playing fields. CYC's own Open Space Study update (2017) shows Acomb ward has a deficit of all categories of open space (these stats include the current open space provision at Manor School). No local parks in the ward. There is local support (540 signature petition) for the playing fields to be designated as a park, for community use. Creating a local park on Manor School site is entirely consistent with the aims of CYC's Green Infrastructure Strategy. Before it was a school playing field, it was private parkland, so is uncontaminated. By contrast, British Sugar is highly contaminated, requiring extensive decontamination before it can be developed. It is misleading to bracket Manor School with British Sugar due to their history and development issues being totally different.</p> | |
| 13460 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Objects to Manor School and playing field and British Sugar playing field being included in the proposed site. With more housing being built locally the need for open spaces is greater than ever. Suggests that the old Manor School playing field is retained for recreational purposes, would also protect the mature trees on site, suggests building tennis courts as there are none that side of town.</p> | |
| 13462 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Roads are already inadequate so it is not feasible to add more traffic to the network. Congestion and related costs or delays and health effects of pollution are already major issues. Major investment in radial routes (especially A59) and ring road should be a priority.</p> | |
| 13470i | ST1 | Obj | <p>Concern over the loss of green space. The former Manor School playing fields should be opened and maintained for public use. Green space contributes to clean air. More dense housing means a greater density of cars and more air pollution.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13484 | ST1 | Obj | Old Manor School playing field must be kept as an open space. Support the idea of Acomb park, keeping this area green and making it into public parkland. There is no other open space in the Boroughbridge road area. Would generally like to see more provisions for cyclists. | |
| 13485 | ST1 | Obj | Respondee is a keen fitness advocate and runs fitness classes on a weekly basis, already struggle to find suitable areas to conduct their classes. Often use the old Manor site for exercise and would like the open green space to be retained with outdoor gym equipment built to encourage activity. York has very little outdoor gym equipment compared to other cities, retaining green space and providing this equipment will improve many peoples' quality of life and save the NHS money by reducing obesity rates. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13494 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Concerned that ST1 proposals have not been properly thought through. Concern over the additional vehicles (1000+) that will need to exit onto Boroughbridge Road and Millfield Lane. These roads already suffer from congestion and the extra vehicles will exacerbate the problem. The proposed access road through the old Manor School playing fields will create further traffic problems and a hazard for school children, it will also further reduce the green space in Acomb/Westfield Ward. The access road will also mean the removal of mature trees, which is not satisfactory from an environmental point of view. The additional homes will mean more children and they will have no additional open space/recreational areas. No additional provision for nurseries, infant or junior schools. to handle the increase in population. Concern that the Local Plan Evidence Base Study Open Space and Green Infrastructure proposals fail to take into account the reduction in the availability of green space in Acomb area if development on the old Manor School playing fields go ahead (ST1). The evidence base study clearly states that Acomb is severely deficient in green space and this already includes the old Manor School Playing Fields as green space. If they are built on it further reduces the deficient green space for Acomb residents to use.</p> | |
| 13497 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Proposals for development are for an access road and housing over an old sports field which is one of few green spaces left in Acomb Ward, a place with a deficit of green spaces. Also concerned with traffic increase on an already congested Boroughbridge Road, which is dangerous for children walking to the New Manor School.</p> | |
| 13500 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Objects to loss of green space old Manor school site for housing. Currently hugely benefits locals, there is little green space in Acomb and this has impacted the area with increasing traffic congestion.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13501 | ST1 | Obj | Objects to lack of protection for green spaces. Manor House playing fields were regularly used until the council chained the gates. Lacks reasoning to build on this existing green space when there is brownfield sites nearby. | |
| 13518 | ST1 | Obj | Strongly oppose building on the site of the old Manor School, this site represents over 50% of local green field space that is left. If it must be developed then it should be turned into a park for all ages. Boroughbridge Road is often bumper to bumper and the proposed number of houses will exacerbate this, the current situation is already dangerous as children walk to and from Manor school each day. Fears York will cease to be a desirable place to live if green open space across the city continues being built on. | |
| 13538 | ST1 | Obj | Whatever the number of dwellings and businesses, this will result in a rise in pollution and increased traffic levels. Keeping the former Manor School Playing Fields as green space will offset the pollution from traffic. It is a vital community place to enjoy, exercise, dog walking, children playing etc. Urge CYC not to build on this vital open space. Where else is there in the area for local people to enjoy? | |
| 13547 | ST1 | Obj | Objects as the A59 is congested, Poppleton roundabout is a huge bottle neck. Houses will worsen issue. Health issues will arise from pollution. Major road improvements should take place before housing developments. Objects to building on green space as little in area, and supports the health and wellbeing of the area. Concerned for the mature trees along the perimeter of Manor School field, as small fine for removing protected trees does not deter developers. Removing them is detrimental to air quality which is already poor in York. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13554 | ST1 | Obj | Object to the proposal to build on Acomb Park (Manor School playing fields) This should be kept for community use. There is a need for open space in this area. Concern over the loss of trees on the site. Concern over the increase in traffic pollution on Boroughbridge Road. | |
| 13566 | ST1 | Obj | Objects to development as Acomb already lacks green space to enable recreational activities, it is important for the community, health and well-being. The alternative is kids hanging around on street corners. | |
| 13579 | ST1 | Obj | Very concerned by the prospect of building over the former Acomb Park being built on, open green space is important for air quality and recreation. The green spaces in and around Boroughbridge Road, the Carr estate and Beckfield Lane provide a minimum amount of green space currently, building on them would be unacceptable. There has been conflicting information regarding access in / out of the former Manor School site onto Boroughbridge Road (A59). The local plan suggests building up to 100 houses and for good reason or possibly in error fails to mention that planning permission has already been granted to British Sugar for the road access (summer 2017). Disappointed that the tree preservation order for the 100+ year old trees that flank the site has yet to be signed. Would like to see the green space remain beyond the treeline apart from the access road and the old manor school building being redeveloped. Believe that the number of houses being proposed is sufficient in that area given that there are also houses being built on the former Civil Service Sports Ground nearby. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13583 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Overall plan for the city is imbalanced, too much development on the western side of the city. Number of houses proposed is too high, local infrastructure will not be able to cope, mentions doctors, hospital and dentists being at or beyond capacity. Investment must be made to accommodate new residents. Site should have its own healthcare facilities. Public transport in the area is infrequent and unreliable. Severe lack of local green spaces, if development goes ahead these must be provided on site. Asks where jobs are going to come from. Says more houses should be built in the less densely populated areas surrounding the city i.e. Nun Monkton & Rufforth and other semi-rural commuter belts such as Wetherby, Knaresborough, Boroughbridge and Harrogate. Acomb already lacks green space, the park should not be built on. Manor School fields account for over 50% of the amenity green space in the ward and need protecting from development. Mentions the importance of recreation and health benefits for residents. Also mentions sweet chestnut trees on site that date back to the 1800s, they are rare for York and need a Tree Protection Order.</p> | |
| 13586 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Appreciates the need to build housing but feels too many houses are being proposed for an area that already struggles with poor infrastructure, mentions congestion on the roads in particular. Strongly opposed to building on the old school fields as they are of great value to the community, losing them will be detrimental to the area (which is already short of green space) and the city.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13616 | ST1 | Obj | <p>As a long standing resident local to ST1 , object strongly to the proposed housing on the3 Manor School site for the following reasons; loss of green open space, loss of sporting amenity, loss of social facilities, loss of public open spaces (already below acceptable standards), number of sporting and social facilities (already below acceptable standards). Locals have already embraced large numbers of new houses in the immediate vicinity. Manor School playing field should be allocated as a strategic green space. Manor School should be treated as a separate planning issue. Pollution and congestion on Boroughbridge Road/Beckfield Lane will be unacceptable. Adding housing to what was to be an access road at Manor School is cynical. Given the very close proximity of the remaining access roads to British Sugar site (Midfield Lane) to the proposed new access road through the Minor School site - believe the access issues should be revisited.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13617 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Object to parts of ST1 (but support the retention of open space on open spaces map page 15 of main document). Note the separation of the Former Manor School site from the British Sugar site. Object to inclusion of the whole of the Former Manor School site for housing. There is a major shortfall of open space in Acomb at present and Manor School provides a highly significant proportion of this. This land has been used by local people for over 50 years and should continue to be used as such. The area to the south and east of the proposed access road should remain as open space and trees adj to Boroughbridge Road retained (similar to ST2). The British Sugar site former sports field should remain as open space and form a green corridor. Object to ST1 due to the increase in traffic that will ensue as a result of this development. The 2016 traffic modelling around the A59 did not agree with our experience - believe that your model is seriously underestimating traffic flows. Don't believe sustainable routes for travel will discourage car use. A rail link may help a little. Commuter to West Yorkshire will buy many of the proposed houses but only if the A1237 is duelled. Also Poppleton Road is a mile from the site, please change the reference to read Boroughbridge Road!</p> | |
| NDM4 | ST1 | Obj | <p>Irrespective of policy HW2, concerned as to whether there would be adequate provision for schools, doctors surgeries, green open spaces and play areas within the development. The Old Sugarbeet factory site is a case in point where there is a conflict between the developer and those representing the community on these provisions. It is questionable whether the road infrastructure is capable of coping with increased traffic, particularly the traffic travelling along Poppleton Road where the road is very narrow and where parents and children attend the local school.</p> | |
| 434 | SS6 | Supp | <p>Support in principle the identification of the site as part of site ST1 for housing led redevelopment to deliver approximately 1,200 dwellings. P</p> | <p>Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13305 | ST1 | Supp | Supporting these sites as they are accessible to city without needing a car. More development should include measures to discourage cars into centre. | |
| 13323 | ST1 | supp | Support principle of residential development on ST1 site. | Councillor |
| 13386 | ST1 | Supp | Fully in favour of the need for additional housing and building on the former British Sugar site is a great idea. | |
| 13438 | ST1 (British Sugar part of site) | Supp | Housing on British Sugar is supported, especially if it is imaginatively designed, with a range of housing including social housing and suggested improvements to infrastructure inc the possibility of a railway station and new radial road. A cycle / footbridge over the railway and Ouse would also bring benefits. Open space could also be provided to help meet existing deficits. The existing nature reserve on the site needs to be protected. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS7: Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2) | | | | |
| 71 | ST2 | Comm | Policy only stipulates mixed housing, however in policy SS18 there is a clear indication of the need for affordable housing addressing needs for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. This should be noted for this site too. Development of this site will increase the use of the local amenities within Poppleton and the City. A buffer zone should be established between the site and Manor Academy as set out in the Poppleton NP. There are significant trees, hedgerows and shrubs within and surrounding the site. The external hedge boundary acts as a buffer and should be retained. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 78 | ST2 | Comm | Policy only stipulates mixed housing, however in policy SS18 there is a clear indication of the need for affordable housing addressing needs for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. This should be noted for this site too. Development of this site will increase the use of the local amenities within Poppleton and the City. A buffer zone should be established between the site and Manor Academy as set out in the Poppleton NP. There are significant trees, hedgerows and shrubs within and surrounding the site. The external hedge boundary acts as a buffer and should be retained. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 1466 | ST2 | Comm | Millfield Lane [Level] Crossing continues to be a high risk crossing which is likely to see the number of trains increased in the short to medium term. Transport Assessments should assess likely vehicular and pedestrian movements over the crossing where the number of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements require improvements to the level crossing. | Network Rail |
| 13230 | ST2 | Comm | States that building new homes is necessary but infrastructure such as roads, schools, shops and parking need to be considered. | |
| 13455 | ST2 | Comm | Ok, with development but needs houses to be affordable at £100K mark. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13628 | ST2 | Comm | <p>Policy only stipulates mixed housing, however in policy SS18 there is a clear indication of the need for affordable housing addressing needs for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. This should be noted for this site too. Development of this site will increase the use of the local amenities within Poppleton and the City. A buffer zone should be established between the site and Manor Academy as set out in the Poppleton NP. There are significant trees, hedgerows and shrubs within and surrounding the site. The external hedge boundary acts as a buffer and should be retained.</p> | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| NDM 4 | ST2 | Comm | <p>Concerned whether there is provision for schools, doctors, open spaces and play areas for development. Road infrastructure may not cope with traffic increase, children walk down to school.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 71 | ST2 | Obj | <p>ST2 was taken out of the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan by the examiner as the land was in the general extent of the green belt. It is a large greenfield site and is grade 2 agricultural land. The former playing fields should be recommissioned as a resource for the large number of residents that have lost facilities by playing fields becoming housing estates. The presence of Grade 2 agricultural land is missing from the policy explanation. The Examiner for the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan stated that this land was in the general extent of the Green Belt and therefore could not be allocated in the NP. He stated that the site should be assessed through the Local Plan process. This land is the last significant break in the landscape between the urban area of York and the villages of Upper and Nether Poppleton. Ironic that the Local Plan promotes healthy living but does not reinstate the playing pitches that were in place for 40 years on this site. Expansion of leisure and sporting facilities for Manor Academy should be considered for this site. Millfield Lane should not be used as access to the site. Vehicles would have to cross the level crossing. Increased traffic past the school will increase problems for local bus service. Site acts as part of a green corridor and should only be used as a last resort for housing. Clear priority of the local plan should be to develop in many areas of the city. The increase on an already partial road of potentially 3500 cars is not welcomed by residents. Commenting on the availability of the Park and Ride as an alternative to car usage is not accurate as the services do not run after 7pm. Manor Academy is already at capacity. Local Plan does not provide for new primary school on British Sugar site or this site.</p> | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 78 | ST2 | Obj | <p>ST2 was taken out of the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan by the examiner as the land was in the general extent of the green belt. It is a large greenfield site and is grade 2 agricultural land. The former playing fields should be recommissioned as a resource for the large number of residents that have lost facilities by playing fields becoming housing estates. The presence of Grade 2 agricultural land is missing from the policy explanation. The Examiner for the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan stated that this land was in the general extent of the Green Belt and therefore could not be allocated in the NP. He stated that the site should be assessed through the Local Plan process. This land is the last significant break in the landscape between the urban area of York and the villages of Upper and Nether Poppleton. Ironic that the Local Plan promotes healthy living but does not reinstate the playing pitches that were in place for 40 years on this site. Expansion of leisure and sporting facilities for Manor Academy should be considered for this site. Millfield Lane should not be used as access to the site. Vehicles would have to cross the level crossing. Increased traffic past the school will increase problems for local bus service. Site acts as part of a green corridor and should only be used as a last resort for housing. Clear priority of the local plan should be to develop in many areas of the city. The increase on an already partial road of potentially 3500 cars is not welcomed by residents. Commenting on the availability of the Park and Ride as an alternative to car usage is not accurate as the services do not run after 7pm. Manor Academy is already at capacity. Local Plan does not provide for new primary school on British Sugar site or this site.</p> | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 192 | ST2 | Obj | Object to ST2 being allocated for residential development. It should be retained to provide recreational/sports facilities for the acknowledged shortfall of sports provision in this part of York or it should be used for the need of education expansion required from ST1. Noted that health facilities would also be needed. Identifies an existing deficiency in highways infrastructure as stated in the SA. Concern that even with the proposed highway improvements on A59 and A1237 congestion will still occur. Object to the loss of Green Belt. It has important Green Belt functions. | |
| 262 | SS7 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 386 | ST2 | Obj | Very concerned by the cumulative impact on congestion this development will have in conjunction with the British Sugar site (ST2). | York Green Party |
| 706 | ST2 | Obj | Main objection due to extra traffic onto already congested A59 and S1237. Concerned about closure of recycling centre as people have to travel to James St which causes more congestion. | |
| 3966 | ST2 | Obj | Concerned about impact on local infrastructure as the roads are already congested, access to schools and doctors is poor, the site is very close to the former sugar beet site (ST1) and will have a cumulative impact. All will require significant investment. Suggests ST1 is developed first in order to assess the impact it has on infrastructure, then the brownfield parts of the Civil Service Sports Ground could be used for an elderly peoples home or retirement complex as this would have less impact on the roads and schools. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4437 | ST2 | Obj | Objecting to the number of proposed houses at ST2 (in addition to the large number of houses on ST1) due to the fact the two sites are so close to one another and the vehicles from, and servicing both sites will affect an already local road system struggling to cope now. | |
| 9773 | ST2 | Obj | The proposed site at the Civil Service Sports Ground (and at British Sugar ST1) will alone change the area totally and put excessive strain on local services and infrastructure. | |
| 10450 | ST2 | Obj | Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan 2016-36 identifies three areas for residential use: H1 Former British Sugar, H2 Land at Longridge Lane and H3 Land at Balirgrowrie. The ST2 Civil Service Sports Ground is within the green belt and should not be developed. Grade 2 agricultural land south of Manor School and adjacent to Millfield Lane should only be allocated for residential use after all brown field land has been used. The Local plan refers to this grade 2 agricultural land as 'Rough Grazing Land' this is incorrect and has previously been pointed out to planners and correctly designated in the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan. This valuable agricultural and should be preserved, development would only add to existing traffic around Manor School, Poppleton villages and the un-manned railway crossing. Millfield Lane is a corridor for school children, adjacent agricultural land with mature hedgerows must not be developed for residential use. | |
| 12131 | ST2 | Obj | Road network already at capacity, development will exacerbate existing congestion. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12535 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Claimed that the land bordering Millfield Lane is rough grazing land, however it is premium quality agricultural land. Development will also worsen congestion on surrounding roads and A1237, which should be duelled prior to development. Recently adopted neighbourhood plan for Upper and Nether Poppleton has been ignored by council, questions why this is encouraged if not taken into account.</p> | |
| 13238 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237).</p> | |
| 13332 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Feels the plan provides an ambitious number of houses for residents that the city will not be able to support. Borougbridge Road is already congested and is difficult for the residents. Disagrees with the number of employment opportunities stated as a way of justifying so many houses. Concerned as to why there is no mention of schools or GPs in the area to support proposed new residents.</p> | |
| 13350 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Transport provision should be a front and centre priority. It is a key enabler in delivering new social infrastructure. Note the cumulative impact with ST1. Developers should not be allowed to look at each site in isolation in regard to the impact on local facilities and infrastructure.</p> | |
| 13462 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Roads are already inadequate so it is not feasible to add more traffic to the network. Congestion and related costs or delays and health effects of pollution are already major issues. Major investment in radial routes (especially A59) and ring road should be a priority.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13579 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Asks whether a combined impact assessment has been carried out for this site given its proximity to ST1 and the fact that it has minimal parking / traffic movement on and off site. Treating the two sites (ST1 & ST2) as separate because they happen to fall in different planning wards is not acceptable, the separation makes no difference in practice for residents. Public transport seems ineffective at reducing congestion here, asks if a parallel route along the railway or reconfiguration of the Harrogate-York line being used for metro type tram system instead of heavy rolling stock has been considered.</p> | |
| 13583 | ST2 | Obj | <p>Overall plan for the city is imbalanced, too much development on the western side of the city. Number of houses proposed is too high, local infrastructure will not be able to cope, mentions doctors, hospital and dentists being at or beyond capacity. Investment must be made to accommodate new residents. Site should have its own healthcare facilities. Public transport in the area is infrequent and unreliable. Severe lack of local green spaces, if development goes ahead these must be provided on site. Asks where jobs are going to come from. Says more houses should be built in the less densely populated areas surrounding the city i.e. Nun Monkton & Rufforth and other semi-rural commuter belts such as Wetherby, Knaresborough, Boroughbridge and Harrogate.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13628 | ST2 | Obj | <p>ST2 was taken out of the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan by the examiner as the land was in the general extent of the green belt. It is a large greenfield site and is grade 2 agricultural land. The former playing fields should be recommissioned as a resource for the large number of residents that have lost facilities by playing fields becoming housing estates. The presence of Grade 2 agricultural land is missing from the policy explanation. The Examiner for the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan stated that this land was in the general extent of the Green Belt and therefore could not be allocated in the NP. He stated that the site should be assessed through the Local Plan process. This land is the last significant break in the landscape between the urban area of York and the villages of Upper and Nether Poppleton. Ironic that the Local Plan promotes healthy living but does not reinstate the playing pitches that were in place for 40 years on this site. Expansion of leisure and sporting facilities for Manor Academy should be considered for this site. Millfield Lane should not be used as access to the site. Vehicles would have to cross the level crossing. Increased traffic past the school will increase problems for local bus service. Site acts as part of a green corridor and should only be used as a last resort for housing. Clear priority of the local plan should be to develop in many areas of the city. The increase on an already partial road of potentially 3500 cars is not welcomed by residents. Commenting on the availability of the Park and Ride as an alternative to car usage is not accurate as the services do not run after 7pm. Manor Academy is already at capacity. Local Plan does not provide for new primary school on British Sugar site or this site.</p> | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13547i | ST2 | Obj | Objects as the A59 is congested, Poppleton roundabout is a huge bottle neck. Houses will worsen issue. Health issues will arise from pollution. Major road improvements should take place before housing developments. Proposed development will impact traffic on already congested roads, which will worsen pollution and therefore health. | |
| NDM4 | ST2 | Obj | Irrespective of policy HW2, concerned as to whether there would be adequate provision for schools, doctors surgeries, green open spaces and play areas within the development. It is questionable whether the road infrastructure is capable of coping with increased traffic, particularly the traffic travelling along Poppleton Road where the road is very narrow and where parents and children attend the local school. | |
| 238 | ST2 | Supp | Noting that the development of the southern part of the site would harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City, we welcome the criterion that development should be set back from the A59 frontage and retain the mature trees in order to preserve the perception of openness. | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 452 | ST2 | Supp | <p>The site should be referred to as "the former" Civil Service Sports Ground. There are no environmental impediments to the site's delivery, this has also been evident by the submission of a planning application for the development of the site by Miller Homes in December 2014, as updated and amended in March 2017. The site was also allocated for development in the Submission Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan with the support of the Neighbourhood Plan Group and Parish Council. 1) the site should be referred to as the former Civil Service Sports Ground and Adjoining Land. 2) New open space can be made within the scheme however off site contributions towards formal sports provision is proposed in order to make effective use of the site and efficiently support other sports sites nearby, Indeed, discussions have progressed with Manor School about this development supporting their proposals for additional sports pitches and recreation facilities on land to the north-west of the school through an off site contribution. 3) Mention is made of the need to cater for additional school capacity as a result of the development and this can be adjudged relative to capacity within existing schools at the time of determination of a planning application. 4) The capacity of the site is suggested as approximately 266 and this is reflective of the current planning application. 5) Access is possible to both Millfield Lane and Boroughbridge Road however there is a strong desire not to create a through route for motor vehicles. 6) The estimated phasing for this site should see its immediate delivery and contribute to the first five years of the plan.</p> | Planning Prospects Ltd |
| 13305 | ST2 | Supp | <p>Supporting these sites as they are accessible to city without needing a car. More development should include measures to discourage cars into centre.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS8: Land adj Hull Road (ST4) | | | | |
| 554iii | ST4 | Comm | The policy states that dwelling site capacity is 211 units. It is considered that the site has capacity for about 240 houses. The council's standard site viability pro-forma has been completed based on the site providing 211 units in accordance with the policy and one with the preferred unit numbers. | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |
| 10055 | ST4 | Comm | Tentative support. It is important to note the principles behind the University of York's Heslington East development where the masterplan catered for a 'buffer zone' between the campus and the Badger Hill estate. Unfortunately this buffer zone has recently been eroded by the retail development on the Heslington East campus. Therefore, any development of the ST4 site should aim to maintain a strong green corridor between development and existing housing. Not only does this mitigate against the visual and noise impact, it also ensures that a main arterial route into the city of York from the east continues to have some form of green wedge. Unfortunately Hull Road hasn't had the same green wedge protection that other arterial roads have had, but it would be a good principle to protect what remains. In particular the ST4 site has a triangular wedge, bordered by Field Lane to the west and Hull Road to the north. Perhaps this could be designated as a required green space? This avoids build-up around a busy roundabout and maintains the green buffer zone currently enjoyed by the north-east corner of the Badger Hill estate. Hull Road is busy at all times and any entrance to and from the ST4 site is likely to have a heavy impact on existing traffic. Field Lane traffic will also need re-assessment as anecdotal evidence says that car speed and volume along this route is rapidly increasing. | Hull Road Ward Councillor |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12129 | ST4 | Comm | The proposed Residential site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. | Amec Foster wheeler on behalf of National Grid |
| 12959 | ST4 | Comm | Field Lane is already busy and gets congested at peak times. It would seem better to have access to the settlement via the P&R. This might also mean people would use their cars less for short journeys. | |
| 13211 | ST4 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. HV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 4 | SS8 | Obj | Add a paragraph identical to Policy SS4 development principle (xii) | Highways England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 62 | ST4 | Obj | <p>FPC considers this proposal should be deleted. It is a further example of the type of incremental urbanisation of the south-eastern quadrant of the City which the CoYC seems to be promoting. This site was once part of a much larger area of open land and Green Belt which extended from Hull Road to the A64 and beyond. The University East Campus was allowed to be developed in this area as an exception to Green Belt policy because of its national and regional importance. Despite this, the presence of the University is now being used to justify further development of open land in this area including ST4 and ST27, ignoring that these locations were shown as protected buffer areas by the Heslington East Masterplan when it was approved by the Secretary of State in 2006. Such an approach discredits planning in general. FPC considers the site of ST4 should be kept permanently open. It forms part of a wider buffer of open land between the Heslington East Campus and Hull Road, including large areas of woodland planting. Its loss as open land would significantly damage the performance of this wider buffer. In particular, the site forms part of Kimberlow Hill (York Moraine) which is a very important landscape feature and is of significance in the history of York. There are important views over the City from the hill, including of the Minster, which would be lost or severely damaged by its development for housing.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |
| 91 | ST4 | Obj | <p>ii. This site crosses an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Esrick. As such would appreciate maintaining a green way over Kimberlow Hill, rather than a path along the edge of a carriage way. Kimberlow Hill should be left as green open space in a manner similar to Batchelor Hill in Acomb.</p> | York Ramblers |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 262 | SS8 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 670 | ST4 | Obj | Understand the need for new housing but do not think the site is suitable for 211 houses. The fields form part of the landscape setting that was required for the new campus planning agreement in order to protect the character and setting of the city and surrounding area. | |
| 4713 | ST4 | Obj | As he said in a previous incarnation of this plan if homes are built half way up Kimberlow Hill the residents cats will play havoc with wildlife / ground nesting birds. | |
| 5677 | ST4 | Obj | Not enough information on transport links to A64 and B1228, could impact countryside, runway should be remain rather than be split in 2, site should be moved further north. | |
| 13003 | ST4 | Obj | More green space should be made available at the site off Hull Road | Rachael Maskell MP |
| 13255 | ST4 | Obj | New developments will put pressure on overburdened infrastructure. | |
| 13464 | ST4 | Obj | Objects to developments. | |
| 238 | ST4 | Supp | Support for the principle of development in this location, although preference given to use of the site as an allocation to meet the future needs of the University of York, thereby enabling a reduction in ST27 to a scale less likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. As the site would be visible from Hull Road and across the University campus to the south we welcome the inclusion of the development principle relating to the need to protect important views and that the site is designed appropriately in relation to its gradient. | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 554iii | ST4 | Supp | Support the allocation of this residential development. | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |
| 2642 | ST4 | Supp | This development will supply much needed housing in this area. It is ideally placed for public transport and local amenities. A new health centre and shops are close by. Open space near by. | |
| 5671 | ST4 | Supp | A block of land connected to existing infrastructure. Trees should be planted/retained to provide good shielding and enhance the approach road into the City. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS9: Land east of Metcalfe Lane (ST7) | | | | |
| 4 | SS9 | Comm | Notes that the second sentence in key principle (v) states that the cumulative impact of sites should be addressed. However, it does not indicate how this should be done. A development of this scale may require capacity enhancement on the highway network, particularly if the cumulative impact with other sites in the area is considered. Para. 3.45 provides the necessary reference to a transport Assessment which should address the impact of the development on the Hopgrove roundabout and Grimston Bar junctions on the A64. | Highways England |
| 45i | ST7 | Comm | This isolated site is too small to provide a sustainable settlement 'garden village' as it is bisected by the green corridor to be developed on Bad Bargain Lane. Recommends size of development is increased so it can become a stand-alone community. | YEF |
| 69 | ST7 | Comm | The Parish Council are concerned about the impact on Murton in terms of the relationship between the City and Murton Village. The gap of 750m is not a 'reasonable gap'; this should be significantly increased. The results of a recent survey undertaken for the Murton Neighbourhood Plan concludes that 95% of respondents were concerned about the traffic through the Parish. The proposed development will mean an increase of traffic through Murton. The existing public transport serving the area is inadequate. | Murton Parish Council |
| 100 | ST7 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | York Georgian Society |
| 372 | ST7 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | Conservation Areas Advisory Panel |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 386 | ST7 | Comm | 3.43 mentions 'The northern boundary runs along Tang Hall Beck for the most part' and yet there is no mention of the importance of flood mitigation measures in the site principles. This is for a very significant number of dwellings which could have a very serious impact on surface water drainage into the Beck, which could have impacts for large areas of the city. An additional principle to this effect should be added. | York Green Party |
| 456 | ST7 | Comm | 845 houses do not make a garden village. A new local centre will only work well in combination with thinking about transport to the city centre. The policy is too vague. Whilst the target of 15% trips to be undertaken using public transport is better than previous targets, it is still unclear how it will be achieved. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1675 | SS9 | Comm | <p>There are numerous policies in the Local Plan that may have financial implications for strategic sites ST7 and ST8 but information on whether or not they apply and to what extent is not outlined in the Plan. Need to engage with the Council on the matter of viability on a site specific basis. The Local Plan is unclear on the timing of strategic highway improvements and educational facility upgrades and to what level individual developments are expected to contribute. The PBA Report has undertaken a Viability Appraisal based upon a standard S106 cost of £3,300 per dwelling but no mention is made as to whether or not education and highways is included or excluded from this sum. Site ST7 will not be viable with the suggested CIL and to have the site specific; education, community facilities, public transport upgrades and wider strategic higher network upgrades sat outside the CIL as additional items. No issue with principles of restricting traffic flow through the site but the location of the site away fro Stockton Lane and Murton Lane makes the costs prohibitively expensive. In transport planning terms this is illogical and unsustainable. As drawn, the site does not lend itself to public transport links and upgrades being deliverable. Cycle and pedestrian links are easier and safer to achieve if the allocation is expanded or moved closer to the existing communities.</p> | Johnson Mowat representing Taylor Wimpey |
| 3245 | ST7 | Comm | <p>Major investment to local road network must be carried out before any building work is started. All local utilities will need to be increased to accommodate the development. Has a detailed diagram with own suggestions for alterations / additions to road network. Refer to original rep.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5826v | ST7 | Comm | The separation between this and ST8 make the suggestion that there could be shared education provision between the two sites unviable, there is no direct or safe route between the sites (ref policy ED6) or likely options for creation of one as the sites are on two different radial routes. Should not be described as a garden village, should be designated an "urban extension site" as separation from existing built up area is minimal. | |
| 12129 | ST7 | Comm | The proposed Residential site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. | Amec Foster wheeler on behalf of National Grid |
| 12249 | ST7 | Comm | Supports garden village, access should include separate cycle and footpaths. Should be attractively landscaped and not intrude onto greenbelt land. | |
| 13182 | ST7 | Comm | A series of individual letters promoting each site including ST7 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations. A copy of the representor's representations regarding site reference ST7, which were submitted to the Preferred Sites consultation are appended to this document. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13330 | ST7 | Comm | Hopes that the houses will be worthy neighbours to Derwenthorpe & will benefit from learning that has been done in the process of it's development. | |
| 13640 | SS9 | Comm | Provision of primary school in this location would be aided by early allocation of land. Would cooperate on this discussion. Should take into account requirements for new schools in location, size, characteristics, and land for expansion. Retaining a degree of flexibility about site specific requirements is necessary as schools vary over time with differing variables. Need for additional schools places at site. ESFA proposals for forward funding schools in large residential developments may be of interest to council. | ESFA |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4 | SS9 | Obj | The first sentence in key principle (v) needs to be modified to 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...' | Highways England |
| 91i | ST7 | Obj | Object to development due to the effect it will have on the green belt, traffic on the proposed roads will cause problems for users of the Bard Bargain Lane bridleway. Comments on p45 under vi and vii seem to conflict. Very difficult to read the base map on computer and scarcely easier on printed version. 15% public transport seems overly optimistic when comparing Ashley Park, Derwenthorpe and Osbaldwick. Appreciate a 50m buffer along Bad Bargain Lane but note no provision is suggested for people accessing by foot, cycle or horseback. Link paths are just as important as promoted paths. At present the bridle road past the caravan site is very pleasant most of the time, a similar buffer would be appreciated rather than alongside a carriageway or gardens. The path itself forms part of an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Escrick. | York Ramblers |
| 238 | ST7 | Obj | The allocation will harm a number of key elements identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as being of importance to the special character and setting of the City: would reduce the gap between the A56 and the edge of the built up area to just 575 m at its narrowest point, impacting on key views and a large encroachment into open countryside; a new settlement so close to the existing urban edge would appear out of keeping with York's historic pattern of development, harming this element of its character. Development should be pulled away from the ring road - the most appropriate approach may be for some limited development on the eastern edge of the City, of a scale which does not harm the scale or compact nature of the City. | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 262 | SS9 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 554iii | ST7 | Obj | Alternative boundary proposed. It is proposed that the boundaries of ST7 should revert to the development boundaries put forward by the Council in its Publication Draft Proposals Plan Consultation Draft October 2014 Local Plan for the northern part of ST7. The proposed western boundary would sit 70-250m from the existing urban edge. Concern that this buffer area would become ill-managed and overgrown. There should only be a gap if there is a technical reason. Northern boundary is 170m south of Stockton Lane, divorcing a development from its main road access introduces a number of problems. It would be more efficient to use the land fronting Stockton Lane, the allocation should be extended northwards. Eastern boundary - the 2014 Publication Draft boundary should be used. The old Foss Beck is a strong boundary. The 2017 Reg 18 boundary is 34.5ha and allow for an estimated 845 dwellings in the short -medium term. The proposed new boundaries would increase the site size to 43.8ha and 1,052 dwellings in the short - medium term. | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1675i | SS9 | obi | <p>Seek alterations to reflect the wider role the school will perform. Early engagement is sought to address the primary and secondary requirements; there may be viability issues associated with the developer building the school. There is also no location shown on the proposals map for a secondary school. There ay be viability issues associated with the developer building the school at their own cost. The current ST7 boundary creates a remote development served off highly costly access roads. It is divorced from the existing settlement making it more expensive to develop, restricts the viability of on-site facilities and makes walking and cycling trips less likely given the routes back into the existing community areas. The target of 846 dpa is significantly below what is sustainably achievable in the northern and southern sectors of land. Currently the scale of development makes facilities difficult to achieve. If numbers were increased, it would increase attractiveness and deliverability of facilities and infrastructure. Do not support the new green wedge to west as it serves no purpose and does not perform green belt functions. This area need to be designated to ensure that in the quality of the land and its use are maintained in the long-term. Object to the footpath requiring 50m wide buffer. It is considered that the masterplan can achieve green corridors through alternative sound advice.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Tayl |
| 1675 | SS9 | Obj | <p>Alternative ST7 boundary supported. An extension to the north towards Stockton Lane is supported. The alternative site size is 46.3 ha with direct access onto Stockton Lane. Circa 750 dwellings could be supported. Considered suitable, deliverable and viable. A Masterplanning document to support Land off Stockton Lane is attached setting out access principles, sustainability and integration, opportunities and constraints, green belt analysis and masterplan.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Tayl |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1751 | ST7 | Obj | Objects to the alternative boundary 876 proposed for ST7 as the proposed access road onto Murton way is unnecessary when the adopted Outgang Lane could be upgraded to provide access to the south. Would also improve employment opportunities. Constructing a new road onto Murton Lane would have a negative effect on the SSSI. All traffic will use this lane. The green wedge should not be reduced to green corridors and small spaces. Attached site plans illustrate how close proposed road is to conservation area. Alternative Stockton Lane to Bad Bargain Lane does have some merit and makes a strong case for good access with road frontage to Stockon Lane. 911 increases overall site size and reduces size of green wedge. | |
| 2416 | ST7 | Obj | The relative size of Site ST7 needs to be carefully considered. ST7 will need very careful integration with Derwenthorpe if it is not to overwhelm the present development and impinge too greatly on Osbaldwick Village. | |
| 2994 | ST7 | Obj | This allocation causes concerns for, inadequate access, busy roads, lack of infrastructure, lack of medical facilities, lack of schools and more. | |
| 5740i | ST7 | Obj | The proposals talk about exits onto Metcalfe Lane and or Stockton Lane, the main issue is not routes into the city centre but routes out of and around town. The only main route is via Hopgrove Lane which is unsuitable, the alternative via Westlands Grove is already the subject of concerns and potential closure to through traffic. Totally against the development if an exit via Stockton Lane is being considered without further mitigation measures. | |
| 9359 | ST7 | Obj | Objects to building houses on green belt land. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13030 | ST7 | Obj | Development at ST7 will result in encroachment into the rural landscape at the edge of York. It will have some impact on the rural setting of the town and on key views from the A64 towards the historic core. This allocations cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. The Plan is unsound as a result. | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |
| 13090i | ST7 | obi | ST7 alternative. A larger site boundary is proposed to deliver 975 homes (as per Officer recommendation in July 2017). This site would be a sub-urban garden village of 43.54 ha (70% developable area - 30.47 ha net). Site density would be 32 dph. Development to commence 2019/20 following planning permission. Build out rate of least 90 dwellings per annum with the potential to develop 120 dwellings per annum (3 outlets). 0.43 ha of land would be provided for a local centre and 10.31 ha provided for public openspace. Land for a primary school (0.59ha) and playing field (1.32ha) would be provided (1.91 ha total). The site would be by landscape-led masterplanning, including protection for millennium way and views of Minster. Three access points are proposed: north, south and bad bargain lane. Evidence base undertaken for the site states that there are no constraints that would preclude development. Evidence base referred to (not attached) includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site. | PBPlanning on behalf of TW Fields |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13182 | ST7 | Obj | The Council's decision to decline to accept the higher housing figure [of 953 dpa], and progress with a OAN of 867 dwellings per annum has an adverse impact the representor's Clients land interests, as three sites were to be either increased in capacity (ST7 – Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick and ST14 – North of Clifton Moor), or in the case of site reference SF10 (Riverside Gardens, Elvington), introduced as a new housing allocation, on the basis that the OAN was to be increased to 953 dwellings per annum have not been carried forward into the Pre-Publication version of the Plan. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13255 | ST7 | Obj | New developments will put pressure on overburdened infrastructure. | |
| 13291 | ST7 | Obj | Object to further encroachment on the countryside | |
| 13348 | ST7 | Obj | Objects to development of the site as the proposed access is wholly inadequate. Around half of the new residents will access Stockton Lane and increase the volume of traffic, as an elderly resident and cyclist this would make the journey to and from York very daunting. Also the area north of Tang Hall Beck and west of the proposed access route is rich in wildlife but has not received any designation. There is a copse in the south-west corner which is a habitat for Tawny Owls, Roe Deer and Red Foxes. The field supports a number of small mammals which are caught not only by the local cats and foxes but also by Barn Owls in the breeding season. The vegetation provides food for numerous invertebrates including many butterflies and moths, some of which are not widely distributed in the York area. | |
| 13553 | ST7 | Obj | Concerned about impact construction had on elderly residents of Meadlands, noise pollution caused stress. Traffic will be increased on narrow road at Bad Bargain Lane, Tang Hall Lane and surrounding roads. Would also provide a bridgehead within the green belt which may lead to further erosion and development, destroying an important area of green belt. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 554iii | ST7 | Supp | Support for the proposed allocation for housing. | Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd |
| 1675i | ST7 | supp | In general support of the allocation. Although support alternative boundary with amendments to policy. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor |
| 11266 | ST7 | Supp | Supports the principle of a garden village in this location. Conditions regarding access should be strengthened - access for construction must be solely over the 2 routes identified to serve the completed development (Stockton Lane/Murton Way). It should be made clear in the Plan that Bad Bargain Lane must not be used for construction traffic under any circumstances. | |
| 9432 | ST7 | Supp | Supports garden village development. Must be adapted in a way where they do not become extended suburbs and have good transport links. | |
| 13090i | ST7 | supp | Support the development of a garden village in this location. Technical evidence undertaken for a new village in this location does not present any constraints that would preclude development. The site is available, suitable and deliverable although amended boundaries are proposed. Evidence base referred to (not attached) includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site. | PBPlanning on behalf of TW Fields |
| 13182 | ST7 | Supp | The site was allocated within the Preferred Sites version of the Plan, but the Council was proposing to increase the capacity of the site. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13379 | ST7 | Supp | Excellent site for housing, supports development. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13624 | ST7 | Supp | <p>It appears more thought has gone into the planning of landscaping and blending into the surroundings with minimal disruption to existing properties nearby, it now looks like a natural extension the area. This is to be welcomed however the addition of a road linking the site onto Stockton Lane, even if only for use by public transport, would ease traffic flow in and out of the proposed routes and help residents to access the A64, A1237 and park and ride sites more easily.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS10: Land North of Monks Cross (ST8) | | | | |
| 45i | ST8 | Comm | Site is regarded as an urban extension. Green wedge to west could be narrowed and still give adequate separation from Huntington. Questions how open space will be managed. If agricultural, will not be accessible to public. The provision of OS8 will not be accessible to residents. | YEF |
| 67 | ST8 | Comm | The percentage of social housing at this site needs to be increased or stipulated, hopefully to 25% of the 30% for affordable housing. York needs to reflect, in each local area, the correct number of each type of dwelling, required for that area - particularly one and two bed properties. Asks if the Local Plan could designate a particular site in the green belt as a development for social housing, this would lower the value of the land enough for a housing association or the council to purchase it for the sole use of social housing. The road infrastructure for this development will need to be upgraded to cope with traffic exiting onto Monks Cross Link Road. Drainage and surface water will require special attention as most of Huntington has clay soil. Would prefer a medical facility or an Elderly Care Facility rather than a community centre, for any section 106 / CIL contribution, as Huntington has a high proportion of elderly residents. | Huntington Parish Council |
| 386 | ST8 | Comm | Principle iv) and the paragraph to begin 'Create a new green wedge' If this is needed, which it would seem it is, then it should be a clear part of the strategic plan. | York Green Party |
| 456 | ST8 | Comm | Fail to see how 'all transport issues' can be addressed when in the same paragraph it is stated that 'the site will exacerbate congestion in the area'. It is unclear how the target of 15% trips to be undertaken using public transport it will be achieved. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1676 | SS10 | Comm | <p>There are numerous policies in the Local Plan that may have financial implications for strategic sites ST7 and ST8 but information on whether or not they apply and to what extent is not outlined in the Plan. Need to engage with the Council on the matter of viability on a site specific basis. The Local Plan is unclear on the timing of strategic highway improvements and educational facility upgrades and to what level individual developments are expected to contribute. The PBA Report has undertaken a Viability Appraisal based upon a standard S106 cost of £3,300 per dwelling but no mention is made as to whether or not education and highways is included or excluded from this sum. Site ST8 will not be viable with the suggested CIL and to have the site specific; education, community facilities, public transport upgrades and wider strategic higher network upgrades sat outside the CIL as additional items.</p> | Johnson Mowat representing Redrow |
| 4429 | ST8 | Comm | <p>Will cause more congestion, road improvement needs to happen before more houses are built.</p> | |
| 5410ii | ST8 | Comm | <p>Good site for housing, should be increased to include land south of ring road (between Strensall Road and Monks Cross Link Road) to meet housing demand.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5826v | ST8 | Comm | <p>Traffic calming measures should not be used on Monks Cross Link Road. This road needs to be maintained as a high capacity part of the transport network and key access point from the Northern A1237 Ring Road into the commercial and leisure site at Monks Cross (including the future Community Stadium). Provision should be retained for the link road to be expanded for dual carriageway standard as a spur from the outer ring road aiding traffic to avoid the frequently congested junction with the A64 at the Hopgrove roundabout (ref policy T4).ST9 should be developed as a self-contained settlement with only one or two access roads entering from Link Road (i.e. No residences fronting onto Monks Cross Link Road) as well as limited access from North Lane to the north of the site and potentially from Monks Cross Drive to the south (the latter is well suited to pedestrian and cycle permeability).</p> | |
| 11128 | ST8 | Comm | <p>Housing development on this site should not happen without remodelling work on roundabout junctions on A1237 from Poppleton in the west to Monks Cross Link Road in the east. There is no dedicated bus service to this site either.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13103 | SS10 | Comm | <p>Consider 968 dwellings to be achievable subject to the primary school being located in green wedge, community facilities being associated with the school such that they do not take land that would be used for residential development, the proportion of public space being located on site is reflective of both community use of the school playing fields, and recognise the public informal recreation role provided by the nature reserve created east of the link road. With regard to housing mix on the site, do not agree with policy H3 - will commission a site specific housing market assessment. Points 2 and 3 re strategic landscape buffer could be merged. Agree with concept of protecting and enhancing biodiversity but policy could focus on protecting existing features and enhancing biodiversity in green wedge. Support principle of new open space but should be provided in green wedge. Site near Monks Cross so no lack of retail facilities. Community facilities should be focussed around the school in the green wedge. The size of the development would only generate the need for a single entry primary school - this needs to be stated in text. Accept that there should be no access from site to A1237. Policy needs to be clearer about the cumulative traffic impact and the implications for highways improvements, timings and costs. Site being master planned such that an internal loop will facilitate the hopper bus service to monks cross park and ride and beyond. Masterplan includes cycle links to wider area but the manner in which the site is detached form the urban area runs contrary to the aims of better integrating the site with existing nearby neighbourhoods.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13103 | ST8 | Comm | <p>Support the inclusion of ST8 as a strategic urban extension. Site is deliverable with national house builder on board to develop the site. Redrow own majority of site. Concerns with reduced scale of the allocation and wording of certain policies. Inconsistencies in relation to 'strategic green space' and 'new green wedge' immediately to west of ST8. Council confirmed intention for land to be designated as green belt. Do not consider that this land will perform green belt functions so should be identified as 'green wedge' not green belt. Masterplan being discussed with Council includes: open space, new access from Monks Cross Link Road with bus links to site, new primary school, appropriate landscaping, new playing fields and sports pitches. The masterplan identifies the primary school and playing fields in the green wedge to the west.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |
| 13211 | ST8 | Comm | <p>Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. HV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required.</p> | Northern Power Grid |
| 13408 | ST8 | comm. | <p>Unclear why the Council has not amended the boundary to take into consideration comments made by Historic England despite land being available with willing landowners.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13624 | ST8 | Comm | The addition of housing to an area that is largely commercial properties will add to traffic congestion, particularly at peak times. The site could be useful for employment at Monks Cross. | |
| 13641 | SS10 | Comm | Object to site as doesn't adjoin Huntingdon so is not an urban extension. More logical to provide extension rather than island of development. Alternative boundaries to the site have been submitted by developers who support ST8 but object to inclusion of land to west. Advises that a separate urban extension with a large buffer is not appropriate. Historic England have also noted that development would harm the rural setting and green wedges, which can be avoided through an alternative site. Separating the extension reduces the sites sustainability and connections. | ID Planning |
| 4 | SS10 | Obj | The first sentence in key principle (x) needs to be modified to 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...' The explanatory paragraphs contain no reference to the Transport Assessment needed to support this key principle. A site of this size, especially when considered with other large sites in the area, is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city, so there should be a reference to the need to agree traffic impact and mitigation measures with HE. | Highways England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST8 | Obj | <p>The allocation seems likely to harm a number of key elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City: development would reduce the gap between the ring road and the urban edge, impacting on the rural setting of the City. It would start to enclose the western edge of Monk Stray, one of the City's important green wedges; the open areas either side of Monks Cross Link Road, along with historic field patterns, contribute to the character of this area. Development would be poorly linked to existing residential areas. In order to reduce the site's impact, development should be pulled away from the ring road and the Monks Cross Link Road.</p> | Historic England |
| 262 | SS10 | Obj | <p>Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy.</p> | York Travellers Trust |
| 2994ii | ST8 | Obj | <p>This allocation causes concerns for increased traffic, poor access, lack of infrastructure, full medical facilities, lack of a community centre.</p> | |
| 3245i | ST8 | Obj | <p>This development will exacerbate the already heavily congested surrounding road network. Tampering with the nearby roundabouts on the outer ring road will not improve things.</p> | |
| 6596 | ST8 | Obj | <p>Local infrastructure cannot support development of this size (roads, schools, doctors etc.).</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 6709 | ST8 | Obj | States the site is not suitable for development as there is already congestion problems nearby, tailbacks through Huntington are bad for public health and roads dangerous for children. Other local services such as the doctors and schools are over-stretched. States there is a lot of local wildlife such as deers that would suffer as a result development and the field often floods. | |
| 7902 | ST8 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt; impact on overstretched services/amenities (drainage, schools, doctors); severe congestion on York Road/Wigginton Road, feeding onto severely congested A1237. Notes increase in travel times identified by transport plan. | |
| 12911 | ST8 | Obj | The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to support the type of development. Air pollution and health will decrease. Valuable Green Belt land will be lost and cannot be regained. Concern over traffic congestion, insufficient schools and health facilities. | |
| 13030 | ST8 | Obj | Site ST8 would introduce development to a section of the Monks Cross Link Road where at present housing is inconspicuous and the landscape dominated by agricultural fields. The development would be highly visible from a number of the approaches to York from the surrounding area. The proposed green wedge along the western boundary would result in a poor relationship between the new housing and existing settlement edge and could form a barrier to effective integration. This allocations cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. The Draft Local Plan is unsound as a result. | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13106 | ST8 | Obj | <p>Boundary change - suggested additional land to form part of ST8. Land to west of western site boundary, and south of North Lane. Land formed part of ST8 at Publication stage. Land does not perform green belt function. Expanded site should deliver c1400 homes, assisting in the provision of a primary school, provide for a more open 'green' design, assisting in delivering community facilities, assisting in providing c100 more affordable homes and delivering wider economic benefits that would flow from the addition of 400 more homes with a construction value of around £40m. The following objections relate to SS10 as drafted - defined housing mix has no regard to 'local demand' - will commission a site specific housing market assessment as advised; object to green wedge to west of site - fulfils no green belt purpose and would be difficult to manage/farm. If retained, should be designated 'green wedge' rather than green belt, which would allow wider range of uses; text should more clearly define need to protect existing features of ecological value and enhance biodiversity within specific areas of the site; open space provision should be partially accommodated in the western green wedge; make ref to adjacent employment/retail - further retail provision on site should not be prescribed by policy; amend text to clarify that the primary school would be the focus for wider community use, rather than a separate facility; viability issues re provision of school - to be discussed; cumulative traffic impacts - Council needs to be clearer on what is expected of this and other named developments, by way of highway improvements, timings and costs; re cycle links - this to be achieved via Monks Cross Link Road.</p> | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |
| 13255 | ST8 | Obj | New developments will put pressure on overburdened infrastructure. | |
| 13260 | ST8 | Obj | Too much development in this area already. Traffic to and from Monks Cross is extreme through Brockfield Park Drive - this development will make the situation worse. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13270 | ST8 | Obj | Existing road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of additional housing. Road between Strensall and A1237 is unsuitable for mixed traffic (cars/cyclists/buses). The Link Road cannot take nearly 1000 new homes at ST8. | |
| 13293 | ST8 | Obj | Objects to building in Monks Cross area due to size and loss of green areas. Roads already struggle with congestion. | |
| 13313 | ST8 | Obj | Development will worsen congestion on the A1237 ring road as will risk of flooding. Appropriate infrastructure should be put in place. | |
| 13322 | ST8 | Obj | While many houses are desperately needed in York, has consideration been given to the road network around the site? The road leaving Monks Cross, leading to the A1237, is gridlocked daily. Malton Road has suffered huge traffic increases since the expansion of Monks Cross/Vangarde. | |
| 13408 | ST8 | obi | Support for an alternative site boundary for ST8 that includes land to the north of North Lane, Huntington . Object to proposed site boundary as it does not adjoin Huntington and therefore does not result in a natural extension to the urban area. Unclear why a 'gap' has been left between Huntington and the site allocation; this is unnatural. Support the position put forward by objectors at the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) detailed in the SHLAA annexes that the boundary should be amended to make efficient use of the land currently identified in the gap. Current boundary at odds with the the plans vision to deliver sustainable pattern of development. Assume that ST8 as allocated would score worse than alternatives in Sustainability Appraisal due to gap to with Huntington. Do not accept conclusion of SA that this site is most appropriate option; consider alternative boundary incorporating land to the north and west more sustainable. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13418 | ST8 | Obj | Object to the large number of houses at ST8 next to the most congested road system in and out of the city. This will cause gridlock. | |
| 13499 | ST8 | Obj | Proposed buffer serves no obvious purpose and should be removed and the boundaries of ST8 extended, with consideration of the impact to the adjoining Huntington area. | |
| 13644 | ST8 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of likely traffic increase, and impact on road infrastructure. | |
| 1668ii | ST8 | Supp | Support the allocation. The development of BDW's land interest in the allocation ensures the provision of a deliverable & viable development, delivering the number of homes prescribed by CYC as a minimum, alongside each of CYC's proposed principles. It will provide the opportunity to help meet York's current & future housing needs. The historic and landscape character of this area will be preserved as key views across the site can be maintained & open space & landscaping will deliver permanent boundaries to the site. Separation distances between the site and surrounding areas will remain substantial through the provision of greenspace in order to ensure that the setting and character of this area of the City is respected. Support the potential use of land to the east of Monks Cross Link Road to deliver additional open space and ecological mitigation. This will enable the developers of the site to ensure that the Council's identified dwelling quantum can be delivered in full, whilst also providing a number of additional benefits to the area. Pedestrian & cycle connections will be provided, with connectivity to the existing settlement of Huntington and the retail/commercial area of Monks Cross. There are no technical or environmental (built or natural) constraints that would preclude the development of the site. | PB Planning obo Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes |
| 9784 | ST8 | Supp | Support for large development within the ring road | |
| 13106 | ST8 | Supp | Support for the principle of development. Note suggested boundary change to incorporate land to the northwest. | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13379 | ST8 | Supp | Excellent site for housing, supports development. | |
| 13408 | ST8 | supp | Support the principle of development at ST8. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS11: Land North of Haxby (ST9) | | | | |
| 4 | SS11 | comm. | The first sentence in key principle (ix) needs to be modified to 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...' Although the site is some way from the A64, its size, when considered with other large sites in the area, is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city, so there should be a reference to the need to agree traffic impact and mitigation measures with HE. It is likely that a development of this scale will require capacity enhancement on the highway network, particularly if the cumulative impacts of sites around the A1237 is considered. | Highways England |
| 841 | SS11 | Comm | Concerned due to existing traffic congestion caused by closure of barriers at 2 level crossings, and the interaction between traffic held at the barriers on York Road and the ring road. There is a proposal by Northern Rail to introduce a York-Scarborough service in addition to existing Transpennine one, when means doubling the number times the barriers lower, which should be considered. Supports opening Haxby rail station. | |
| 1355 | ST9 | Comm | The ST9 proposal would be a significant development for an area which feeds onto the Outer Ring Road, so he would expect air quality to be considered in terms of numbers and the impact on Haxby and Wigginton residents. | Julian Sturdy MP |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1528 | SS11 | Comm | <p>Key principle ii) requires the delivery of a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council’s most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy. The Developers fail to see the need for reference to the provision of smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing in the policy. Further, the Site will be developed over the whole of the plan period and housing needs may change over time. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment is a document which we would expect to be updated regularly and therefore will always reflect the housing needs of the District. Whereas the Local Plan is likely to remain unaltered for considerable period of time and therefore in respect of the housing need it could become out of date.</p> | <p>DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1528 | SS11 | Comm | <p>Policy G16 states that the identified areas of proposed new open space are indicative which we support. However, whilst policy G16 indicates that areas of proposed new open space are indicative the text to policy SS11 and the proposals map suggests otherwise. Key principle iii) and the proposals map still shows a single large area of strategic open space to the south of the Site. The Developers maintain their concern that such a specific locational requirement could prejudice the ability to provide for the other planning objectives mentioned in policy SS11 and a properly considered layout. The Developers feel that the open space to be provided on the Site should be determined through the master planning process, which they fully support, and which can determine the optimum location for such spaces. The Developers have tried to show how the policy's objectives of SS11 can be met through an masterplan. The Developers suggest key principle iii) should read 'the proposed development of the Site should lead to the creation of new on site open space to reflect the needs of the Haxby and Wigginton ward including formal pitch provisions, informal amenity greenspace, play provision and allotments; the location of which is to be determined through the preparation and submission of a masterplan and in liaison with the Council, Haxby Town Council and Wigginton Parish Council, the neighbourhood plan group and local residents.'</p> | <p>DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1528 | SS11 | Comm | <p>The Transport Assessment prepared on behalf of the Developers, previously submitted to the Council, does not suggest that the Usher Lane access should be only a secondary access. It confirms that a primary access is acceptable onto Usher Lane if improvements are made to the Usher Lane/Station Road junction. Therefore, with sufficient mitigation at the junction both the primary access and two secondary accesses proposed onto Usher Lane, as shown on the Masterplan, can be accommodated. Key principle x) suggests that the Proposed Development should seek to minimise the amount of trips using the Usher Lane/Station Road junction. There is no justification provided by the Council for this and it has been demonstrated that a primary access and two secondary access onto Usher Lane can be accommodated. Request that this reference is removed from the policy.</p> | <p>DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division</p> |
| 1528 | SS11 | Comm | <p>The Developers suggest that key principle viii) be deleted and key principle x) be amended to 'Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B1363 Wigginton Road with secondary access to Usher Lane to the East of the site. Improvements would be required both to the junction of Moor Lane with The Village and Usher Lane/Station Road to improve safety and visibility. The scheme should seek to minimise the amount of trips using the Usher Lane/Station Road junction due to existing capacity and safety issues unless it can be demonstrated that these capacity and safety issues can be mitigated or that unacceptable harm to this junction will not be caused as a result of the scheme.</p> | <p>DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 1528 | SS11 | Comm | The Developers are concerned with the inter relation of policy SS11 and G16 and how this might impact on the capacity of ST9. The Developers reserve the right to comment in more detail on this matter when the details of the Council's intentions are fully understood. The Developers have obtained a thorough knowledge of the technical issues relating to the development of ST9 through the commissioning of several technical reports. These reports informed the production of a masterplan to guide the development of the Site. It is considered that this process represents good planning practice. | DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division |
| 3606 | ST9 | Comm | Road and drainage infrastructure should be improved before development progresses. Plan for more schools, medical facilities and environmental concerns (habitats). Junction at Usher Lane and Station Road is already dangerously busy, must be resolved to accommodate housing increase. | |
| 5386 | ST9 | Comm | Should include affordable housing for starter/ smaller families, employment opportunities. Not to become a separate sub village but included. Concerned that some of development is under electric cables. Increased traffic may worsen air pollution, alternative modes of transport need to be introduced (station, bus, cycle routes). New road should be created to cope with traffic, and drainage systems dealt with before more development. School capacity is full. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5597 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Traffic and parking is already an issue in Haxby. Usher lane is unsafe as many houses have 2 cars and no off road parking, and York Road and Moor Lane cannot absorb more traffic. No houses should be built until ring road is duelled, roundabouts will not fix problem. Having a station in Haxby will not ease congestion as people will travel in and the crossing will be closed more often. Drains are inadequate and experience flooding, with sewage coming into houses in heavy rain. The health centre cannot cope with more patients and the schools are at full capacity.</p> | |
| 5805 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Accepts the need for more housing and sees the new plan as an improvement. Mainly concerned about impact on local infrastructure. Would support the possible link of ST9 by a road across the railway line to Towthorpe Road, this would help reduce congestion on Usher Park / Station Road junction. Car parking in Haxby is already difficult, stresses the need to find more spaces, control the length of stay and improve bicycle access as well as provide more bike racks. Mentions existing congestion on A1237 causing residents to take detours through residential areas, notes improvements are being made but is depressed by the prospect of increased journey times. Is concerned that the proposed Haxby train station would cause the number 14 bus route to be discontinued. Mentions that the level crossing gates would close more often and for longer which would have a knock on effect on journey time on the roads. Closes by saying they have not seen any mention of an off road cycleway from Haxby / Wigginton into the centre of York but this will be needed if number of journeys by bike are to be increased.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5826v | ST9 | Comm | <p>Suggestion that an additional site access could be made to the east (Towthorpe Road) seems undeliverable. Not only would this access road cut across open spaces, in conflict with maintaining the openness of the green belt in this location, it would require crossing the York to Scarborough railway line. As Network Rail policy is currently to remove level crossings wherever possible it is unlikely they would support addition of more in this vicinity (two already in Haxby at York Road and Station Road and a further two in Strensall) which would leave either an under or over bridge at significant cost. Assuming the connection was viable what proportion of traffic would take this route out of the settlement considering its circuitous nature - either back to Haxby via Station Road or on a winding route to Strensall Road.</p> | |
| 7883 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Refers to results of earlier consultation and stresses the importance of upgrading infrastructure (drainage, transport, ring road) before any new development. Says that the prospect of a train station for Haxby is talked about regularly but never comes to anything.</p> | |
| 9403 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Appreciates the need for housing but feels 735 homes will overwhelm current services / facilities - roads, schools and doctors. Asks how many homes will be affordable as this is the greatest need of all.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 11003 | ST9 | Comm | Support the provision of new housing in Haxby but this should not be built without improvements to infrastructure/upgrades as listed; water and waste upgrades, a new primary school, a new well staffed and equipped elderly/dementia care home, space for one/more convenience store and small commercial area to reduce traffic movement, a cycle lane into York from the development tied into a new P&R, extension to Haxby health centre, social housing and affordable/shared ownership housing (at least 30% of the development site), safeguarded extension to Haxby/Wigginton cemetery, new rail station, and improved bus service | |
| 12345 | ST9 | Comm | State that they are generally in favour of all proposals but Haxby / York need more affordable housing. Investment in supporting infrastructure is required - schools, doctors, roads and the train station in Haxby needs to happen. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12407 | ST9 | Comm | <p>A minimum of 30% affordable housing should be included. Existing drains and sewerage system already at capacity and drains frequently cause surface water flooding. Before any development occurs, a separate sewerage system and surface water drainage must be installed and completed. Any property built under ST9 proposal must not connect up to existing sewer and drainage system. The upgrading and dualling of the A1237 as a contingency for development work in this area should be carried through and upheld. The Haxby and Strensall roundabouts on A1237 require upgrades inclusive of cycle and pedestrian access. Haxby and Wigginton already experiences severe traffic congestion plus lack of parking near retail premises. Additional traffic will compound these issues. Traffic generated from ST9 using Moor Lane as the primary access point will have a negative impact on existing communities - could an alternative access point be considered? Concerned about the impact on air quality caused by extra vehicles and congestion. Schools in Haxby and Wigginton are already at or near capacity.</p> | <p>Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12407 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Proposal ST9 needs to have these things to meet the basic needs of residents to ease the congestion problems across the area: primary school, secondary school access, GP surgery, dentist surgery, cemetery, church/mosque, bus terminus, other transport links e.g. train for Haxby, high speed broadband, open and green spaces. Concerned about the lack of land allocated for employment in ST9. Some of the land should be reallocated for local jobs and business premises for future residents. Needs to be a mix of housing and varying bedroom numbers as well as dwellings for those with disabilities where accessibility is required. There are power lines over the site. A consultation/survey is required to assess the potential impact on the health and safety of future residents. Concern about the impact of ST9 on the wildlife including hedgerows, trees and land features and public rights of way. There are potential sites of historical and archaeological interest near ST9 including the ruins of a Roman Villa and ridge and furrow fields. These are of cultural value and need to be preserved.</p> | Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 12821 | ST9 | Comm | <p>Questions whether land for schools and retail facilities has been taken into account in development.</p> | |
| 13182 | ST9 | Comm | <p>A series of individual letters promoting each site including ST9 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations.</p> | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13211 | ST9 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 13276 | ST9 | Comm | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on traffic congestion, lack of school space, problem teenagers. | |
| 13448 | ST9 | comm. | Increased traffic flow along Strensall Lane will make it dangerous , including access to cemetery. Will also spoil the lane/open countryside. | |
| 13519 | ST9 | Comm | Recognises need for houses but believes size of development is unrealistic. Infrastructure needs to be able to cope before development. The ease the traffic issue, The Haxby rail station should become a reality, as should developments to the Haxby and Wigginton roundabouts. Concerned that local schools are at capacity | |
| 13520 | ST9 | Comm | Concerns about the clause vi) in respect to the additional loading of the Strensall with Towthorpe Waste Water Treatment Works and the increase road tanker traffic. The clause in x) the highway provision from ST9 to Towthorpe Road but be studied especially if the rail station is located close to Towthorpe Road. The extra road traffic needs to be considered in terms of its impact on Strensall and Towthorpe. | Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13552 | ST9 | Comm | Support the development of ST9 if improvements can be made to local transport. A Station could be easily provided at Haxby. This should be an essential part of the process of permission for this site. | |
| 13598 | ST9 | Comm | Concerned with extra traffic on Moor Lane. Rush hour will be significantly worse. Should consider a mini roundabout at junction of Moor Lane and The Village and traffic calming measures. Drainage and sewage systems need improving. | |
| 13600 | SS11 | Comm | This policy should include a requirement to 'provide required financial support' for the construction of a railway station at Haxby to ensure some of the value of the development site is contributed to the provision of suitable public transport links. | |
| 45i | ST9 | obi | Incorporating OS9 between existing and proposed development does not mitigate impact on present town. Extension on this scale to Haxby is unacceptable as the town is already overdeveloped with inadequate infrastructure and services. | YEF |
| 63 | ST9 | Obj | Since the last iteration of the Plan, new sites have been brought forward at Queen Elizabeth Barracks and Imphal Barracks. There is no commentary reflecting the impact this will have on sites previously listed. Lack on consideration given to sustainable access. Must be significant improvements to the roads leading to the new developments. There is unlikely to be new job opportunities nearby so residents of the new developments will have to travel through Haxby and Wigginton causing more congestion. Attendance by residents at the recent drop in at Oaken Grove will have alerted CYC to their strongly held opposition to the proposed development. There has been a reduction in the area of the buffer (strategic open space) as the edge of the development has shifted southwards. 735 houses will damage the natural environment, biodiversity, ridge and furrow fields, and a bridleway. | Haxby Town Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 71 | ST9 | Obj | This policy states that the development of 735 houses will require a new primary school. This is inconsistent as the policies for ST1 and ST2 which would be 1500 houses does not mention the requirement for a new school. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 77 | ST9 | Obj | Site ST9: Serious concerns about the allocation of this site - it is requested that the site be removed altogether, or substantially reduced in size. Sewage from this site will be treated at Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works, the capacity of which is unlikely to be sufficient to cope with the extra flows from Site ST9, together with sites ST35, E18 and H59. Traffic from ST9 may also use Strensall to avoid congestion in Haxby, exacerbating traffic problems. | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |
| 78 | ST9 | Obj | This policy states that the development of 735 houses will require a new primary school. This is inconsistent as the policies for ST1 and ST2 which would be 1500 houses does not mention the requirement for a new school. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 551 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to 900 houses in Haxby - no more houses on green belt. Further issues include congestion, parking, overstretched schools and drainage - and prohibitive cost of infrastructure upgrades. | |
| 574 | ST9 | Obj | Deep concern over building 735 houses on Green Belt land. It does not have direct access to the Ring Road like the other Strategic sites, therefore impacting on Haxby's existing infrastructure especially on Usher Lane and Moor Lane already have congestion and parking issues. Air quality is also a concern. Haxby is already over developed with schools and a health centre at capacity. Already insufficient parking in the village. Concern over the advanced plan for a train station which will introduce more commuters. To support the additional 735 houses further infrastructure would be required. The sewerage system is inadequate in Haxby. Concern over flooding in the SE corner of ST9. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 656 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development due to Haxby becoming gridlocked. There are also existing sewerage issues and not enough infrastructure such as schools, doctors and recreational facilities. Objects to giving developers permission to build on green belt areas and agricultural land in terms of sustainability. | |
| 700 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned by volume of traffic as it will make access through both Haxby town centre and Wigginton more difficult, particular concern about Moor Lane. Understands that utilities are under pressure already and will require significant investment. | |
| 715 | ST9 | Obj | Concern over: increase of traffic, increase of congestion on near by roads and ring road, increase in air pollution, populations of both Haxby and Wigginton will be affected due to proposed access points, lack of cycle routes. Bus travel will be affected due to increased traffic, improvements to Moor Lane/ The Village and Mill Lane B1363 Junctions will not significantly reduce traffic issues. The plan needs to clearly define what constitutes sufficient local facilities. These should not conflict with existing village facilities. Need for additional healthcare, this is not mentioned. Concern over increased rainfall due to climate change and run-off rates and poor drainage, lack of sewerage. The effect of Brexit and need for self-sufficiency needs to be considered, with removing agricultural land. Local primary and secondary schools are already over subscribed. Could these cope with the extra numbers of children? Concern over whether houses will be affordable given to above associated problems with the site. | |
| 1278i | ST9 | Obj | Concerned about additional traffic in and around Haxby / Wigginton contributing to congestion and having negative impacts on air quality and public health. Also concerned about additional pressure on already over-stretched healthcare provision that will come from new residents, local services already in a bad financial predicaments without additional patients. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 1355 | ST9 | Obj | Has commented on his disappointment that ST9 has not been reduced further than the 735 properties proposed. His views have not changed. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 1466 | SS11 | Obj | Has no objections in principle but would like it to be noted either within the text or the wording of the policy that the transport assessment to support the development should consider increases in traffic likely at level crossings in the Haxby area | Network Rail |
| 1528 | SS11 | Obj | The Transport Assessment which has been submitted in support of the development of the Site does not explore the alternative access to the seat of the site onto Towthorpe Road suggested in key principle x) and the representor would like to understand this in more detail. It is understood that there is party land and a railway line which would prevent this access from being an option. As such the representor would welcome a meeting with officers to discuss this as at this initial stage the representor concerns about the practicality of delivering this arrangement. The last sentence of key principle x) does not add anything to the policy and even if it is deleted it would not preclude a connection onto Towthorpe Road if found to be achievable. | DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division |
| 1908 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: flood risk; electric pylons on the sites; single access (Usher Lane) is narrow and at capacity; impact on the ring road - currently heavily congested; impact on local services and amenities (schools/doctors); lack of public transport alternatives. | |
| 2421 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on congestion/parking (Usher Lane/Station Road) and air quality; lack of parking in village; impact on services/amenities (school space/health care/drainage)/ | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2456 | ST9 | Obj | There are proposals for 735 dwellings on ST9 and this will have a large impact on a) transport links especially on Wigginton Road and Wigginton Road roundabout. This proposal will make congestion worse. Dualling of the ring road should be considered. b) flood risk, the Council has already done some drainage work along Wigginton Road, new houses could add to the problem. c) education, the proposal should provide for finance of an additional primary school in advance of the building of dwellings. d) health and wellbeing, a further increase in residents would have an effect on the service the doctors practice can offer. e) transport, there is not enough parking spaces in Haxby and Wigginton at present let alone when 735 additional dwellings are built north of Haxby. | |
| 2482 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned with infrastructure, road congestion, drainage, schools and health centres coping with the new housing. | |
| 2523 | ST9 | Obj | Traffic is already an issue in Haxby and the infrastructure will not cope with new homes. | |
| 2549 | ST9 | Obj | States there is no employment in the area so all new residents will have to travel on roads that are already at capacity. Area already suffers from poor drainage and there is no full plan for a new school to meet demand. | |
| 2586 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned with road systems, drainage, schools and health centres coping with the new housing. Health concerns related to air pollution increase with traffic, children walking to school and reduction of green space. | |
| 2692 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: road infrastructure cannot take any more traffic, noting existing congestion; overstretched shops/doctors and schools; impact on green belt. | |
| 2763 | ST9 | Obj | Too many houses for roads, medical centre and schools to cope. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 2846 | ST9 | Obj | Site ST9: Serious concerns about the allocation of this site - it is requested that the site be removed altogether, or substantially reduced in size. Sewage from this site will be treated at Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works, the capacity of which is unlikely to be sufficient to cope with the extra flows from Site ST9, together with sites ST35, E18 and H59. Traffic from ST9 may also use Strensall to avoid congestion in Haxby, exacerbating traffic problems. | |
| 3127 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that roads, parking, schools and drainage will not cope under more housing. Suggests creating another village with extra infrastructure. | |
| 3130 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that the sewage system will not cope, current facilities are oversubscribed, Usher Lane is used for parking and dangerous with volume of traffic, standing water is already an issue. Assurance should be given that open spaces schools and a new doctors will be provided, and affordable housing guaranteed. | |
| 3245ii | ST9 | Obj | There should be no further expansion to either Haxby or Wigginton as the two villages combined are now as big as a small market town and have lost their identity. The proposed station at Haxby is needed now and not when additional homes have been built. There are concerns about delaying trains travelling west to York but suggests this could be overcome by starting trains five minutes earlier from Scarborough. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 3256 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Objects to response to traffic congestion on A1237 as improving roundabouts on routes to Wigginton, Haxby and Strensall, which doesn't improve issues much. The new developments will worsen congestion, suggests dualling the A1237 and A64 with grade separated junctions. The suggested use and increase of public transport, cycling and walking in the plan is problematic. A train station at Haxby would be beneficial but need to consider parking and extra car journeys from outside to use it. There are issues with sewerage and drainage which need to be handled first. Supports the ST9 open space, but suggests additional costs be spent on the upkeep of it rather than the local councils. Concerned about developers destroying the biodiverse landscape features on this large development area.</p> | |
| 3257 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Too many houses in the proposed development, already have problems with access and drainage which have caused prior applications to be rejected, these problems have since got worse. Increase in traffic flow unacceptable, Usher Lane very narrow and unsafe for both drivers and pedestrians because of encroachment onto pavements. Congestion will worsen, negatively impacting air quality. Schools and medical already severely over-subscribed. Drainage already a problem that development will worsen, problems with standing surface water and backing up of sewage. Plan does indicate a small increase in the amount of green space but this is still below government guidelines. Council should prioritise brownfield sites over building on greenbelt, where greenbelt is only option it would be preferable to extend the new garden villages with their own infrastructure and direct access to ring road rather than extending current small villages and damaging their character.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 3272 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to building on green belt, inadequate public open space, already many cars parked on pavements in Haxby. Traffic congestion already a problem and will be exacerbated by development. If there is to be a train station it will require parking facilities. Medical centre already over-stretched, may need a new school to cope with new demand. Drainage around Usher Lane in particular is completely inadequate at present, trees have been dying because of waterlogged ground. Feels residents will not be listened to and disappointed with overall proposals. | |
| 3602 | ST9 | Obj | There will need to be another school built to cater for 735 new houses. Also, not sure if the surgery at Haxby & Wigginton will be able to cope with more patients. | |
| 3632 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that roads, schools, doctors, sewerage and drainage will not cope under more housing. Objects to fracking in the York area. | |
| 3967i | ST9 | Obj | Concern over drainage in Haxby and whether the existing overloaded local water and sewerage systems will cope with 735 additional houses. Already existing problems of flooding and blockages. Concern over parking and roads in Haxby. The increase number of cars has already reached saturation point. Parked cars cause issues for deliveries and buses. Concern over the new roads being able to cope with all the new cars (1000+). Concern over the Haxby Health Centre. Due to the number of additional residents a new health centre would have to be built. Concern over schooling in Haxby. Current schools are at capacity. Extra capacity at the existing schools or new schools would have to be built. Concern over the additional cars and car parking problems if additional capacity was built at existing schools and land availability if a new school/schools would have to be built. | |
| 3984 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned with proposed housing impact to mains drainage, schools, and parking. Haxby already struggling to cope. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4043 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds that it would exacerbate congestion and result in further drainage problems. | |
| 4048 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that Haxby cannot take more private cars due to congestion, noise and pollution. There is no parking, people relying on public transport have to allow an hour between Haxby and the rail station to make it. A train station in Haxby would take about 5 minutes to reach York station but it has not gone through. | |
| 4158 | ST9 | Obj | <p>This Plan has failed to take notice of previous high levels of objections to this site. The only difference is the proposed buffer to the south of the development from Usher Lane in the east and to Moor lane in the west which will make no difference at all. Object to this site and have huge concerns over sustainability and the impact on green belt around Haxby and Wigginton will be disastrous. Brownfield development should be exhausted first. NPPF Para 158 requires a relevant and adequate evidence base and Para 182 states policies have to be based on proportionate evidence consistent with national policy. The RSS was revoked except for policies YH9 and Y1C - these relate to the York Green Belt. YH9 states inner boundaries should be defined to establish the long term development limits that safeguard the special character and setting of York. CYC need to assess the urban capacity of the central core so that no significant adverse impact on the character and setting takes place. A long term evaluation of around 30 years needs to be carried out - this has not been done. Haxby and Wigginton are outside the inner boundary and it is implied the capacity within the inner boundary should be developed first but CYC have not assessed the inner boundary capacity - thus the proposal is not justified as required by NPPF.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4159 | ST9 | Obj | <p>This Plan has failed to take notice of previous high levels of objections to this site. The only difference is the proposed buffer to the south of the development from Usher Lane in the east and to Moor lane in the west which will make no difference at all. There has been a failure to work with our local communities and parish councils when designing the development visions - CYC have obviously ignored the huge objections to this development. I find it inconceivable that more than 36 ha of green belt will be removed for ST9 and ST14. Haxby and Wigginton are small historic villages where local infrastructure is already under threat. Without significant sustainable investment in our infrastructure we risk grinding to a halt. There is congestion on the outer ring road and A64 that slow down residents and local businesses and increases the risk of accidents. Greenbelt should protect Haxby and Wigginton from development. The negative aspects to consider regarding this site proposal are; we should protect agricultural land and green belt land, Haxby and Wigginton are already over developed, infrastructure and access to key services are already inadequate, parking in the village is almost impossible now, existing drainage, sewage and flooding issues are serious, congestion is a problem, the outer ring road is severely congested, the burial ground expansion needs consideration and the site is crossed by high transmission power lines. Access to schools, GP, local public transport, traffic access, suitable roads, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young and old and more vulnerable, are all concerns.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4200 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Page 50, Point X. 'Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B1363 Wigginton Road'. This statement indicates that there is to be a new access road to site ST9 directly from the B1363. Concern that this statement is misleading. The outcome of this error could be that a number of people did not make a comment about their concerns over pollution, congestion and the impact on Haxby. This could have skewed the objection figures for ST9.</p> | |
| 4200 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby is already congested with traffic and development will exacerbate this, particularly at peak times. The inevitable increase in slow and stationary traffic will have particularly negative impacts on the health of children and elderly residents with respiratory problems. Concerned about road access as no provision for new roads to the site is planned. This will bring all the traffic through the main village, Usher Lane and Moor Lane are narrow country roads not suitable for large amounts of traffic. Suggests that the alternative access road from the site to the East of Usher Lane to Towthorpe Road is provided rather than explored. Upon enquiring about page 50 x 'Provide highway access from Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B1363 Wigginton Road' they were told that statement is incorrect and misleading. Needs to be clarified as many residents have been given the impression this would solve the increase in traffic taking it away from the village. Also concerned about provision of parking, drainage, schools and healthcare as all are already inadequate now. Feels the village cannot sustain any more development without losing the village feel and having a significant negative impact on resident's quality of life.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4200ii | ST9 | Obj | <p>Page 50 - point x 'Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B13363 Wigginton Road' This statement clearly indicates there is to be a new access road to site ST9 directly from the B1363, having enquired about this by phone and at a drop in event they were told this is not the case and the statement was acknowledged as misleading. The only access to the west is to be via Moor Lane into the village. Many other people had understood from the information provided that there was going to be a direct road, therefore avoiding a considerable amount of extra traffic passing through the village, adding to the already troublesome congestion. The outcome of this error could be that a number of people did not make comments regarding their concerns around congestion, vehicle emissions and impact on the village as they thought there would be a new road diverting the traffic. The outcome will have been an understating of objections to the site ST9.</p> | |
| 4283 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Concerned that roads, parking, sewerage and drainage will not cope under more housing.</p> | |
| 4313 | ST9 | Obj | <p>The burden on infrastructure and amenities in Haxby and Wigginton will be too great. Traffic, already heavy and liable to congestion, will worsen in Haxby village, Wigginton Mill Lane, York Road, Wigginton Road and the ring road. Increased traffic in Oaken Grove will pose a danger to children and increase noise and air pollution.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4396 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Strongly opposes development as Haxby's drainage is already completely inadequate. Also opposes building on the green belt when brownfield land should be prioritised to meet the demand for housing. Goes into detail about the road network's existing inadequacies that development will exacerbate. Suggests that the A1237 would have to be completely duelled with roundabouts removed to have any chance of reducing congestion, even then the A64 from Hopgrove would have to be made into a dual carriageway to prevent backing up from Hopgrove roundabout. Says that the promise of a railway station at Haxby is a white elephant and financially unviable, having a station in Haxby would also impact the level crossings and then contribute to traffic congestion. Local buses are unreliable and often get caught up in congestion, bus service would need to be enhanced for new residents and the additional strain they place on the network. Air quality will deteriorate as a result of development and subsequent traffic. Concerned about road safety in particular Usher Lane and the junction with Station Road. States that there is not enough school capacity to accommodate new residents. Not the time to be adding to demand for local services when cuts are being made, even if</p> | |
| 4690 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Traffic congestion will worsen and sewerage system will struggle. Suggests an improvement in infrastructure. Issues such as parking, failure to take responsibility for snickets and areas left by builders, closure of the library, overcrowded schools and poor public transport are mentioned. There is also little employment in Haxby, causing people to travel out, and poor affordability. Junctions need improving. Suggests dualling the northern ring road, improved pedestrian and cycle safety, more schools and medical facilities, consideration of power lines, and respect to historical ridge and furrow medieval fields of Crooklands lane.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4797 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby / Wigginton are already over-developed, infrastructure, especially the roads are inadequate, as is access to services. Congestion will get worse. Existing draining, sewerage and flooding issues in Haxby and along Wigginton Road are already serious and will be exacerbated. Agricultural land should be protected. Green space will need to be preserved along Moor Lane and Usher Lane if development is to be acceptable. Ring Roads need to be duelled before any development takes place. Sufficient space for the expansion of Haxby burial ground must be allowed. The site is crossed by high voltage transmission power lines which must remain in-situ and buildings must not be located directly beneath. Goes into further detail on specific roads and where congestion will arise should development proceed. Stresses severity of local flooding / drainage issues and says that in the interest of accountability council employees should be made personally financially responsible for any insurance claims that arise from flooding caused by development. Closes by saying that opposition to the development is not NIMBYism as such, people are generally accepting of the need for housing but any further development will require huge investment in supporting infrastructure as the current provision is failing as it is.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4817 | ST9 | Obj | Object to ST9. Having lived in Haxby for 36 years, the infrastructure has never improved to accommodate more housing. Now have pollution, parking, drainage issues and a doctors surgery which can't cope with the amount of patients - Haxby is full! One car per family - and most have 2 cars or more - would result in a mind boggling number of extra cars on the roads in Haxby, resulting in gridlock and pollution. We don't want any more fields developed - we will soon end up joined to Strensall, Huntington and Wigginton, creating a massive city from what used to be villages. Please scrap the plans for ST9, and any for Strensall and Wigginton too. Develop brownfield first, in sustainable areas | |
| 5286 | ST9 | Obj | Local infrastructure can't handle an extra 735 homes. | |
| 5291 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby cannot cope with more traffic, York Road is dangerously busy on a rout used by school children. Local amenities will be stretched (primary schools and doctors surgery). Poor parking facilities will worsen problem. | |
| 5307 | ST9 | Obj | Local transport needs to be improved before more housing is developed. Air pollution will worsen. Dualling ring road will not improve congestion. No provision for primary schools. Moving schools would cause more congestion on York Road. Safety of cyclists and children would need to be considered and cycle lane widened. Doctors and drains would struggle, shops are insufficient and there is a lack of parking. | |
| 5364 | ST9 | Obj | Accepts the general need for new housing but objects to development on the following grounds: impact on traffic- Haxby and Wigginton are already congested at peak times. Adding this number of homes without employment allocation, will increase commuting/impact on highway safety; need for alterations to existing road infrastructure; sewerage/drainage at capacity; potential to exacerbate surface water flooding; lack of services - schools/healthcare/retail; impact on sites archaeology, noting earlier roman finds on the site. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5379 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that Haxby can take no more development and whether developers can be trusted to build affordable housing, roads, parks, schools etc. Should be legally required to build amenities. The three roads connecting Haxby to A64, A1237 and York are at capacity, the roads should be duelled before development. Cycle lanes are too narrow and dangerous. A train station would cause more traffic due to parking and obstruction. Parking, GPs and sewerage are already a problem. | |
| 5391 | ST9 | Obj | Opposes development as traffic through Haxby and Wigginton is already very heavy. Similarly, the health centre and schools are also at capacity. | |
| 5471 | ST9 | Obj | States the new roads and utilities for Haxby and Wigginton should be addressed before the new houses are built. States that the roads next to the planned green space will become rat runs and there is no contingency plan / ideas. | |
| 5545 | ST9 | Obj | Road between Haxby and Strensall is unsafe enough without adding to the existing traffic. Strensall Barracks may be a better location for new housing. | |
| 5582 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby does not have the infrastructure in terms of schools, roads, parking, drainage and amenities to cope. Cars would increase by estimated 963 based on the national travel survey's statistics. Suggests to develop brownfield sites first, and protect green belt land. | |
| 5617 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: current infrastructure (road and rail) is wholly inadequate - the proposals to improve roundabouts will only produce bigger roundabouts which do little to improve north/south traffic flows; housing on the periphery will increase car use into the city; car parking in Haxby is wholly inadequate; school space is at capacity, and a new primary school is essential if this goes ahead. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5672 | ST9 | Obj | Green belt land should be preserved. Site has no access to York/Leeds apart from through local roads. Moor Lane and Usher Lane have congestion problems already. Ringroad has reached capacity, already have flood and sewerage problems, schools and doctors needed, not enough parking. Retail study used for site is incorrect, 2 large supermarkets there which work well. | |
| 5673 | ST9 | Obj | This Plan has failed to take notice of previous high levels of objections to this site. The only difference is the proposed buffer to the south of the development from Usher Lane in the east and to Moor lane in the west which will make no difference at all. Object to this site - there has been no consultation with local residents threatened with massive inappropriate development. on precious Green Belt land. Impact of development would be totally unsustainable as infrastructure in Haxby village is already under huge strain and without huge investment in infrastructure will not be able to cope with such dramatic increases on demand. Access to schools, GP, local public transport, traffic access, suitable roads, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young and old and more vulnerable, are all concerns. The message is clear from government to make use of Brownfield sites and regenerate existing housing estates before taking the easy option of destroying our valuable green belt spaces. | |
| 5777 | ST9 | Obj | Infrastructure cannot cope already in Haxby which is at full capacity. Traffic is a problem down York road and this would worsen. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5796 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to site as local infrastructure is inadequate to cope with increased demand - goes into some detail about existing traffic congestion, mentions road safety, air quality, existing parking issues and existing drainage issues (both surface water and sewage). Says that schools are at capacity and children are already having to travel to schools outside the village. Says an environmental impact assessment should be completed before any further development takes place in Haxby. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5833 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Overwhelming local opposition to the site, at a public meeting of 200 people just one resident was in favour. The site violates the current green belt boundary, will alter forever and in a wholly negative way the character of the immediate neighbourhood. Main concern is a traffic along Usher Lane both during construction and occupation. The Council indicate that preferred access is via Moor Lane but it gives no indication on how this is to be enforced. Why not block off access for vehicles from the estate to Usher Lane, restricting it to pedestrians and cycles? Can the Council please provide a quantitative estimate of the expected percentage increase in traffic on Usher Lane if this goes ahead? Increased danger of accidents, inevitable loss of air quality and loss of recreational uses. In the unfortunate event of any development being permitted the Open space should be extended as far as Usher Lane and no building should be permitted on the plot directly bordering Usher Lane. A screen of trees and hedges should be maintained so that the estate is effectively invisible from the road. What is meant by "high quality" development and how will it be enforced? What is the proposed time-scale for the development? One of the tables indicates year 1-16. Does this mean completion of 46 houses per year for the next 16 years? The proposed new rail station at Haxby is a good idea, whether new building takes place or not, but I note it is not expected for a very long time. Will this promise be kept? The sensible thing would be to establish the station before any new houses are built. Would support extension of ST14 (or similar) in preference to Haxby development.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5875 | ST9 | Obj | Supports the provision of an open space and new school to address capacity. Concerned about drainage issues and transport. Haxby is already at capacity and York Road and Mill Lane are extremely busy. A 20% increase in volume as the transport and communications section suggests will bring the A1237 to a standstill. Need to dual A1237 first. | |
| 13668 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: Haxby is already overdeveloped and underserved by public facilities; worsening congestion and associated pollution. If this awful plan is to go ahead we need more green spaces, trees to soften estates, proper cycle lanes, opening the railway station, small affordable housing with good rental accommodation and public sports facilities. | |
| 6041 | ST9 | Obj | Already limited services in Haxby and no guarantee of new services going in to support new housing. Suggests Poppleton being considered as the village already has a rail station and a new Park and Ride. Before green belt is considered all brownfield sites should be used first, as the impact on wildlife will be detrimental (crested newt and barn owls). Low field Drive is a flood plain and have issues already with surface water drainage. No room for expansion of existing shopping facilities or parking. Schools are at capacity and traffic will worsen as will air pollution - the outer ring road would have to be made into a dual carriageway to cope. | |
| 6171 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development as infrastructure not in place and little employment opportunities in York. Concerned at statements about reducing the need to travel and promoting cycling and walking when many have cars already. | |
| 7050 | ST9 | Obj | Village already struggles with parking and traffic. Parking on ring road slows traffic more. Hospital/York cannot cope with more people. | |
| 7154 | ST9 | Obj | Health centre, schools and parking cannot accommodate more. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 7182 | ST9 | Obj | Objects due to Haxby being overloaded with traffic already at peak times, lack of parking (suggests large car park), current shopping facilities cannot be increased, drainage issues, health surgery struggles (2 weeks for appointment), and schools at maximum capacity. To meet these needs would need more than one new village with services attached. | |
| 7880 | ST9 | Obj | Have lived in Haxby for 40 years and seen it change from a village to town, as residents of Usher Lane are very concerned about ST9 and H54. Goes into detail about their experiences with inadequate drainage - both sewerage and surface water - development will exacerbate this. Similarly goes into detail about over-capacity road network and related problems i.e. road safety, parking. Would welcome a train station for Haxby but notes this would attract commuters from afar that would then require parking. Mentions the inadequate provision of health services in Haxby and concerned that this could be overwhelmed. Wishes to stress that they have seen developments in and around Haxby in the past and not been concerned so this is not a case of NIMBYism, they are objecting to this development as Haxby's infrastructure is at breaking point. | |
| 7902 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt; impact on overstretched services/amenities (drainage, schools, doctors); severe congestion on York Road/Wigginton Road, feeding onto severely congested A1237. Notes increase in travel times identified by transport plan. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 7909 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned that further housing development would cause flooding, issues to dirty water/ sewage system. Junction of Moor Lane should be enlarged as roads are heavily congested. No employment opportunities in Haxby means more travelling and more congestion. Primary school and doctors full. Haxby and Wigginton are already at full capacity. | |
| 8286 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: Haxby is already overdeveloped and underserved by public facilities; worsening congestion/traffic load on Moor Lane, Usher Lane and York Road; lack of parking. | |
| 9486 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on congestion, unalleviated by alternatives (walking/cycling/reopening Haxby Station); lack of public services; housing provision is unlikely to address local need, instead providing more profitable 3/4 bed semis and detached houses. | |
| 9503 | ST9 | Obj | Site is too large in relation to the local community, infrastructure inadequate to cope with such a large development, schools, medical facilities and roads will be pushed beyond breaking point. Oaken Grove, Moor Lane and Usher Lane will be used by construction traffic which will place children and the elderly at risk. There are no traffic calming measures on Oaken Grove, it is already dangerous and construction traffic will put lives at risk. | |
| 9510 | ST9 | Obj | Infrastructure such as the drainage system, roads, doctors and schools cannot cope. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9633 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of likely increased congestion on local roads and A1237. Without dualling the northern ring road and providing further access roads to the ringroad, plans north of Haxby will simply result in gridlock/congestion/pollution. Also objects to impacts on local amenities/resources (schools, shops, open space etc). | |
| 9649 | ST9 | Obj | Village infrastructure will not cope with additional demand, schools and doctors are at capacity now. The village already has traffic problems, traffic along Wigginton and Haxby roads are often gridlocked at peak times as the A1237 is clogged. The A1237 is often gridlocked between the A19 and Strensall Road during the day which makes it difficult to get out of Haxby. Further congestion will be detrimental to public health and people will not use public transport unless it is affordable and reliable. Overall the development will be detrimental to the local area and people living here. | |
| 9690 | ST9 | Obj | Too much traffic at Haxby crossing now without a new station or new development. Their bungalow backs onto an unused snicket, is concerned that if the recreational space is opened up as proposed there should be a fence put up to protect their bungalow. Traffic congestion in Haxby / Wigginton is already terrible, new houses will exacerbate this. | |
| 9878 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds - overdevelopment; impact on Wigginton Road and York Road, and northern ring road; highway safety, esp in vicinity of Oaken Grove; parking; lack of capacity in local infrastructure (schools/doctors). | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9972 | ST9 | Obj | The new site would require access roads onto the already congested Wigginton Road and Haxby Road. The access via Moor Lane and Usher Lane are single lane in places which make access completely inappropriate. Development would require upgrades to the drainage and utilities in Haxby & Wigginton. | |
| 13669 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on congestion/parking (Usher Lane/York Road); lack of parking in village; impact on services/amenities (school space/health care/drainage) | |
| 10171 | ST9 | Obj | Site has continued to be unsuitable for traffic and access. Need improvement first. | |
| 10292 | ST9 | Obj | It is bad enough getting a doctors appointment now, what will it be like with another 3000 residents? Likewise, schools and York Hospital. | |
| 10351 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby & Wigginton already have problems with the volume of traffic and drainage which development will exacerbate. Investment needed before the houses are built. | |
| 10388 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development in Haxby due to traffic congestion, parking issues, increased risk of flooding, and lack of facilities. | |
| 10389 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development in Haxby due to drainage issues, traffic congestion and amenities (schools and health centre). | |
| 10610 | ST9 | Obj | The B1363 access to the A1237 is already grossly inadequate with a dangerous roundabout. More people using the B1363 will cause greater difficulty and danger. Haxby is already too busy, as it is a 'cut through' to avoid the A1237. Haxby needs better roads. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 10815 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned about impact on medical centre and general increase in traffic. Particularly concerned about traffic on Usher Lane as footpaths are already unsafe for wheelchair users / people with pushchairs. Parking in the village is already inadequate and there seems little prospect for more. Supports in principle the proposed train station for Haxby but stresses that affordable parking must be provided so that it does not just exacerbate existing parking problems, specifically mentions parking near Ralph Butterfield School. | |
| 11018 | ST9 | Obj | It is beyond comprehension that 700+ houses are being considered in the Haxby area, due to existing traffic congestion. There are also delays due to rail traffic. Why isn't the plan pushing for a rail halt? This would allow commuters to catch a train to York and beyond leaving the car behind. Station first, infrastructure in place and then think about new houses. | |
| 11021 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby/Wigginton are full and cannot cope with the present volume of traffic/ parking/ drainage/ doctors appointments. Green belt should remain green belt. The ring road is not meeting needs now. | |
| 11035 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby/Wigginton are at their capacity. It is difficult to park, exit the area at peak times, get a doctors appointment. The drains cannot cope with more surface water. Need the right infrastructure to build more. | |
| 11049 | ST9 | Obj | Additional traffic would be dangerous, drainage is already inadequate and additional housing would exacerbate this. There is no capacity for the health provision that would be required by new residents. Claims there is no evidence that a development of this size is required in this part of York. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 11089 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to likely impact of development on local area, namely: transport/traffic congestion (particularly as all existing access is via Usher Lane); unacceptable public transport alternatives; overstretched schools and doctors. Mix of homes should reflect local need. | |
| 11100 | ST9 | Obj | Inadequate attention to parking and other traffic/highway needs. Current congestion is severe and will become even worse if 735 homes are constructed (1500+) cars. | |
| 12217ii | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development because local infrastructure is already at / over capacity, specifically talks about drainage, traffic congestion, shopping, medical and recreational facilities. States that the proposed development is disproportionate to the village and not in-keeping with local character. | |
| 12233 | ST9 | Obj | Object to development on open farm land. Also development bordering villages that already suffer from bad congestion is short sighted. | |
| 12257 | ST9 | Obj | Disappointed that Haxby share of new housing programme was not reduced following the Strensall barracks announcement. States that dualling northern part of outer ring road is a must. | Haxby Town Councillor |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12272 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Very concerned by additional traffic, impact this would have on congestion, junctions that are dangerous at present as well as vibration of houses and subsequent impact on quality of life. Ground under the road has already proved unstable plus there are issues with flash-flooding and drainage. Elderly residents have great difficulty crossing the road as it is, both during construction and occupation increased traffic will mean more disturbance and pollution. Flooding is a particular concern for many residents along Moor Lane who already use pumps either permanently or in times of heavy rain. None of the drains, roads, doctors or schools have the capacity to meet the additional demand.</p> | |
| 12276 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby's infrastructure is already inadequate, Usher Lane dangerous for pedestrians at present. Additional traffic will exacerbate existing road safety problems, contribute to pollution harming residents health, add to congestion and make parking even more difficult. Current bus provision is lacking, shelters are poor, electronic information patchy, journeys slow and often take lengthy detours. Welcomes the plans for a Haxby Train Station but does not expect it to come to fruition. A cycle path into the city centre should be prioritised, hopes that solutions to the issues raised can be found and funded through planning gain or investment from the council if further expansion of Haxby is to be considered.</p> | |
| 12308 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby and Wigginton services already over-subscribed, specifically mentions the doctors. Drainage systems often back-up causing minor floods in poor weather. Ring road already at capacity. Driving through the village already dangerous and parking for the shops difficult. Haxby and Wigginton already growing naturally due to high number of 'garden builds'.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12343 | ST9 | Obj | Comment raises a number of general issues, namely: if the responsibility for transport is with the developer what powers do the council have to enforce this?, why is there no extra healthcare provision? questions whether the drainage will be adequate, concern over car parking in Haxby. | |
| 12366 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on already congested village roads; parking; sewerage/drainage; schools and services underprovided. Note also pylons on site which Naton Grid recommend are avoided. | |
| 12381 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development due to additional strain on infrastructure that is already at capacity - road network (particularly outer ring road), schools, health centre and drainage. | |
| 12536 | ST9 | Obj | Roads are already inadequate, York Road in particular already badly congested. Apparently Yorkshire Water have informed her that drainage capacity in Haxby has reached its maximum. Development would require a whole new drainage system. General services in Haxby already inadequate, more thought needed on roads and drainage. | |
| 12542i | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of overdevelopment, impact on traffic, services and schools. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12705 | ST9 | Obj | Supports councillor Cuthbertson's submission. Wishes to highlight the disproportionately large nature of the proposed site and its impact on the road network. If there is any development it is essential to have an eastern running spine road from the ST9 site towards Towthorpe, such a road should interconnect with a rail halt situated between the railway line and Towthorpe Road. On a more general point wishes to voice support for York Civic Trust's arguments in favour of new settlements, preferably adopting the David-Rudlin style approach. This avoids death by stealth on existing settlements across the city and produces the critical mass to achieve the appropriate funding for necessary infrastructure. Lack of such an approach in the plan is disappointing. | |
| 12726 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby and the ring road near Haxby are already at capacity, severe congestion already. Further housing will exacerbate this and impact not just Haxby and Wigginton residents but all York residents as the infrastructure struggles to cope. | |
| 12747 | ST9 | Obj | Very concerned about proposed access through Wigginton - Mill Lane and the village. Roads are already very busy, increased traffic from development is unacceptable and it would have a significant negative impact on residents' quality of life. | |
| 12751 | ST9 | Obj | The Village and Mill Lane Wigginton are part of the proposed access route for ST9. This road is already very busy. Traffic fumes/pollution, houses shaking etc are already an issue on The Village. ST9 would generate a substantial increase in traffic. The impact on residents would be inconceivable it would see their amenity and quality of life severely diminished. If a new road was created connecting Moor Lane to the B1363 this would greatly improve the access route and eliminate the intolerable traffic burden that Wigginton would incur. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12790 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Concerned by additional traffic, goes into detail on existing problems that will be exacerbated by development. Development will increase congestion, will not encourage transition to a sustainable low carbon economy and cause further decline in air quality, contrary to SA objectives 6, 4, & 7 & 12 respectively. Construction will increase noise, pollution and vibrations along Mill Lane and The Village. Flooding is already a major concern for residents along Moor Lane and many use pumps permanently. Ultimately development will put intolerable strain on existing infrastructure, the schools and doctors are at capacity. Unsure where the jobs are coming from, this level of housing building may not be justified.</p> | |
| 12804 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Asks for detail on open space provision and scheduling of new facilities that will be needed. Asks if land will be reserved for a new school and detail on drainage strategy / sewers. Goes into detail on access roads, problematic junctions and outer ring road. Raises concerns about pedestrian and cycle integration. Also concerned about housing density as the proposed site is much denser than the existing village and the development is disproportionate in size. Asks where jobs will come from and asks if the low paid will be able to afford the 'affordable' housing.</p> | |
| 12821 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Road infrastructure must be improved before development. Moor Lane and Usher Park Lane are too narrow for more traffic but cannot be widened. Improving junctions will still not resolve issue. Suggested access roads from site to Towthorpe Road dangerous as could cause negative effects to junction there. Access road from site to Moor Lane would increase congestion through Wigginton.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12830 | ST9 | Obj | Believes location for new Haxby station is unsuitable (though one is needed) as it replaces allotment space with no alternative space for allotments. Locals put a lot of time and energy into the allotments and there is an 8 year waiting list. Provides great mental health benefits and a habitat for wildlife. Also to access would go past primary school and The Village which is already very busy. Suggests locating station north of Haxby near Towthorpe Road, with a link road put to the north of the Upper Park Road estate. This would make it easier for people from Strensall to access, or relocating the proposed development to Strensall. Air pollution and traffic will increase with development in Haxby. Dualling ring road will not relieve this congestion. There are not enough primary schools and York Road is dangerous for cyclists and children. The doctors surgery may not cope, there is a lack of shops and there is a lack of parking in the village. | |
| 12894 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned as the back road between Strensall and Haxby is very narrow and development would create extra traffic accessing the A64, particularly around the primary school at school times. | |
| 12911 | ST9 | Obj | Concern over traffic levels and the harm the air quality has on people's health, specifically asthma and early death, this will only get worse. The loss of Green Belt land is of concern especially given Brexit and needing to be more self sufficient. Lack of consideration to wildlife and nature. | |
| 12916 | ST9 | Obj | Opposes building on green belt land, 735 houses north of Haxby will cause unnecessary further traffic congestion, this traffic will also increase risk to cyclists and pedestrians. Local infrastructure - drains / sewerage, schools and healthcare - are already over-capacity. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12950i | ST9 | Obj | Concerned about village coping with development as health care, sewerage and parking are already a concern. Mill Lane junction to Moor Lane and Usher Road also struggle with current levels of traffic. | |
| 12952 | ST9 | Obj | The Village and Mill Lane Wigginton are part of the proposed access route for ST9. This road is already very busy. It is not feasible for this road to incur the substantial traffic increase that this housing plan would generate. Many residents/ houses are near the road side. Traffic fumes/pollution, houses shaking etc are already an issue. Any further increase in traffic would be very bad for residents especially on The Village. | |
| 13030 | ST9 | Obj | Development at site ST9 would result in the loss of pleasant agricultural land with a distinctive pattern of well trees hedgerows and a historic small scale/strip field pattern. The existing landscape framework would make a comprehensive development scheme, including playing fields and access, difficult to achieve without resulting in losses of trees and sections of hedgerows. The proposed open space would result in a development which is poorly related to the existing settlement. The development would result in a significant northern expansion of the existing settlement and would impact on the rural approaches along Moor Lane and Usher Lane. This allocations cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. The Draft Local Plan is unsound as a result. | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |
| 13047 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby is already large and sprawling and this proposal risks coalescence with Towthorpe. This will damage the openness of the Green Belt and the special character and setting of York and its villages. Walbutts sewerage works is already at capacity and polluting the River Foss. Walbutts cannot continue to be overloaded. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13065 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Goes into detail about heavily congested local roads, mentions the junction of Usher Lane and Station Road being dangerous at peak times. Mentions that residents use Towthorpe Road, Moor Lane and Usher Lane to access the countryside and use them for walking, cycling, jogging, horse riding and dog walking. All activities that would be put at risk following development. Crooklands Lane is a unique bridleway that is worth preserving for its environmental value and highly used local-amenity. Also mentions existing problems with parking that would be exacerbated. Unless there is some encouragement given to employers to provide light industrial opportunities it is unlikely new residents will work in the village, most will be commuting elsewhere and contributing to congestion. Local air quality will deteriorate and impact residents' health. Major problems with drainage and sewerage at present, pumping station would need full upgrade should development proceed. Haxby and Wigginton health centre is at capacity, a new facility would be needed. Mentions that the land north of Haxby is divided into a number of fields that are not intensively farmed, these fields along with hedgerows and mature trees provide habitats for a number of species that could be lost. Mentions that a number of National Grid pylons in this area will require planning consideration regarding health and safety. Also mentions there is need for up to 2.3 acres of additional land for the joint Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery which should be taken into consideration. Questions police resources and the ability to provide extra officers to police the area.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13166 | ST9 | Obj | <p>The design, quality, type, mix and construction of any proposed housing on ST9 must take account of the character of the wards existing housing and its social and demographic mix. Affordable and social housing should be included. Provision for a variety of ages and social groupings should be considered. Green and open space should be provided and existing trees and vegetation maintained where possible. Housing density should be similar to existing Haxby housing densities. Concern over the retail shopping area in Haxby and it would need to be expanded difficult in a conservation area. Prioritise retail over food outlets. Disappointing that no employment land has been allocated in Haxby / Wigginton, additional trips will be the impact. Three local primary schools near capacity, limited secondary provision. New primary school required. Health centre near capacity, additional facilities needed from the outset. Key problem is surface water drainage and must be considered. Improved drainage needed in the buffer zone if it is to be used for open space. Flooding is an issue, pumping stations at capacity. Limited capacity of the sewerage disposal network. Proposals on how to support increasing numbers of elderly residents must be included in the masterplan. Cemetery expected to reach capacity during development period, space must be allowed for its expansion. Space for a new library should be considered. Appropriate social hall or meeting space required. Dental and optical provision at capacity the provision of new facilities will be necessary.</p> | <p>Cllr I. Cuthbertson - Haxby and Wigginton Liberal Democrats.</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13166 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Concern over air quality where there are heavy traffic movements and will cause respiratory issues. pollution levels should monitored before a masterplan completed. ST9 would have major impacts on wildlife, trees and vegetation. National Grid power lines cross site ST9 health and safety concerns over these for residents, further information about the health and safety aspects of living near power lines should be provided alongside the masterplan for this site. Parking an issue in Wigginton with no off street parking and Wigginton has no centre due to its linear nature. Priority must be given to the provision of a detailed sustainable transport plan. There must be improved access for Haxby and Wigginton to the wider road network. Including upgrading the A1237 roundabouts, a rail halt and improved bus service would also be needed. Current indicative Rail Halt location not viable due to lack of available land. A new site should be sought just outside the and to the north east of the village on Towthorpe Road based on fields between the road and the railway line. A parking area and possible bus terminus could be sites here and a footbridge over the railway line and footpath could be provided to Usher Lane. Bus routes could be extended and additional routes added. Suggests new spine road through ST9. Information regarding overloading at peak times on junctions near ST9 provided. Local roads to ST9 already at capacity at peak times. Concern Haxby used as a rat run for ST14, ST35 and H59. A masterplan is needed before development commences. A clean safe pedestrian route should be provided from ST9 into the centre of Haxby to avoid people using their cars, alternative routes given. Existing Rights of Way through ST9 must be preserved.</p> | <p>CLlr I. Cuthbertson - Haxby and Wigginton Liberal Democrats.</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13187 | ST9 | Obj | Traffic at Usher Lane is already at a dangerous volume, problems with parked vehicles along the lane. Access to the site via Usher Lane will exacerbate this problem, will be dangerous for children crossing and worse for air quality. Also state that traffic in and out of Haxby via the ring road is already severely congested at peak times, proposed development will only make this worse. | |
| 13236 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: impact on roads and traffic congestion; impact on local services (GP); change to local character of Haxby. | |
| 13238 | ST9 | Obj | Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237). | |
| 13243 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: drains won't cope; no school/health centre space; impact on existing congestion. | |
| 13246 | ST9 | Obj | Building on ST9 should not be allowed. Green belt land should remain green. The infrastructure could not cope with 735+ extra cars that would appear on Haxby roads. | |
| 13307 | ST9 | Obj | Facilities such as road access, dentists, doctors, school, shopping, parking and shops needed. | |
| 13317 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: village centre unable to cope with further expansion, noting massive growth in the last 40 years; impact of additional traffic on (already congested) Usher Lane, Moor Lane and York Road. | |
| 13335 | ST9 | Obj | The new housing residents of ST9 will use the village which is already at a standstill at busy times. There is insufficient provision for doctors, schools and other infrastructure and services. Given the amount of new houses planned it would be better to build a new community with all services for that town. | |
| 13353(i) | ST9 | Obj | Objects to the number of homes proposed, noting insufficient infrastructure and likely impact on traffic. Infrastructure cannot cope, roads already at capacity, doctors surgery already over-burdened. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13359 | ST9 | Obj | Disappointed that the new estate will not benefit from shops, doctors and a school. If Haxby is to be developed this should be done right, thought should be given to the needs of the new residents. | |
| 13363 | ST9 | Obj | Opposed to any building on green belt. Infrastructure cannot cope with additional demand - congested roads, poor air quality, lack of parking, over-burdened drainage system, overcrowded schools, long waits for health care and over-stretched amenities. Brown field land should be developed before green belt. Public need should take priority over developer profits. | |
| 13398 | ST9 | Obj | Infrastructure needs upgrading before any further development - doctors, schools (both primary and secondary), drainage and parking in Haxby village. Outer Ring Road is most in need of investment, it is often gridlocked even outside of peak times, at a minimum needs dualling between Clifton Moor and Hopgrove, Haxby and Wigginton. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13407 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby and Wigginton is already heavily populated and the existing facilities have developed to meet the needs of the current population - there is no room for them to expand to meet the demand of an additional 735 houses. The infrastructure, esp road network and drainage are already overloaded. The proposed accesses to the east and west are on existing lanes and have limited scope for improvement, road access from the south (along Usher Lane / Station Road and beyond along York Road to the Ring Road) are already heavily overloaded and this development will only make it worse. Access to the north is along narrow country lanes, over a very narrow hump back bridge and through a congested area of Strensall, past Robert Wilkinson Primary School, which is dangerous and is already a rat run. The northern Ring Road is already highly congested at peak times. Parking in Haxby is already inadequate around the shopping centre. Foul and surface water drainage is already inadequate and cannot cope with additional houses. The current land use is good quality agricultural land which should not be lost to housing when other sites are available. The land is also of historical importance, with ridge and furrow and Roman remains evident.</p> | |
| 13411v | ST9 | Obj | ST9 extends north into the green belt and its shape should be tighter to Haxby | Pilcher Homes |
| 13448 | ST9 | obi | <p>Alternative boundary submitted to allow for greater buffer to existing cemetery. Request that there is a buffer to the cemetery on all sides to preserve tranquil nature of the site and avoid overlooking. Revised buffer plan attached to submission.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13457 | ST9 | Obj | The increase in houses would add more residents and cars to an area where the infrastructure is already at breaking point. The doctors, schools, parking and drainage could not cope with any large scale development. It will be contrary to the council's clear definition of what the Local Plan should achieve 'It will improve the city and not damage the environment'. | |
| 13465 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development as town has grown too big. More cars will lead to worse parking, near the shops the cul-de-sacs are full which is inconvenient for those living there. Schools and health centre are full. Will ruin character of the village. | |
| 13472 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to building on the Green belt. Haxby is already overdeveloped, it is at capacity and building more houses will be detrimental to existing residents. Haxby has existing congestion issues, development will exacerbate congestion and pollution which is particularly bad for children at Wigginton Primary and Ralph Butterfield. Altering roads to try and accommodate the extra traffic will spoil the character of the village and will not prevent tail backs along Mill Lane and York Road. Concerned development will cause the village feel of Haxby to be lost, the green belt should be protected, providing open space on site will not compensate for this loss. Infrastructure and access to services is already inadequate. There are existing issues with drainage, sewerage and flooding that will be exacerbated. If there must be houses built then a much smaller development would be more acceptable. | |
| 13476 | ST9 | Obj | The proposed development is far too big given the existing amenities, transport infrastructure and schools provision in Haxby and Wigginton. Disappointed that previous objections focused on amenities, transport, infrastructure and schools do not seem to have been adequately addressed. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13481 | ST9 | Obj | Opposes as the increase in housing encroaches on countryside and is concerned that the increase in traffic will increase risk off accidents. York Road is already heavily congested at present. Haxby's infrastructure cannot accommodate additional demand and will lose its village feel. Brownfield land should be prioritised. Insidious that this is the fourth time they have had to object and feel it is a clear attempt to fatigue local democracy. | |
| 13482 | ST9 | Obj | Opposes as the increase in housing encroaches on countryside, is concerned that the increase in traffic will increase risk off accidents. York Road is already heavily congested at present. Haxby's infrastructure cannot accommodate additional demand and will lose its village feel. Brownfield land should be prioritised. Insidious that this is the fourth time they have had to object and feel it is a clear attempt to fatigue local democracy. | |
| 13483 | ST9 | Obj | Currently enjoys the countryside setting and cycling on the quiet roads, development will ruin this. | |
| 13493 | ST9 | Obj | Do not support the proposed housing development. 700+ houses is too many. The improved footpaths proposed as part of ST9 should be provided anyway and should not be dependant upon more housing. Need for a new cycle path between Mill Lane, Wigginton and Clifton Moor. This will increase safety and reduce car use. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13495 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Feels the local people's opinions have not been taken into consideration. Mill Lane, The Village and Moor Lane junction are very congested and cannot take more cars. Traffic and parking are an issue in Haxby. Major improvements need to be made to the ring road before development. Dualling carriageway and improving junctions and connecting roads is suggested. Surface water and drainage is already an issue and easily flooded. Asks about measurements to minimise noise pollution during and after construction. Concerned about lack of schools and overcrowding and house prices decreasing (affordable housing losing character of village). Cycle routes to city are poor.</p> | |
| 13496 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Development needs to take into account traffic infrastructure and pressure on local services, schools and healthcare. Traffic on Usher Lane and York Road is high and turns to gridlock in peak times.</p> | |
| 13504 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Haxby already has issues with congestion and parking, new housing will exacerbate this. The village's character will be altered and community damaged. Village services have to expand to meet additional demand. Says the village will become increasingly rowdy, as it has been in recent years. The ring road is a problem currently and this development along with ST14 will make matters worse.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13509 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Does not feel residents views have been taken into consideration, the claim to support economic growth by building new housing and the creation of 11,000 new jobs does not consider the current state of the city. Respondee works on call at the hospital and is required to get to the hospital quickly, this is very difficult in and around Haxby. Additional housing will only exacerbate congestion problems and bring Haxby to a standstill. The ring road is at capacity and will only get worse, notes that the problem is acknowledged but sees no plan to improve this or adjoining roads / junctions. Concerned about drainage in Haxby as it is inadequate currently, school is also at capacity. Concerned about air quality, asks what is being done to mitigate the impact. Unhappy that house prices are likely to decrease as a result of the development, adding more, and affordable housing will detract from the charm and ruin the village for existing residents. Finds cycling from Haxby to the city centre difficult, suggests a segregated cycle route like the one between Clifton Moor and Haxby Road to encourage more journeys into the city centre by bike. Disappointed by lack of communication.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13511 | ST9 | Obj | <p>Strongly object to ST9. These proposals are inappropriate and unsustainable for the following reasons: 1. drainage, the drainage system in Haxby is already at capacity and Haxby suffers from localised flooding after even average rainfall. An increase in housing will only make this worse. 2. congestion, traffic congestion is already an issue in Haxby and on the A1237. Adding the additional houses will cause gridlock at peak times. Upgrading the A1237 roundabouts will not work. The A1237 and the A64 eastwards would need to be duelled. The railway station at Haxby is not viable from a cost point of view. The local bus service is unreliable, the bus service would need to be enhanced. 3. pollution - the increase in traffic and congestion would increase local air pollution. 4. schools - there is not enough school capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in homes. 5. Impact on existing services - services such as hospitals, local health practices, refuse collection are already at capacity and the new houses would increase the burden. 6. property values - An increase in the number of homes proposed would have a negative effect on the value of existing properties in Haxby. It would impact on people's quality of life. 7. Loss of Green Belt - Brownfield sites should be developed first. 8. Safety - Usher Lane is already busy with fast cars and parked cars on the pavements are already a hazard. The safety of local residents would be at risk. 9. where are the people coming from who are going to live here?</p> | |
| 13550i | SS11 | Obj | <p>Object to the policy as it will take place on productive agricultural land and in the Green Belt. Also object to the low density housing rather than high density apartments. Garden Villages will also mean reliance on the car, this is counter to the Council's policy of trying to reduce car journeys.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13564 | ST9 | Obj | Agrees that there needs to be housing built locally but transport networks need investment before construction. Increased traffic will impact on Haxby and Wigginton residents' health, safety and quality of life. Mentions current cycle lanes on York Road are too narrow and dangerous. Doctors surgery and school are both at capacity now, would not be able to meet additional demand. | |
| 13580 | ST9 | Obj | Road vibrations are already shaking houses along The Village, Wigginton and Mill Lane. This route is already very busy as it is used by people looking to avoid the ring road. Dangerous for motorists trying to pull out and pedestrians alike, this will only be made worse by the proposed development, as will congestion and air quality. Adding to congestion seems to contradict policies on sustainability. Suggests traffic calming measures. Mentions that flash flooding and drainage is already a problem. Says Haxby and Wigginton infrastructure is at breaking point - schools, roads, healthcare and drainage, all require structural investment. Asks where the jobs will come from. Lists many policies / objectives that development here seems to contradict. | |
| 13604 | ST9 | Obj | Haxby and Wigginton cannot absorb further homes. The sewerage system is at capacity, roads are often gridlocked, schools do not have space for expansion and no more land for playing fields. Before additional homes are built infrastructure must be paramount. Homes are not the main objection but the lack of infrastructure to support them are. Brownfield site should be built first before the loss of Greenfield sites. Land banking by developers should be stopped. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13614 | ST9 | Obj | The plans do not upgrade the infrastructure to support the extra housing before or at the same time as the housing to be built. Haxby already has an overcrowded doctors surgery, is losing shops and banks and being replaced by charity/coffee shops. Bus services are unreliable and traffic congestion, especially in mornings is causing delays. Improvements need to come first. | |
| 13628 | ST9 | Obj | This policy states that the development of 735 houses will require a new primary school. This is inconsistent as the policies for ST1 and ST2 which would be 1500 houses does not mention the requirement for a new school. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 13630 | ST9 | Obj | Very concerned about the roads, medical and educational facilities as all are already at capacity. | |
| 13631 | ST9 | Obj | There are unfinished projects which ought to be completed before further building is considered for example the council adopted Windmill Way and all roads off it more than 40 years and yet no final top surface has been laid on the base concrete which is now pot-holed and dangerous. The doctors is over-subscribed, there is insufficient parking close to the shops for the elderly. The nearest school needs to be refurbished and extended or a new primary school built. No information is available about footpaths or roads linking to current roads. At least 50% of all new housing should be affordable for young people. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13644 | ST9 | Obj | There are unfinished projects which ought to be completed before further building is considered for example the council adopted Windmill Way and all roads off it more than 40 years and yet no final top surface has been laid on the base concrete which is now pot-holed and dangerous. The doctors is over-subscribed, there is insufficient parking close to the shops for the elderly. The nearest school needs to be refurbished and extended or a new primary school built. No information is available about footpaths or roads linking to current roads. At least 50% of all new housing should be affordable for young people. | |
| 13644 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of likely traffic increase, and impact on road infrastructure. | |
| 13646 | ST9 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds - infrastructure, shops and services are at capacity; suggested access roads have limited scope to take additional traffic; congestion on ORR and access roads (York Road, Haxby / Usher Lane / Station Road). Queries justification for positive transport score; parking; drainage and sewerage; | |
| 1528 | SS11 | Supp | The Developers support policy SS11 in that there is a need for a detailed policy to guide the development of the Site and support the requirement for a masterplan within the policy. The Developers wholly support the proposed site, and its estimated development capacity, and confirm that this can be delivered in the plan period. | DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division |
| 1741 | ST9 | Supp | More new housing sites will be required to meet the OAN - the whole of ST9 plus additional land to the immediate east may alternatively be considered for housing allocation. | Carter Jonas on behalf of client |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5410iv | ST9 | Supp | Strongly supports site, which should be extended further north to allow hundreds more houses to be added along with the already urgent need for a new secondary school. A township the size of Haxby should already have this facility. | |
| 13664 | ST9 | Supp | Area of open space set aside will add value for the children living in the area. Proposed rail station is scheduled for longer term, hope the commitment will become a reality as would benefit the people of Haxby and Wigginton. | |
| 9432 | ST9 | Supp | Supports garden village development. Must be adapted in a way where they do not become extended suburbs and have good transport links. | |
| 9784 | ST9 | Supp | Support for the principle of housing site adjacent to current villages | |
| 10275 | ST9 | Supp | General support for site - note request for homes to be affordable and that infrastructure (roads/drainage) is provided for. | |
| 13287 | ST9 | Supp | Affordable housing should be provided, feels new primary school is needed for area. | |
| 13343 | ST9 | Supp | Support this site - my concerns are traffic and parking on Usher Lane - could double yellow lines or resident only parking be considered (bearing in mind if rail station opens) | |
| 13359 | ST9 | Supp | Pleased to see the development at ST9 as it will create more needed housing. | |
| 13514 | ST9 | Supp | Development should not be built without an upgrade to Haxby's water and waste water system, a new primary school, an elderly/dementia care home, more convenience stores, a safe cycle lane into York, an extension to the health centre, social and affordable housing on at least 30% of development, safeguarded extension/land for Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery, new station and park and ride system and an improvement on bus routes. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13548 | ST9 | Supp | <p>Supports the provision of new housing in Haxby but major infrastructure upgrades need to be made to: water and waste water infrastructure; a new primary school; a new care home; a cycle lane into York along with a new Park and Ride site with bus service; improved bus service generally; a new link road from the Haxby / Strensall back Road (Cross Moor Lane) over to the Wigginton / Helmsley Road; an extension to Haxby Health Centre; a new Rail Station; social and affordable housing to make up a minimum of 30% of new developments and new convenience stores within the development to ease local traffic. There should also be land safeguarded for an extension to Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS12: Land West of Wigginton Road (ST14) | | | | |
| 42 | ST14 | Comm | ST14 has the potential to be expanded as it is within arable farmland which will have low biodiversity. A net gain in biodiversity would be possible with well planned green infrastructure. Sustainable transport links to Clifton Moor across the A1237 would be considerably more direct and quicker than car journeys so would encourage more active travel. Links by cycle to a new rail station at Haxby would also be possible and would enable car free commuting to work and schools etc. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 45i | ST14 | Comm | If development was increased in size to 5000 units and external transport issues addressed a case could be made for development to take pressure off ST15 and ST9. | YEF |
| 75 | ST14 | Comm | Development could seriously affect the village because of the increased traffic flow and potential 'rat running' through Skelton to avoid the A1237. Improvements to the Northern Ring Road are vital. Must also consider the impact of housing growth in adjacent authorities | Skelton Parish Council |
| 100 | ST14 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | York Georgian Society |
| 136 | ST14 | Comm | ST14 has extensive tree cover which needs to be conserved. | Skelton Village Trust |
| 372 | ST14 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | Conservation Areas Advisory Panel |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 456 | ST14 | Comm | The use of 'garden village' is meaningless window dressing, and the creation of a local centre needs joined-up thinking which includes transport and the city centre. The traffic aims need consideration within the process of urban design and bold holistic transport network planning. With good urban design and proper transport links to the city, a target above 15% of people using public transport could be achieved. | |
| 1355 | ST14 | Comm | Whilst the significant fall in housing numbers from previous consultations is welcomed, this site will still significantly impact on York's already pressured transport network. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 1901 | ST14 | Comm | Objects as on green belt land and too close to Skelton and ring road which will cause urban overspill. Historic setting of Skelton would be damaged. Will cause gridlock on A1237. Local villages, such as Skelton, are struggling from the current effects of rat-running as traffic tries to avoid the congested A1237. Notes potential for increased rat-running from ST14, in particular for Moorlands Road, The Village and St Giles Road. Site should be removed. | |
| 4355 | ST14 | Comm | In relation to the Phase 2 Terry's Car Park Site, fully supports the allocation for housing however the figure of 33 dwellings is predicated on the Council's expressed desire to secure a low profile development on this site. This approach fails to take account of the positive visual, landscape and urban design benefits that would accrue from a taller and denser development which would create a strong gateway feature for the town on Bishopthorpe road. This can be achieved on the car park site without compromising views of the Multi Storey Factory and Clock Tower. Goes into further detail later in response. | ELG Planning on behalf of Henry B |
| 4430 | ST14 | Comm | Will cause more congestion, road improvement needs to happen before more houses are built. | |
| 5410i | ST14 | Comm | More houses and a secondary school needed at site. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 5446 | ST14 | Comm | Supports garden village. Should be possible to walk/ cycle if able. Concerned about roads becoming more obstructed and congested, needs better access. | |
| 5597 | ST14 | Comm | No houses should be built until ring road is duelled, roundabouts will not fix problem. | |
| 11128 | ST14 | Comm | Housing development on this site should not happen without remodelling work on roundabout junctions on A1237 from Poppleton in the west to Monks Cross Link Road in the east. There is no dedicated bus service to this site either. | |
| 12407 | ST14 | Comm | It would be more cost efficient for developers to begin development with ST14 rather than ST9. The 'clean slate' approach will provide the opportunity for community design. A traffic plan for Wigginton Road and A1237 based on anticipated (final) numbers should be done. The following services should be provided for the new community: GP surgery, dental surgery, primary school(s), secondary school provision within walking/public transport distance, library, cemetery, church/mosque, open and green space, retail shops (incl parking), land for employment (incl parking), transport hub, other transport links (taxi rank). | Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 12527 | ST14 | Comm | Does not object to the development so long as 1) there is no access by Moorlands Road as the road is already too narrow and should not be widened. There is already too much through traffic using Skelton as a short cut to avoid the outer ring road between Wigginton Road and the A19. 2) The A1237 is made into a dual carriageway before any more development, already inadequate. | |
| 13026 | ST14 | Comm | Housing infrastructure bid submitted to the government with the aim of accelerating the delivery of new homes on the site within the plan period. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Comm | The Proposals Map appears to show two Indicative Access points for ST14, however one of the pink lines is dashed and one is solid. We presume that this is an oversight and that both lines are meant to be dashed as per the accompanying key, however confirmation would be greatly appreciated. | Airedon Planning and Design |
| 13182 | ST14 | Comm | A series of individual letters promoting each site including ST14 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13211 | ST14 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 13240 | ST14 | Comm | Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237). | |
| 13321 | ST14 | Comm | Concerned that the plan should manage the impact of additional traffic on A1237 access roads at Clifton Moor and B1363 Wigginton Road. Both roads are at capacity now. Sustainable transport alternatives have largely failed. | |
| 13412 | ST14 | Comm | If ST14 goes ahead a cycle path should be built along Wigginton Road to connect it and Wigginton to the Ring Road. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 13587 | ST14 | Comm | As an established local business with potential for growth, Body Fix ask that they continue to be consulted in developing ST14 given the potential impacts to their operation from highway/housing development and the opportunities offered by housing growth in the local area. | Body Fix Transformation Centre |
| 13637i | SS12 | Comm | This policy is well written in planning terms, however, CPRENY does not understand how the physical and social infrastructure needed to support the aim of sustainable communities will be achieved at this location as it is remote from existing infrastructure. It would be more appropriate to deliver the new units attached to another proposed new garden village or as a extension to existing settlement. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |
| 4 | SS12 | Obj | A site of this size, especially when considered with other large sites in the area, is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city, so there should be a reference to the need to agree traffic impact and mitigation measures with HE. | Highways England |
| 71 | ST14 | Obj | This policy states that traffic issues need to be considered in conjunction with other developments in the area. There should be the same requirement for sites ST1 and ST2. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 78 | ST14 | Obj | This policy states that traffic issues need to be considered in conjunction with other developments in the area. There should be the same requirement for sites ST1 and ST2. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 136 | ST14 | Obj | This land represents a significant intrusion into valuable green space separating Skelton and Wigginton. | Skelton Village Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 262 | SS12 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 386 | ST14 | Obj | This site is too small to stand alone as a sustainable garden village, but is still very large as a development site which if built without additional sustainable transport provision will generate unacceptable traffic congestion both in the immediate area and on arterial routes into the north of the city centre. Reducing the numbers on this site should be considered. | York Green Party |
| 970 | ST14 | Obj | A1237 is already gridlocked and pollution high, exacerbated by the Vanguard development. Plans to alleviate traffic problems are welcome but there does not seem to be funding for the plans. Support efforts to build housing and the prioritisation of brownfield land, concerned by proposed building on 55ha of green belt for this scheme. Objects on the basis that without funding for necessary road improvements the scheme will be unviable. | |
| 1352i | ST14 | obi | Do not think ST14 is deliverable or developable in the context of the NPPF because no indication when it is likely to be permitted, multiple land ownership, complex to deliver with phased delivery and the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the development, which will inhibit delivery. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakeford P |
| 1498 | ST14 | obi | Do not think ST14 is deliverable or developable in the context of the NPPF because no indication when it is likely to be permitted, multiple land ownership, complex to deliver with phased delivery and the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the development, which will inhibit delivery. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Ho |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1661 | ST14 | Obj | Site has not been assessed against reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal, nor is it deliverable or developable when considered in the context of the NPPF. | Lichfields on behalf of Linden Homes |
| 1914 | ST14 | Obj | The proposed size of ST14 is not proportionate to the adjacent village of Skelton. It represents a significant loss of valuable agricultural land and loss of open countryside, existing adjacent infrastructure highway, drainage, water treatment will not support such a development. | |
| 2416 | ST14 | Obj | The relative size of Site ST14 needs to be carefully considered. The development at Site ST14 will place considerable strain on facilities at Wigginton/Haxby and also impose a much heavier traffic flow on the already highly congested ring road. | |
| 2456 | ST14 | Obj | There are proposals for 1348 dwellings on ST14 and this will have a large impact on a) transport links especially on Wigginton Road and Wigginton Road roundabout. This proposal will make congestion worse. Dualling of the ring road should be considered. b) flood risk, the Council has already done some drainage work along Wigginton Road, new houses could add to be problem. c) education, the proposal should provide for finance and an additional primary school in advance of the building of dwellings. d) health and wellbeing, a further increase in residents would have an effect on the service the doctors practice in Haxby/Wigginton can offer. e) transport, there is not enough parking spaces in Haxby and Wigginton at present let alone when additional dwellings are built. | |
| 2513 | ST14 | Obj | The Wigginton-A1237 bypass is already heavily congested. Additional development will add untenable traffic to a very busy road. | |
| 3045(ii) | ST14 | Obj | Site should be removed from the Plan. The A1237 is at capacity. Would support alternative development to east of York. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 3428 | ST14 | Obj | Strongly object to the use of 55 ha of prime agricultural land in the Green Belt. In-depth transport modelling for the A1237 has yet to be undertaken. This is a concern as the congestion is already at critical levels and will be made worse by the development proposed in the local plan. | Skelton Village Action Group |
| 3245iii | ST14 | Obj | New village will require new additional utilities, especially as the nearest water treatment plant at Rawcliffe is working at maximum capacity. Says that the development will become additional housing for Leeds commuters as there are insufficient jobs within York to accommodate this number of people. Despite plans to upgrade roundabouts on the northern section of the A1237 ring road this is too little too late and by the time this development is started it will be far too late. Plans to restrict road traffic through the city centre will only increase congestion on the A1237. | |
| 3967 | ST14 | Obj | Of the many problems raised in ST14, questions any plans linked to the Outer Ring Road. The sprawl of the city beyond the Ring Road with 1348 houses in a somewhat isolated area will require some localised services, or are the plans to link into Wigginton Road which is a very busy, high-speed through route? Even now with the waiting area leading into Wigginton from the Ring Road at the traffic lights is not long enough, so causing hold ups in the through road with a green light. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4158 | ST14 | Obj | <p>This Plan has failed to take notice of previous high levels of objections to this site. Object to this site and have huge concerns over sustainability and the impact on green belt around Haxby and Wigginton will be disastrous. Brownfield development should be exhausted first. NPPF Para 158 requires a relevant and adequate evidence base and Para 182 states policies have to be based on proportionate evidence consistent with national policy. The RSS was revoked except for policies YH9 and Y1C - these relate to the York Green Belt. YH9 states inner boundaries should be defined to establish the long term development limits that safeguard the special character and setting of York. CYC need to assess the urban capacity of the central core so that no significant adverse impact on the character and setting takes place. A long term evaluation of around 30 years needs to be carried out - this has not been done. Haxby and Wigginton are outside the inner boundary and it is implied the capacity within the inner boundary should be developed first but CYC have not assessed the inner boundary capacity - thus the proposal is not justified as required by NPPF.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4159 | ST14 | Obj | <p>This Plan has failed to take notice of previous high levels of objections to this site. The only difference is the proposed buffer to the south of the development from Usher Lane in the east and to Moor lane in the west which will make no difference at all. There has been a failure to work with our local communities and parish councils when designing the development visions - CYC have obviously ignored the huge objections to this development. I find it inconceivable that more than 36 ha of green belt will be removed for ST9 and ST14. Haxby and Wigginton are small historic villages where local infrastructure is already under threat. Without significant sustainable investment in our infrastructure we risk grinding to a halt. There is congestion on the outer ring road and A64 that slow down residents and local businesses and increases the risk of accidents. Greenbelt should protect Haxby and Wigginton from development. The negative aspects to consider regarding this site proposal are; we should protect agricultural land and green belt land, Haxby and Wigginton are already over developed, infrastructure and access to key services are already inadequate, parking in the village is almost impossible now, existing drainage, sewage and flooding issues are serious, congestion is a problem, the outer ring road is severely congested, the burial ground expansion needs consideration and the site is crossed by high transmission power lines. Access to schools, GP, local public transport, traffic access, suitable roads, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young and old and more vulnerable, are all concerns.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4204 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Objects to building on green belt land, the site is too large and will have an adverse effect on the rural setting of medieval Skelton. York's 'Priority Greenbelt Status' should be respected, the city contained within the outer ringroad and this site removed. The A1237 is already operating beyond capacity and nearly 3000 extra cars would mean total gridlock, this alone should render the site unviable. Further sites to the north of York will have a cumulative impact on traffic flow on the A1237 that should not be underestimated. Would like to point out that it is not just the additional traffic from York's Local Plan that will impact the northern ring road, the Harrogate and Hambleton Plans will also bring increased traffic to York.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4797 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Haxby / Wigginton are already over-developed, infrastructure, especially the roads are inadequate, as is access to services. Congestion will get worse. Existing draining, sewerage and flooding issues in Haxby and along Wigginton Road are already serious and will be exacerbated. Agricultural land should be protected. Green space will need to be preserved along Moor Lane and Usher Lane if development is to be acceptable. Ring Roads need to be duelled before any development takes place. Sufficient space for the expansion of Haxby burial ground must be allowed. Goes into further detail on specific roads and where congestion will arise should development proceed. Stresses severity of local flooding / drainage issues and says that in the interest of accountability council employees should be made personally financially responsible for any insurance claims that arise from flooding caused by development. Closes by saying that opposition to the development is not NIMBYism as such, people are generally accepting of the need for housing but any further development will require huge investment in supporting infrastructure as the current provision is failing as it is.</p> | |
| 4816 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Object to ST14 on the following grounds: concern over the additional cars created by this development, the Outer Ring Road needs to be duelled first. The increase in traffic would also have a bad affect on traders in the area. Concern over the people using the narrow road between Skelton and Wigginton more to avoid the traffic jams on the Outer Ring Road. Queries whether the proposal will include a primary or secondary school? would there be any shops in the proposed development? would there be a community centre or church? all of these will increase traffic in and out of the development.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5263 | ST14 | Obj | Reduce congestion in an imaginative way, such as by banning car ownership. | |
| 5307 | ST14 | Obj | Local transport needs to be improved before more housing is developed. Should also look at impact of new housing on development - suggests that new housing should have solar panels and enough garden space. Objects to nearby fracking. | |
| 5379 | ST14 | Obj | Access roads cannot take more traffic. Schools needed. Planning provisions need to be made before development. | |
| 7902 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt; impact on overstretched services/amenities (drainage, schools, doctors); severe congestion on York Road/Wigginton Road, feeding onto severely congested A1237. Notes increase in travel times identified by transport plan. | |
| 9210 | ST14 | Obj | Concern over current and future Outer Ring Road congestion as it is over capacity now. Questions who will pay for the upgrades to the Outer Ring Road. Queries how the high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services will be delivered throughout the site and links to other rural communities where feasible and to other employment centres? 1348 houses is unlikely to produce enough passengers for services to be commercial even if everyone used public transport. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9381i | ST14 | obi | ST14 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. The site will generate a significant amount of traffic on the A1237. It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP Planning on behalf of Linden |
| 9633 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of likely increased congestion on local roads and A1237. Without dualling the northern ring road and providing further access roads to the ringroad, plans north of Haxby will simply result in gridlock/congestion/pollution. Also objects to impacts on local amenities/resources (schools, shops, open space etc). | |
| 9649i | ST14 | Obj | Village infrastructure will not cope with additional demand, schools and doctors are at capacity now. The village already has traffic problems, traffic along Wigginton and Haxby roads are often gridlocked at peak times as the A1237 is clogged. The A1237 is often gridlocked, unless it is fully upgraded (not just roundabouts) the development should no proceed. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10097 | ST14 | obi | ST14 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. The site will generate a significant amount of traffic on the A1237. It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP Planning on behalf of Shephe |
| 10351 | ST14 | Obj | Haxby & Wigginton already have problems with the volume of traffic and drainage which development will exacerbate. Investment needed before the houses are built. | |
| 10610 | ST14 | Obj | The B1363 access to the A1237 is already grossly inadequate with a dangerous roundabout. More people using the B1363 will cause greater difficulty and danger. Haxby is already too busy, as it is a 'cut through' to avoid the A1237. Haxby needs better roads. | |
| 11089 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to likely impact of development on local area, namely: traffic congestion adjacent to the already congested A1237; mix of homes should reflect local need. | |
| 11100 | ST14 | Obj | Concern over 1. the additional traffic on the Outer Ring Road due to the additional cars from ST14 and the traffic jams it will create 2. the sewerage which will swamp existing services. | |
| 11135 | ST14 | Obj | Traffic congestion already exists on the ring road, and the other route through Haxby has dangerous driving and sharp bends. Need traffic calming measures or extra capacity to be able to cope with proposed houses. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12233 | ST14 | Obj | Object to development on open farm land. Also development bordering villages that already suffer from bad congestion is short sighted. | |
| 12257 | ST14 | Obj | Disappointed that Haxby share of new housing programme was not reduced following the Strensall barracks announcement. States that dualling northern part of outer ring road is a must. | Haxby Town Councillor |
| 12542 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of impact on traffic (A1237), drainage and sewerage. | |
| 12560 | ST14 | obi | ST14 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. The site will generate a significant amount of traffic on the A1237. It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP on behalf of landowner |
| 12830 | ST14 | Obj | Local transport needs to be improved before more housing is developed. Should also look at impact of new housing on development - suggests that new housing should have solar panels and enough garden space. Objects to nearby fracking. | |
| 12950 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to development adding congestion to A1237. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13026 | ST14 | obi | <p>Alternative boundary to ST14 suggesting 1350 homes. Boundary includes additional land to the north with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 42.3 ha net site area at 32 dph. Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York. Consider that 1350 would be delivered within the plan period. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.46km.. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 2 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 16.52ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial area of green space on western boundary. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13026 | ST14 | obi | <p>Alternative boundary to ST14 suggesting 1725 homes, which is the recommended option. Boundary includes additional land to the north with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 53.9 ha net site area at 32 dph. Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York. Consider that 1725 dwellings could be delivered within the plan period. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.46km. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12 with proportionate enhancement of benefits. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 2 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 17.12ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial areas of green space on western boundary. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13026 | ST14 | obi | <p>Alternative boundary to ST14 suggesting 2200 homes. Boundary includes additional land to the north and south with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 67.9 ha net site area at 32 dph.</p> <p>Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York and the requirement to ensure a permanent Green Belt. Consider that 2200 dwellings could be delivered within the plan period of a care home and build to rent are implemented within first 5 years. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.25km. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.42km. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12 with proportionate enhancement of benefits. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 3 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 27.09 ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial areas of green space on western boundary. Additional openspace to north which would likely be new woodland plantation. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.</p> | |
| 13030 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Due to Site ST14's relative isolation from the existing highway, new roads would need to be developed crossing tracts of intervening countryside. The woodland belt contains views from the east, whilst to the north, south and west, views will be possible despite the site being relatively flat. This allocations cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. The Draft Local Plan is unsound as a result.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13065ii | ST14 | Obj | Development will exacerbate existing congestion and local air quality will deteriorate impacting residents' health. Haxby and Wigginton health centre is at capacity, a new facility would be needed. Mentions that the land north of Haxby is divided into a number of fields that are not intensively farmed, these fields along with hedgerows and mature trees provide habitats for a number of species that could be lost. Also mentions there is need for up to 2.3 acres of additional land for the joint Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery which should be taken into consideration. Questions police resources and the ability to provide extra officers to police the area. | |
| 13178 | SS12 | Obj | Policy SS12, which relates to the development of proposed allocation ST14, makes no reference to the need for an assessment in the context of York's heritage assets, such as the Minster. It is the representor's opinion that the Council has failed to appropriately assess ST14 in heritage terms. | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>A preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) of proposed strategic housing allocation site ST14, commissioned by the representor (submitted as Appendix A to the representation) identifies two important views that encompass the site: from York Minster towards the north, and from the White Horse at Kilburn towards York Minster. In both of these views, the green countryside around the built-up area of York is very obvious. The proposed allocation site lies in the middle of this view. Whilst there would be no impact upon the views from the White Horse the impact upon the view from the Minster would be “major adverse”. Whilst the view from the Minster is not one that is seen by all visitors to the city, a substantial number of visitors do benefit from this sight. However, the view from this historic building is not only important for the view itself, and the setting of the Minster, but from the principle of the development of the City of York. The proposed allocation site, if developed, would critically change the ‘established’ historic development pattern of the city. This would effectively comprise the first ‘planned’ extension to the City beyond the ring road, rather than the strengthening of the existing character of the city.</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>A preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) of proposed strategic housing allocation site ST14, commissioned by the representor (submitted as Appendix A to the representation) concludes that the development of ST14 would have the following landscape effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Development of 1,350 or 1,725 homes and infrastructure would directly alter the fabric of the physical components within the site and introduce built form into an area which was previously pastoral. Supporting infrastructure and associated structures and lighting are required to service the development and will extend outside of the consultation boundary. The nature and location of the new highways, infrastructure upgrades and extent of lighting are unclear within the City of York Plan – Preferred Sites Consultation 2016. • The character of the site is considered to have few detracting features and contribute to a positive landscape character. The area conforms to, and contains many of the key characteristics described within the Vale Farmland with Plantation Woodland and Heathland character type. Development on the site would introduce built form and visual detractors, the most obtrusive considered to be the increased amount of lighting into this area and as such would conflict with national and local landscape character. | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting of the outlying villages would change as the scattered settlement pattern would become less apparent when travelling along the country lanes and footpaths within the study area and the quiet rural landscape which currently separates them would become urbanised. • The necessary upgrading of infrastructure to support the development on land off Wigginton Lane (ST14) would potentially change the character of this rural road with the addition of street lighting and improvements to the junction. • Development would impair the perception of important green links from the existing Green Wedge into the open countryside”. <p>Overall, the greatest visual effects are likely to be experienced close to the proposed allocation at Viewpoint 4 Moor Lane and Viewpoint 2 Wigginton Lane where the overall level of effect is judged to be major adverse. At these locations, the development would form a prominent new component within the view that would alter the character of the view. In terms of effects on long range views, particularly from York Minster, the development would blur the distinction between the urban core of the city and the open countryside beyond, negatively affecting the setting of York.</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>An Ecology Appraisal Update commissioned by the representor (submitted as Appendix C to the representation) concludes that the proposed access road locations [for ST14] will cause loss of habitat, disturbance and fragmentation within ecological sensitive areas (namely Nova Scotia Plantation and Clifton Airfield SLI) and potentially affect protected species (badger and great crested newts).</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>A Transport and Highways Report commissioned by the representor (submitted as Appendix B to the representation) states that <i>“ST14 is poorly located to achieve the objectives of sustainable travel set out in both local and national transport policies. The site is unrelated to existing development and it is unlikely that a significant number of trips will be by way of sustainable modes of transport”</i>. The report highlights existing issues associated with severe delays and congestion on the Outer Ring Road to the south of the site and demonstrates that conditions will significantly deteriorate even without ST14 from which it is concluded that the LTP programme of measures including junction capacity enhancements and the dualling of the ORR from Wetherby Road to Clifton Moor should be progressed. However, as set out in the LTP, funding for the scheme, which will require third party land, is uncertain. Furthermore, <i>“developing ST14 for some 850 houses within the plan period and a further 498 houses in the five years afterwards, will significantly worsen delays and congestion. It is therefore considered that without a firm commitment to the implementation of the LTP proposals, ST14 should not be allocated since there is no certainty that any necessary mitigation measures can be implemented. To do otherwise could result in the site being allocated but not deliverable.”</i></p> | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Objects to the proposed housing allocation ref: ST14 (land to the west of Wigginton Road) on behalf of its Client. the potential increase in the size of the allocation, put forward by those promoting the site, and the options of which were taken forward for Executive Committee consideration on 13th July 2017, has not been taken forward into the draft Plan. The Representor's client has concerns regarding the way in which the Council has assessed the proposed housing allocation off Wigginton Road (ST14). There appear to be a number of serious flaws and inconsistencies in the way in which the Council has undertaken their site selection process. The Site Selection Paper sets out the various stages of assessment, the scoring system that was used to assess the sites and a scoring threshold utilised to discount sites. Although the majority of sites were taken through the above scoring system, sites over 100ha that could provide a minimum of 3,000 dwellings (based on a net developable area of 60% of the site at a density of 50dph) would be large enough to provide all the local services including a primary school, local shops and services, open space and sustainable transport routes on site. were except form scoring exercise and were taken forward for further assessment.</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>At the time of the initial assessments, the Wigginton Road site (now ST14) was part of a much larger amalgamated site known as 'land north of Clifton Moor'. It stretched to 134 hectares in size. Given the scale of the site, 'land north of Clifton Moor' and another site at Whinthorpe met the above larger sites threshold and were fast-tracked to the detailed Stage 2 assessment. Since this early assessment, the scale of the 'land north of Clifton Moor' site has decreased significantly to form what is now the ST14 site (land west of Wigginton Road). The site now only extends to 55 hectares and falls significantly short of the 100ha threshold set out in the Site Selection Paper for it to be a sustainable standalone settlement. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any evidence to suggest that the Council has revisited Criterias 4a and 4b once the site size had been significantly reduced. It is our view that the site would fail the accessibility to public transport and/or facilities and services tests. If this is the case, it is our view that the site should never have been included as a potential allocation and should therefore be excluded as a result.</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13178 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Representations submitted in relation to the previous Local Plan consultation on behalf of the landowners and promoters of the ST14 site suggested that an increase in size (of at least 10 hectares) was necessary in order to be able to deliver the number of houses and community infrastructure needed to be inline with the Garden Village design philosophy that needed to be utilised given that ST14 will essentially become a standalone settlement. Furthermore, these representation stated <i>"the allocation boundary needs to be expanded in order to deliver a minimum of 1,350 homes at the site"</i>. The Executive Committee decision on 13th July 2017 appeared to reject the proposal to increase the scale of the ST14 allocation. Thus, the representor concludes that ST14 cannot deliver a self-sufficient standalone settlement, capable of bringing forward York's housing growth in a sustainable manner. This is a concern expressed by the promoters of the site themselves, which really does put into serious question the deliverability and sustainability of the site, and whether the site is even remotely suitable for residential development.</p> | Airedon Planning and Design |
| 13233 | ST14 | Obj | <p>The northern ring road (A1237) struggles to cope with the current level of traffic, development will worsen congestion.</p> | |
| 13234 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Disagrees with development as the site is on greenbelt and fears this will open the door to future expansion / intrusion into the countryside.</p> | |
| 13238 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237).</p> | |
| 13245 | ST14 | Obj | <p>The ring road cannot support a further 1348 houses. The road must be upgraded to dual carriageway first.</p> | |
| 13275 | ST14 | Obj | <p>Objects to the impact of development on the already congested A1237 ring road. Also questions the need for further development given 1348 homes built at Water Lane.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 13288 | ST14 | Obj | Object to the proposed housing developments designated ST14 and H58 own the grounds that they would add future loads to the already overburdened sewerage / surface water infrastructure and there is a very real danger of flooding due to sewage/surface water back-up | |
| 13301 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to the impact of development on the already congested A1237 ring road. | |
| 13314 | ST14 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of traffic congestion - adding more than 1000 homes, with extra cars, will overwhelm existing roads. Need to dual the ORR. | |
| 13315 | ST14 | Obj | Outer ring road cannot cope with traffic now and will struggle with more traffic. Needs public transport initiatives. | |
| 13335 | ST14 | Obj | ST14 is a very large new housing site which is in reality a new village and will use current infrastructure which is already not fit for purpose. No new schools or any other facilities or services are planned and will add to flooding. | |
| 13345 | ST14 | Obj | Site ST14 would be totally inappropriate unless the ring road, which is already gridlocked a lot of the time, was upgraded to dual carriageway. | |
| 13353 | ST14 | Obj | This will cause a totally unacceptable increase in traffic on the A1237 which already resembles a car and lorry park at times. | |
| 13398 | ST14 | Obj | Infrastructure needs upgrading before any further development - doctors, schools (both primary and secondary), drainage and parking in Haxby village. Outer Ring Road is most in need of investment, it is often gridlocked even outside of peak times, at a minimum needs dualling between Clifton Moor and Hopgrove, Haxby and Wigginton. | |
| 13411v | ST14 | Obj | This site is not sustainable because it is dependent on new infrastructure and would work as a dormitory settlement that puts pressure on to the ring road. | Pilcher Homes |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13418 | ST14 | Obj | Object to the large scale housing development (ST14) proposed on Green Belt land. | |
| 13462 | ST14 | Obj | Roads are already inadequate so it is not feasible to add more traffic to the network. Congestion and related costs or delays and health effects of pollution are already major issues. Major investment in radial routes (especially A59) and ring road should be a priority. | |
| 13493 | ST14 | Obj | The garden village at ST14 is not supported. There are other sites in York (identified in the Plan) which will regenerate derelict areas and these should be prioritised. The improved footpaths proposed as part of ST14 should be provided anyway and should not be dependant upon more housing. Need for a new cycle path between Mill Lane, Wigginton and Clifton Moor. This will increase safety and reduce car use. | |
| 13495 | ST14 | Obj | Feels the local people's opinions have not been taken into consideration. Mill Lane, The Village and Moor Lane junction are very congested and cannot take more cars. Traffic and parking are an issue in Haxby. Major improvements need to be made to the ring road before development. Dualling carriageway and improving junctions and connecting roads is suggested. Surface water and drainage is already an issue and easily flooded. Asks about measurements to minimise noise pollution during and after construction. Concerned about lack of schools and overcrowding and house prices decreasing (affordable housing losing character of village). Cycle routes to city are poor. | |
| 13504 | ST14 | Obj | The area is unable to accommodate such a large expansion, the ring road is already badly congested and development will only make this worse. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13509 | ST14 | Obj | Does not feel residents views have been taken into consideration, the claim to support economic growth by building new housing and the creation of 11,000 new jobs does not consider the current state of the city. Respondee works on call at the hospital and is required to get to the hospital quickly, this is very difficult in and around Haxby. Additional housing will only exacerbate congestion problems and bring Haxby to a standstill. The ring road is at capacity and will only get worse, notes that the problem is acknowledged but sees no plan to improve this or adjoining roads / junctions. Concerned about drainage in Haxby as it is inadequate currently, school is also at capacity. Concerned about air quality, asks what is being done to mitigate the impact. Unhappy that house prices are likely to decrease as a result of the development, adding more, and affordable housing will detract from the charm and ruin the village for existing residents. Finds cycling from Haxby to the city centre difficult, suggests a segregated cycle route like the one between Clifton Moor and Haxby Road to encourage more journeys into the city centre by bike. Disappointed by lack of communication. | |
| 13514 | ST14 | Obj | Objects as site is green field and green belt land and already has traffic issues along A1237. Development would contribute to flooding and congestion problems and require new services. | |
| 13526 | ST14 | Obj | Site has not been assessed against reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal, nor is it deliverable or developable when considered in the context of the NPPF. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakefield Properties |
| 13537 | ST14 | Obj | Object in principle to this over large development outside the ring road. Access and increased traffic especially on this very congested part of the A64. Will community amenities (school, church, shops, community space etc) be included? Where will people work? What is being done to encourage businesses to locate in the York area? | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13550i | SS12 | Obj | Object to the policy as it will take place on productive agricultural land and in the Green Belt. Also object to the low density housing rather than high density apartments. Garden Villages will also mean reliance on the car, this is counter to the Council's policy of trying to reduce car journeys. | |
| 13564 | ST14 | Obj | Appreciates the need to build housing but stresses investment in needed in local transport network, the ring road is often gridlocked at present. Mentions the site is close to the proposed fracking site and the risk this poses to potential residents' health. | |
| 13624 | ST14 | Obj | This site is outside the ring road so not a natural extension to any existing housing area. Traffic around Clifton Moor is particularly congested for most of the day, any further housing will only exacerbate this, adding to air pollution that harms the health of residents. | |
| 13628 | ST14 | Obj | This policy states that traffic issues need to be considered in conjunction with other developments in the area. There should be the same requirement for sites ST1 and ST2. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 13632 | ST14 | Obj | The A1237 is often gridlocked and the additional traffic will exacerbate this, it will make the job of emergency services exceptionally difficult which is putting lives at risk. The A1237 simply cannot cope without the additional volume of traffic if it stays a single carriageway. | |
| 75 | ST14 | Supp | Parish Council welcomes the proposed reduction in the total housing numbers for York, and in particular the reduced size of ST14. | Skelton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST14 | Supp | Support the principle of development, as part of a strategy to accommodate growth. The degree of harm caused to the openness of the green belt in this location could be far less than would be cause should the housing in this settlement be located, instead, on the edge of the existing built up area of the City or in its surrounding settlements. The site's size/location appears to have taken account of the relationship which York has to its surrounding villages - identified within the Heritage Topic Paper as being part of the character of the City. It has been designed to ensure development does not threaten the individual identity or rural setting of neighbouring villages, preventing the treat of coalescence or visual intrusion to the green wedge and important views from the ring road. Would have significant concerns were the size of this settlement to increase. There is considerable work still to do to demonstrate that the infrastructure necessary to deliver this scale of housing can be achieved in a manner which will minimise harm to the rural setting and does not harm other elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York. | Historic England |
| 1355 | ST14 | Supp | Whilst the significant fall in housing numbers from previous consultations is welcomed, this site will still significantly impact on York's already pressured transport network. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 5446 | ST14 | Supp | Supports garden village. Should be possible to walk/ cycle if able. Concerned about roads becoming more obstructed and congested, needs better access. | |
| 5826vi | ST14 | Supp | Land immediately to the north of this site (and south of Moor Lane) should be safeguarded for development after the current plan period (i.e. Excluded from Green Belt) and designed into the village road / path layout as a sustainable extension to the new village. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13026 | ST14 | supp | <p>Principle for the delivery of a new garden village is fully supported including provision of substantial community infrastructure. It is considered that the site is suitable with no technical constraints to development, deliverable and viable. Evidence base is submitted to support the technical or environmental constraints including a statements on ecology, transport, archaeology and utilities. A concept masterplan document supporting the principle of development is submitted incorporating outcomes from evidence base. Community consultation on the site has already been undertaken. However, whilst support principle of development three alternative boundaries are submitted. All alternatives support proposed access points with no access to Moor Lane (to the north). Likely to have 2 outlets commencing from start of development to 4 outlets delivering 120-150 homes per annum.</p> | |
| 13182 | ST14 | Supp | <p>The site was allocated within the Preferred Sites version of the Plan, but the Council was proposing to increase the capacity of the site.</p> | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13407 | ST14 | Supp | <p>If there is a need for further housing north of York, ST14 could accommodate a greater number of dwellings than the Local Plan currently envisages, whilst still preserving the character of the existing nearby communities & offers an exciting opportunity for a 'garden village' development.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15) | | | | |
| 4 | SS13 | Comm | HE's position is that a new access on the A64 has been agreed in principle for land West of elvington Lane (ST15). However, one of the provisions of this agreement is that there is no through route into York for general traffic. Therefore, HE do not expect the new junction to provide access to the university or points north of the A64. He will need to understand how the high quality public transport linking Site ST15 will cross the A64 and what measures will be used to enforce a bus and cycle only crossing of the A64. | Highways England |
| 9 | ST15 | Comm | Site ST15 is in a remote location and will require significant investment in public transport infrastructure. The cumulative impact of this proposed new settlement on the highways network, along with the proposed expansion of York University (Site ST27) and the employment allocation at Elvington Airfield will need to be mitigated. Selby District Council need more detail to that shown in the Transport Topic Paper, before providing any further comments on the potential impact this allocation may have on Selby district. | Selby District Council |
| 10 | SS13 | Comm | The provision of new access onto the A64 would still need to be considered alongside other improvements to the Grimston Bar (A64/A1079/A166) junction. | East Riding of Yorkshire Council |
| 10 | ST15 | Comm | ERC has previously highlighted the need for viability evidence to clarify whether the proposed scale of housing development (3,339 dwellings) would be sufficient to deliver the timely delivery of the required infrastructure. It will be important to clarify that sufficient robust evidence has been considered and made available through the plan making stage. It would be helpful to publish and submit the masterplan, including the related viability evidence, alongside the Regulation 19 publication stage York Local Plan. | East Riding of Yorkshire Council |
| 42 | ST15 | Comm | Concerns that the plan could be found unsound without a final HRA screening showing no LSE, particularly in regard to site ST15 . | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 46 | ST15 | Comm | Concerned by lack of information on commercial viability of the site and worry developers will push for additional housing on site after the adoption of the plan. | Heslington Village Trust |
| 61 | ST15 | Comm | If ST15 is to be built, it should be further north to retain the runway and further west to minimise distance from A64 - its principle access point. As proposed, it is too close to Elvington and Wheldrake. | Elvington Parish Council |
| 79 | ST15 | Comm | The Parish Council recognises that the changes from the previous version of the local plan has resulted in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land and green belt taken up. Whilst there is some concern about the loss of green belt, this is a preferable form of development compared to 'bolting on' large densely spaced housing to villages with inadequate infrastructure (like ST33). Whilst there are unlikely to be significant impacts on Wheldrake village, there are a number of residential properties and a farm to the northern part of the parish which would be close proximity to the proposed south-eastern boundary of the proposed village and would be impacted for a considerable period during construction. | Wheldrake Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 91iii | ST15 | Comm | There is a bridleway along the north of this site which would need suitable crossing points on any access road. Would appreciate maintaining a green way alongside the site rather than a path along boundary buildings. There is also a popular bridleway across the site that is used by cyclists and a green way would be appreciated, rather than a path along estate roads. If the airfield runway is closed this would give opportunities for re-opening paths closed during the 1940s with a bridle road links to Wheldrake and possibly Elvington. Green Infrastructure (Policy G11 p.164) is not just green space, it includes public rights of way. These form useful links to policies HW1 and HW7. | York Ramblers |
| 100 | ST15 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | York Georgian Society |
| 372 | ST15 | Comm | Suggests that, as proposed garden villages, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. | Conservation Areas Advisory Panel |
| 377 | ST15 | Comm | Although the Green Belt should be protected, a new development like this at ST15 is probably necessary. | |
| 386 | ST15 | Comm | Whilst the new settlement will include affordable housing, there is no mention of making the new build affordable to run for everyone. In keeping with our climate change commitments and One Planet York as well as tackling fuel poverty, the principles must include a commitment to high standards of sustainable building. Design should not be constrained by an implication that the new 'village' should look exactly the same as villages built in previous centuries. | York Green Party |
| 456 | ST15 | Comm | Road capacity shouldn't be an issue if other forms of transport are prioritised. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1675i | ST15 | Comm | Concerned that this allocation will not provide capacity to deliver the services and facilities necessary to create a sustainable settlement; The settlement needs a minimum of 5,000-6,000 homes. It is an isolated development with no existing infrastructure which would result in a long lead-in time and no certainty over potential supply as there are complexities with delivery. ST15 scores no differently that other sites in proximity to services. Flaw in scoring system? | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey |
| 1883 | ST15 | Comm | The newly proposed location at ST15 is a better location than that previously proposed for the Whinthorpe plan. Broadly supportive that development should be focused on brownfield land and be kept as far away as possible from farmland and Heslington Tilmire to reduce the impact on important habitats. Supportive of the reduced number of houses but concerned that this is still a significant number and any supporting infrastructure should be carefully planned. Not wish to see an increase in housing numbers and would support a reduction in housing numbers given the Greenfield productive land. Supportive of OS10 the open space but this should be kept as productive farmland. It should not have public access. Support the proposed allocation of the land at the end of the runway being protected as a site important to local nature conservation. The access point to the A64 should be kept as far away from the Tilmire as possible and not cut across OS10. Avoid the access road becoming a rat run to the A1079. | |
| 1887 | ST15 | Comm | Proposition of a new nature conservation area is highly optimistic. Existing areas are already established adjacent to the ST15. Reassessment of adjacent areas and interaction with ST15 is required. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1887i | ST15 | Comm | Concerns that current conservation effort will be adversely affected by development but consider that part of the woodland adjacent to ST15 could form part of mitigation for site. Also evidence out of date for areas currently identified as SLIs around ST15. | |
| 2578 | ST15 | Comm | In general terms support sustainable development. | |
| 5754 | ST15 | Comm | Concerned about increase in cars on congested road network. Affordable housing should be a high percentage of development. Suggests maintaining and increasing investment in York's historic environment, and aiming to reduce carbon footprint by encouraging public transport, walking and cycling. Keeping open spaces help flooding and benefit health and wellbeing. | |
| 5826 | ST15 | Comm | ST15 should be of similar density to Haxby and Wigginton to ensure that a broad range of services and facilities are sustainable in this new village which will eventually be of similar size to the former. The scale of settlement should support the development of a new District Centre (ref policy R1 & R2). This would complement those already identified at Haxby and Acomb and provide the neighbouring settlements in this quadrant of York, including Elvington and Wheldrake, with additional local retail opportunities. Considered development of ST15 and appropriate connections to adjacent highways could provide a step-change in public transport for neighbouring settlements. Elvington is a natural fit via connection to Elvington Lane, but Wheldrake would also benefit greatly from services into York via ST15. Of course this depends on a viable route being identified for buses after reaching the A64. Asks how desirable living in the proposed development would be if flight operations from Elvington Airfield increase in future. Asks if the economic benefit of a local airfield been factored into site selection methodology. | |
| 6196 | ST15 | Comm | No mention of new schools, surgeries, shops, bus services. Need these in conjunction with homes. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 10818 | ST15 | Comm | Asks why map does not show the runway, why there has been no consideration of impact on York Maze and Yorkshire Air Museum. Annoyed at the lack of detail for such a big site. Asks how schools and doctors will cope with increased demand. If a garden village must be built then it should be further to the west, closer to A64. | |
| 12160 | ST15 | Comm | Grazing on the Tilmire for the sites conservation is important. For effective grazing it is vital that existing arrangements are retained; different animals may act as deterrent for access such as cows. Consider that additional fields could be used to help buffer development to Tilmire. Consideration should also be given to a Public Space Protection Order on the Tilmire together with other dedicated space for dog walkers which is attractive and accessible. | |
| 12160i | ST15 | Comm | Cycle track and footpath should be included alongside new road to A64 and link to routes on the York side of the ring-road. Do not use Common Lane, Long Lane and Langwith Stray as cycle and pedestrian routes; concerned that narrow roads used by farm vehicles and existing residents. Access arrangement need to be maintained for existing residents and preventing access from new development. Important that existing businesses in the area are supported through existing access arrangements. | |
| 12160i | ST15 | Comm | Grazing on the Tilmire for the sites conservation is important and this is recognised by Natural England. To facilitate the continuation of grazing it is necessary to retain the fields and nearby farm buildings. Grazing must remain attractive for grazers otherwise use will cease. Large lakes should not be used for mitigation; would support small ponds in a network of trees. Important that existing businesses in the area are supported through existing access arrangements. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12891 | ST15 | Comm | Instead of developing ST33, the size of the proposed village ST15 should be increased from 3,339 homes to 5,000. This would alleviate problems with provision of public services and transport; traffic through Wheldrake; the loss of Green Belt; loss of jobs on Wheldrake's industrial estate and having to provide open space on site. It would ensure the conservation areas and public pathways in Wheldrake are protected, traffic problems will not be worsened and the Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve will be protected. | |
| 13043 | ST15 | Comm | The site isn't big enough to support a community and is likely to become a dormitory town for York - a rail/tram link to the city centre is vital to its success. | |
| 13100 | ST15 | Comm | Likely that the first phase of construction would be accessed via Elvington lane with the new junction on the A64 available for general use 3 years following granting of outline planning permission. | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |
| 13182 | ST15 | Comm | A series of individual letters promoting each site including ST15 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations. | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13211 | ST15 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13258 | ST15 | Comm | How is the road system going to handle additional traffic. The A19/A1079 are already congested at rush hour. | |
| 13259 | ST15 | Comm | Although on paper this space/number of homes looks good, please consider that this is a annex of York therefore all infrastructure needs to be in place to support 3,500 people or it will just become a problem in waiting. When making your decision consider if you would live there. | |
| 13266 | ST15 | Comm | The Council should be petitioning to save this site rather than planning housing on it. Queries infrastructure provision. | |
| 13411v | ST15 | Comm | This site limits the ability of York to develop an airport. It would be an ideal small regional airport that could benefit York's tourist industry in the long term. The loss of the runway will remove this long term strategic possibility and short term would limit employment. The site is not sustainable because people would commute from it to York and Lees. It would require a greater percentage of employment opportunities to be created prior to and alongside housing to adequately meet sustainability standards. | Pilcher Homes |
| 13432 | ST15 | Comm | Suggest houses proposed to Wheldrake should be allocated here. However there will be increased traffic on Elvington Lane and an already congested Hull Road. | |
| 13521 | ST15 | Comm | There is a farmers track that goes south behind the University that nearly reaches the road to Elvington. This would be an ideal walking/cycling route for ST15 and would prevent the use of big roundabouts off the A64 and encourage walking/cycling. | |
| 13524 | ST15 | Comm | ST15 should be made larger so that ST33 at Wheldrake does not need to be built. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13560 | ST15 | Comm | No objection to development in principle, however notes that additional congestion is likely in an already congested part of the city. Building a link road on the A64 between Grimston Bar and the A19 roundabout should be a priority for the construction of the village. Would also hope that development included both affordable and private market housing. | |
| 13636 | ST15 | Comm | The additional traffic generated by a development of this size will cause huge congestion in and our of York unless serious investment is put into the road network. Investment is needed in infrastructure and amenities otherwise York will become a socially isolated place to live. | |
| 13640 | SS13 | Comm | Supports development of infrastructure and reference to education. Would be helpful if plan could safeguard land for provision of new schools to meet housing demand. Would like key national policies relating to this to be referenced in document (listed, from NPP, ESFA, Joint Policy Statement from Secretary of State). Encourages cooperation with ESFA with council to meet demand for primary and secondary schools. Need for additional schools places at site. ESFA proposals for forward funding schools in large residential developments may be of interest to council. | ESFA |
| 13645 | ST15 | Comm | Queries transport access into/out of the new village, links with the A64 and links to B1228/Elvington | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Policy SS19 is scored as (?) uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine the effect in relation to SA Objective 8 and accepts that there is outstanding information under the HRA. This site should be scored negatively in relation to impacts on biodiversity considering the difficulty in mitigating for recreational disturbance on Heslington Tilmire SSSI. Expect that the SA to clearly set out the wider sustainability reasons why the benefits of this site outweigh the impact of development on Heslington Tillmire SSSI. Without clear evidence of this consider the site to be unsound with regard to the NPPF Para 118 and not legally compliant concerning the SEA Directive. Para 7.1.7 states that no appropriate alternatives to site ST15 were identified, it is recommended that more details are provided of alternatives which were considered to comprise the Spatial Shapers of the City criteria and explanation of how the different components of the Spatial Shapers of the City framework including nature conservation sites were weighed up against each other to determine that ST15 was the most sustainable option. The narrative is noted and welcomed regarding the rejection of alternatives with regard to high level housing and employment growth options and the scoring of alternatives in appendix H. However unable to identify any detailed assessment of alternatives to strategic site ST15 other than the statement in Para 7.1.7. Recommend that para 7.1.6 regarding the avoidance of locations that have high biodiversity and recreational value in the context of ST15 should be clarified.</p> | Natural England |
| 4 | SS13 | Obj | <p>Deletion of the words 'as necessary' in key principle (xi) will render it acceptable. Para. 3.63 should also state that proposals for a new junction on the A64 should be supported by a detailed design and a transport Assessment and must be agreed with HE. Satisfactory funding proposals will also need to be in place.</p> | Highways England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 34 | ST15 | Obj | Sutton on Derwent shares many amenities with Elvington and the B1228 road connects the two villages. Concerned that site will adversely impact on the community if the B1228 is allowed for access, increasing commuter through-traffic and HGVs. Note impact on highway/pedestrian safety. Not additional impact of development on local flora and fauna and SSSI. | |
| 42 | ST15 | Obj | Concern that there is high potential for development in this position surrounded by so many valuable wildlife sites to have significant residual impacts on wildlife and biodiversity despite mitigation and compensation. There will be loss of part of the Elvington Airfield SINC with no clarity on how the remaining part of the SINC will be protected. Concern over the impact on birds associated with the Lower Derwent Valley. Increased access to the Tilmire SSSI particularly by dog walkers may cause impacts on breeding birds and grazing animals. Increased pressure on Grimston Wood SLI to nature conservation could reduce biodiversity value. Attached article in the CIEEM 'Human Impacts on Nature Reserves - The Influence of Nearby Settlements' (2017) by Fin Rylatt, Lauren Garside and Sara Robin analyses the damage and disturbance on Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserves in relation to their proximity to development. This gives an idea of the problems on nature reserves which nearby developments can cause. The allocation should be moved slightly north to limit the impact on the airfield. Amendment suggested to iv of the policy OS10 open space. Supports vii of the policy. Xiii cycle and pedestrian links should be maintained. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 45i | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that environmental impact would be severe. | YEF |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 46 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Whilst noting support for the reduced scale of the site and its further removal from the SSSI/Tilmire Common, we are concerned by the proposed additional 'Open Space' to the east of Tilmire Common and Fulford Golf Course, if this allows public access it will be very detrimental to the Tilmire SSSI. The best way to protect it is to maintain this as worked farmland. Concerned by lack of information on commercial viability of the site and worry developers will push for additional housing on site after the adoption of the plan. Confused as to the access arrangements, it is essential that the new development has its own separate access road network which does not include access to Heslington. This includes access via Ox Close Lane, Low Lane, Long Lane, Common Lane and Langwith Stray. Access to the village for pedestrians, cyclists and existing residents south of the A64 is acceptable although the method of controlling the latter must be subject to agreement of Heslington residents and the Parish Council. Movement of the site away from the village is welcome but as with ST15 the village must be protected from both vehicular traffic and students coming through the village (a need that was recognised in the planning consent granted for Heslington East where using the new lakes as a barrier has been successful). Any new access from ST15 must run closely adjacent to the A64 to minimise harmful impacts on open farmland and views to / from Heslington.</p> | Heslington Village Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 48 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Whilst welcoming the reduced scale of development and its use of brownfield land, very concerned that the scale of the development will have a major urbanising effect on the rural open countryside that is an essential part of the Green Belt function around the city. Development will exacerbate existing congestion issues and Tilmire SSSI will be damaged by pollution, increased footfall and pet predation. Concerned as to details of road connections. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that Common Lane, Long Lane and Langwith Stray must not handle any vehicular or pedestrian traffic from the site allowing the continuation for local residents/farmers of “free” existing access. Ox Close Lane must be similarly protected for local residents. Any access road to A64 is located to the east, away from the Tilmire SSSI, and should incorporated cycling and pedestrian facilities. Objection to OS10 new open space. Concerned that because of ST15’s close proximity to the Tilmire SSSI a significant requirement for ecological mitigation takes a further 139.25ha of productive Green Belt. This farmed area presently surrounds the Tilmire SSSI, giving it the protection with no public access to the area. Any change to that position will have a detrimental effect on the Tilmire as well as to a further three farming, family businesses. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that Openspace must be retained as farmed agriculture land. No direct public access from ST15 and no infrastructure.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 61 | ST15 | Obj | Parish Council has concerns with the lack of information provided on the impact on the local area. It is absurd and economically ill-advised to destroy the airfield runway in the way proposed. Should be retained for historic reasons and further strategic need as well as recreation and tourism. There would be severe ecological impact where ST15 is currently proposed. | Elvington Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 62 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object to development on the Green Belt, the gap between Elvington and the main urban area has already been substantially reduced by the development of the Heslington East university campus. Due to the size of the development it would have a major urbanising impact on the rural landscape to the south of York, this will be significant noise and air pollution to the detriment of residents and recreational users. Development of this size would have a severe impact on the already high levels of congestion and air quality on radial routes including the air quality management area in Fulford. The proposed link road to the A64 and its grade separated junction would significantly damage the existing bucolic landscape to the south of Fulford and Heslington, impacts on the ecology of Heslington Tillmire SSSI and the Lower Derwent SPA / Ramsar site would be similarly damaging. FPC considers that the proposal should be abandoned, not least because of the great level of uncertainty about its deliverability, including that of the link road. If CoYC takes a different decision, the policy should be strengthened to ensure that a 'green settlement' is created and provides safeguards for the local communities which would be worst affected, including Fulford. In particular the policy should include:</p> <p>1. That all transport issues have been resolved and not just "addressed". The NPPF paragraph 32 test should be used which is that the residual cumulative impacts on the surrounding highway network are not severe. (cont...)</p> | Fulford Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 62 | ST15 | Obj | <p>(cont...) 2. There should be a stronger policy commitment to public transport and more sustainable transport modes. In particular, it should require the developer to prepare a Travel Plan which discourages the use of the private car. FPC suggests criterion xvi) should be rewritten as follows: The developer will need to include a series of measures designed to discourage the use of the private car by residents and encourage the use of more sustainable modes of travel, including cycling and walking. The objective should be to ensure that upwards of 15% of trips to outside the settlement are by public transport and a further X% of trips (to be specified) are by other sustainable modes of travel. Monitoring and contingency arrangements will be required in a Section 106 Undertaking to ensure that this policy objective is secured in practice. 3. The reference in paragraph 3.62 to improvements to cycle facilities on the A19 should be deleted. Previous studies have shown that there is no scope to provide such facilities without removing the green verges which are very important to the special character of the Fulford Village Conservation Area.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 68 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Site is too large for the rural area and there is no supporting infrastructure in place. States the development would have a negative impact on the following: already congested local road network, loss of farmland and farm infrastructure; local ecology; road safety for cyclists and pedestrians; loss of the airfield would harm amenity and heritage; construction would cause noise and disruption; loss of footpath and bridleway infrastructure; there is no access to public transport or local services. The council should reconsider the need for so much extra housing in the Vale of York and if justified investigate more dispersed smaller developments in the area, including to the south west and west of York - but only after upgrading the supporting infrastructure. Should CYC decide to include ST15 in the Local Plan Kexby Parish Council make the following recommendations and stipulations: 1) Any new road connections onto the A64 should be in place before any development commences and all construction traffic should use this road. 2) The road should be a reasonable sized thoroughfare with routes in both directions on and off the A64. 3) Any secondary access to and from ST15 should be via the Elvington Airfield industrial estate and not down the route of the bridleway past Gypsy Wood. 4) HGVs should be prohibited from accessing the B1228, before, during, and after development works, because the B1228 is not suitable for the current volume of traffic and will not cope with an increase in volume.</p> | Kexby Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 86 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Has a major concern over how residents at Site ST15 would access the centre of York. Although there is a new road suggested from Site ST15 to link with the A64, any motor traffic wishing to get into central York would have to drive east to the A1079 junction or west to the A19, and either park in the city centre car parks or use Park & Ride at McArthur Glen or Grinston Bar. Bus services too would also use the existing road network - this is not an elegant or well thought-out solution. Would prefer the idea of this development being larger than in the current plan, enabling it to be a more self-sufficient community with retail, employment, leisure and school facilities, and taking the pressure off central York for providing housing.</p> | |
| 262 | SS13 | Obj | <p>Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy.</p> | York Travellers Trust |
| 657 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Suggest site is moved north west towards the A64, using more of the previously proposed land rather than destroying a historic runway and impinging on two neighbouring villages. Site 821 is preferred over S888 by Elvington Parish council. S888 brings the site south east towards the villages. Site is out of proportion to neighbouring villages and would impact the villages character. Public bridal way path through ST15 is regularly used. Will create urban sprawl and destroy rural character. Vague suggestions about transport infrastructure - exit onto B1228 would impact local village and cause severe traffic.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|---|
| 670 | ST15 | Obj | Objects to a development of such scale on the Green Belt, object to lack of information on proposed infrastructure including junctions and roundabouts in the vicinity of A64. It will have a detrimental impact on Heslington village and on the character and countryside setting of York. | |
| 755 | ST15 | Obj | Strongly objects on grounds that we need farm land to feed ourselves, and to any development on land outside the 2 ring roads (A64 and A1237) before any available land within is used, including Hob Moor. | |
| 880 | ST15 | Obj | Strongly opposes the loss of agricultural land to make way for open space (OS10). Although in principle the new open space is welcomed it should not be at the expense of farming land. | |
| 1007 | ST15 | Obj | Site is in the middle of the countryside; would be better located by the railway lines (Haxby/Copmanthorpe) - we have got to look at a sustainable future. The scale of the site is in any case totally unbalanced with the rest of the Plan. | |
| 1352i | ST15 | Obj | Do not think ST15 is deliverable or developable in the context of the NPPF because no indication when it is likely to be permitted, multiple land ownership, complex to deliver with phased delivery and the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the development, which will inhibit delivery. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakeford Properties |
| 1355 | ST15 | Obj | Is particularly concerned about such a large development on York's already congested roads particularly the A64, A19 and A1079. Previously questioned the financial viability of delivering access on to the A64 when the site was moved further away from the A64 and this question remains. Also very concerned about the impact such a large development will have on school places | Julian Sturdy MP |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1498 | ST15 | Obj | Do not think ST15 is deliverable or developable in the context of the NPPF because no indication when it is likely to be permitted, multiple land ownership, complex to deliver with phased delivery and the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the development, which will inhibit delivery. | Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes |
| 1661 | ST15 | Obj | Site has not been assessed against reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal, nor is it deliverable or developable when considered in the context of the NPPF. | Lichfields on behalf of Linden Homes |
| 1666 | ST15 | Obj | The Airfield should be preserved due to its link to the Air Museum, the displays in the summer, other events which attract visitors, and its value as a wildlife corridor. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 1668iii | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object to boundary of proposed allocation. Boundary should be extended to the northwest, with the following reasoning: would enable delivery of 4,000 homes, increasing the development's viability and deliverability, with particular reference to the feasibility of providing principle access from the A64 due to proximity. This would also enable early delivery on site since access construction times would be reduced; CYC will require additional housing sites to those already identified in order to meet housing need - this site could provide necessary flexibility; no additional impact on biodiversity or historic/ landscape character; would retain separation distances with Elvington Lane / Heslington an replicate historic patterns of development (satellite settlements). Refers to 10th July LPWG report and officer recommendation not to include alternative boundary due to concerns relating to landscape and heritage impacts. Rep suggests alternative boundary, providing 268.4ha site, approx 4,000 homes (1,620 within the plan period) developed at 30dph across 50% net site area. This net/gross split and lower development density better reflects garden village principles. Planning application submitted 2019 following adoption of Local Plan. Housing trajectory submitted. No identified technical/environmental constraints (suitable); no legal or ownership constraints (available); viable housing development can be achieved within first 5 years of the Plan (achievable). Land can be considered a deliverable residential development site and its release would deliver a number of significant economic, social and environmental benefits.</p> | <p>PB Planning Ltd obo Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 1674 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object due to the impact development could have on existing businesses at Elvington Airfield Business Park as well as the planned expansion of the Business Park. Existing businesses operate 24 hours a day and consequently are emitters of noise and light pollution throughout the full 24 hours. It is important to maintain an appropriate separation between the Business Park and any residential development. Therefore very concerned by this site allocation, suggest it would be sensible to require the developers to undertake noise and light assessments ahead of allocating the site and as part of any application process. Consideration needs to be given to incorporating screen planting as part of any allocation. Criterion (xi) refers to the need for the proposed development to address all transport issues and reference is made as to the cumulative impact of this site alongside a number of other allocations. The list of sites fails to include reference to SS21, even though they both feed into the same road network. We would therefore like to request that SS21 is added into the list of sites referred to under criterion (xi). What is also apparent from reading through the list of criteria associated with the allocation of SS13 is how the requirements are not consistent with the requirements being made of other allocations. For example, where is reference to surface water drainage or archaeology? Both of these are matters relevant to this site. We would therefore request that Officers review each of the policies associated with the allocation of land to ensure all relevant matters have been identified, and that there is consistency in relation to the matters to be addressed, at the application stage.</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd on behalf of William Birch & Sons |
| 1887i | ST15 | Obj | <p>The SA (Amec) report highlights issues which are of limited concern. I.e impact of animal predation on ground nesting birds as already issue with foxes.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2578 | ST15 | Obj | Question the proposal to build 3339 houses on the land west of Elvington Lane (ST15). This is Green Belt land and the houses would be built next to an SSSI. Roads, groundwork's and sewage systems would need to be developed to service such a large housing scheme. Concern over the Tilmire SSSI and effect on ground nesting birds and other animal species. Dunnington could be expanded which already has infrastructure attached. | |
| 13670 | ST15 | Obj | Says the map is poor and makes it hard to see how close to Tillmire SSSI the site ST15 will reach. New open space is never defined, asks what the area next to ST15 is. | |
| 3220 | ST15 | Obj | Objects as site is too close to the village of Elvington and will ultimately merge with the village. Will ruin Elvington's 'small village' character and of historic value. The site does not have natural boundaries and is unlikely to be contained long term. Suggests settlement is moved closer to the ring road. Concerned about housing density and appearance of village, and impact of housing on nearby roads without rail transport links. The Elvington runway is of historic importance. | |
| 3245iv | ST15 | Obj | Fears the village will either become an extension of the University or a commuter village or Leeds and Hull. With no direct route into the city traffic will have to use Grimston Bar. Public transport or cycle routes will not accommodate the majority of journeys for this new village. At a time when the country should be thinking about self-sufficiency we should not be losing agricultural land. | |
| 3313 | ST15 | Obj | Local business owner needing access along Common Lane, Long Lane and Langwith Lane. | |
| 4039 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned about access to and from garden village, which document doesn't specify. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4754 | ST15 | Obj | Site takes in land in useful agricultural production, which shouldn't be used until other brownfield sites have been developed (as per NPPF paras 111 &112). The site will have a detrimental effect on the local ecosystem and the Tillmire. Development of this site goes against Policy DP4 (Approach to Development Management) - the loss of high quality agricultural land in this instance outweighs the need to build on this site until other brownfield sites and land of lower agricultural grade have been developed first. | |
| 5146 | ST15 | Obj | Congestion is an existing issue on the A64 and B1228 in rush hour and has gotten worse in recent years, already have to queue before reaching the Park and Ride, development will exacerbate this. Elvington Airfield is a major tourist attraction, destroying the history and character of the runway will harm tourism. The development generally is disproportionate in size to the local area and would dominate the villages of Elvington and Wheldrake, overwhelming the doctors and schools which are already full. Development would also do severe damage to local ecology. | |
| 5147 | ST15 | Obj | Deeply concerned at lack of viable transport options and connections in this area. Building at ST15 will lead to gridlock, negatively impacting businesses, commuters and school children. Elvington airfield should be fully retained in the interest of historical preservation, future strategic need, maintain current recreational amenity and value for tourism. Building on it would do economic harm, negatively impact Yorkshire Air Museum and Allied Air Forces Museum and damage the reputation of York itself. Development would also do severe impact to local ecology. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5151 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Cannot support the proposed new town at ST15. It will not provide the social housing so desperately required. Homes will be purchased by commuters to Leeds, East Riding and further afield placing further strain on the A64 and will possibly require a separate access/egress point to this road. Productive agricultural land will be removed. Due to Brexit and importation issues such land will be required for food production. Removal of such agricultural land will mean farms becoming unviable. Other brownfield sites should be used first - greenfield sites only used when all other options are exhausted.</p> | |
| 5153 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Building on the airfield will destroy York's history due to the area holding all of the UK's land speed records and adds to the tourist industry. Land is also suggested to be green belt land as a site of nature conservation. Moving the site north would prevent dwarfing local villages and save more greenbelt. Plan does not provide sufficient information for proposals such as infrastructure and transport impact on locality. Elvington Lane is not an appropriate entrance to site. Northern limit for site is suitable for development but a new town will dwarf Elvington and Wheldrake. Suggests site be moved further north, which would reduce length of road to A64.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5235 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object to ST15 for substantial housing development. This is a massive development without serious indication or analysis as to infrastructure and impact. It seems to be driven by landowners rather than proactive and creative and imaginative planning. The proposal is too close to Elvington Village. Elvington currently contributes to the overall historic setting of York as a whole. This would be lost forever. This proposal does not conform to planning policy to ensure separation between settlements and substantial green space in-between. This site will impact adversely on the Green Belt function and environmental issues. It does not have substantive natural boundaries and is unlikely to be contained in the medium-to-long term. ST15 will have a huge impact on traffic. More information required on the type of settlement it will be. It should have direct rail access.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5237 | ST15 | Obj | <p>As proposed ST15 is too close to Elvington and Wheldrake, it is disproportionate to them in size and would dominate the area. The impact of additional traffic on an already saturated network is a major concern, agree with the council commentary that any new development of such a size should include strategic plans for road transport to include a new dedicated A64 junction and to ensure that the B1228 Elvington Lane and Grimston Bar do not become further congested, It should be a development requirement that the new A64 junction is constructed before construction commences. The plans for dedicated cycling facilities are welcome and they should be extended to Elvington and Wheldrake. If the site must go ahead it should be further to the north and further to the west, situated in a location which has greenbelt to all four sides to preserve the individual character of Elvington, Wheldrake and Heslington. At a minimum Elvington airfield should be retained for its historical, recreational and tourism/economic value.</p> | |
| 5259 | ST15 | Obj | <p>While there is insufficient detail to provide a truly considered response, the location of ST15 development is inappropriate on the following grounds: the heritage of the airfield site should be preserved, and the economic benefits of the site recognised; impact on the nearby 'Maize maze'; disconnect from the A64 - a site closer to the ring road would minimise the length of new road required; potential for contamination from airfield site (underground fuel pipelines); impact on Elvington village - Elvington retains its old village character and this should be respected and protected.</p> | |
| 5265 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The site is located outside the urban limit of York, public transport links are poor so residents will mainly use cars to travel to and from the site. All of this will lead to more pollution and is not environmentally sustainable.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5421 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned by the ambiguity of the land designated as new open space that surrounds the development, it would seem to suggest a change from the current status of productive farmland which also ensures the Tilmire SSSI remains protected. Tilmire SSSI needs to be protected from increased foot / dog traffic and other recreational use in order to provide a sanctuary for wildlife. The local plan as it is being consulted on is too vague to comment on properly. | |
| 5535 | ST15 | Obj | More traffic on B1228 and through village to Hull and M62. | |
| 5536 | ST15 | Obj | Will cause more traffic on B1228 and through village. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5671 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Supports reduced housing numbers on site and reduction in greenfield land; however: there is more brownfield land available on the site - this should be used, thereby further reducing the removal of Green Belt and valuable farm land; moving the site east would benefit the Tilmire SSSI; road linkages (A64/A1079/A19 and B1228) are already highly congested. Additional traffic on York's local roads (Fulford Road/Hull Road) would increase traffic/air quality issues; commuting from this new village will add to pollution; it is not clear that the Council has provided the proof of "exceptional circumstances". If the site is to be development, rep suggests the following measures: roads should be screened and unlit to reduce impact on bird population; new road should allow for cycle and pedestrians; no public access to the proposed 'open space' via Langwith Lane - this is predominately a farming area and residents want to maintain the same level of access to their village/visitors. Additional footfall/traffic would impact the Tilmire. Taking traffic and pedestrians away from the Tilmire should be given the highest priority in decision making. Re OS 10 -The way to ensure protection of the SSSI is to continue surrounding it with farmed land and with its proven management programme (as per Askham Bog). With eight of ten farms affected to a major or lesser degree, only two will remain assured of viability. The farming community will be wiped out.</p> | |
| 5738ii | ST15 | Obj | <p>Area cannot cope with traffic increase, will lose green belt and wildlife, new town would 'swamp' village, loss of airfield which is used for land speed records which will damage tourism.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5741 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Does support the principle of creating a single new development as opposed to making small additions that detract from existing villages however feels the location for such a development must be right. Preferred original location for Winthorpe, closer to Grimston Bar, it could be screened properly and have little impact on residents of Heslington. Goes into detail about the history of the air museum and Elvington Airfield, feels it is important to preserve the airfield for the historic, recreational and tourism / economic value. The development should be closer to the A64 to minimise connecting roads / pollution and to avoid overshadowing or merging with Wheldrake and or Elvington. Feels that overall there is insufficient detail to provide a full response but with the information provided is sure that the site should be moved.</p> | |
| 5842 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Safeguarded Land is supposed to be land that is safeguarded from development. Objects to development on the following grounds: scale is inappropriate given its proximity to Elvington and Wheldrake - would impact on the historic setting of these villages; will impact on the airfield and air museum; runway should be retained for historic reasons; significant ecological impact; additional traffic through Elvington; insufficient infrastructure, noting the B1228 and A19 as congested routes.</p> | |
| 6036 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Objects to development in the vicinity of Elvington on the following grounds: would change the nature of Elvington village such that it would become the suburb of a new town; loss of the airfield damaging to tourism; infrastructure requirements - local access is a 'B' road which is inadequate now (heavy HG traffic)/lack of schools, surgeries, shops etc; impact on wildlife; impact on green belt. Suggests 'new town' is move closer to the A64.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9381i | ST15 | Obj | ST15 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. T It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This site is likely to require a 5 year lead-in from report adoption and therefore unlikely to achieve capacity set out in the plan. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes |
| 9473 | ST15 | Obj | The original position for the new town is preferred by the Parish Council and the residents of Elvington. The new town should be positioned nearer to the A64. This will reduce the traffic on Elvington Lane, which is already congested at peak times. There should be no access to Elvington Lane. The access to the new town should be via the A64. This would also reduce the impact on wild life at the Till Mire SSSI and it would preserve the airfield and reduce any impact on the Air Museum – an important tourist site for York. Most importantly it would preserve the nature of Elvington as a separate, rural village and not a suburb of a new town. | |
| 9726 | ST15 | Obj | Does not disagree with building in principle but needs much more detail on road access during building, Elvington Lane is a country road not a highway. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 9776 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned by prospect of extra traffic on B1228. Opposes destruction of Elvington Airfield, this would harm the history of York and business / tourism. ST15 should be built further to the north in order to retain the airfield runway, and further west to minimise the distance from the A64. This would have minimal visual or auditory impact on Heslington. | |
| 9832 | ST15 | Obj | Airfield is a public amenity, provides activities and draws tourists which is key to York's economy. Museums adjacent to field should be retained. | |
| 9833 | ST15 | Obj | I agree York needs large scale housing development, however, the siting of ST15 is poorly thought out as in reality it adjoins Elvington and Wheldrake and will ultimately cause suburban sprawl. It would be better placed to the south of Heslington, adjacent to the A64 as previously proposed. Elvington Lane is backed up every morning - additional traffic would cause gridlock even if a new junction was to be created on the A64. Using part of the airfield to suggest a brownfield development would only be an excuse to move the development away from Heslington. There would still be a large removal of green space and loss of the airfield would impact on York's attractiveness as a tourist destination (the Air Museum would suffer along with 3rd party events on the airfield). The site is too close to existing villages that are restricted from development on loss of green belt/space grounds - contrary to the proposed new site. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9888 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that this site would not create and support sustainable patterns of development as it is situated in open countryside with no existing infrastructure, required buffers/landscaping would reduce developable area, the proposed number of homes are too few to support a sustainable garden village - would require a minimum of 5000-6000 homes. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development Ltd |
| 9904 | ST15 | Obj | Elvington Airfield should be preserved for historical, recreational and tourism value. New settlement a mile away from the A64 makes no sense, will cause loss of biodiversity due to connecting roads, noise, pollution and so on. Says the city of York should remain compact within the A64 - A1237 ring road, greenbelt outside the ringroad should be protected not urbanised. Providing essential infrastructure and connection to the A64 would seem to make development financially unviable. Any connections to the site from A64 - A1079 - B1228 will be corridors through green belt countryside, splitting farms and land with associated noise, light and air pollution. The impact on the B1228 will be intolerable as the villages of Elvington and Sutton are suffering from increasing volumes of traffic and freight. The road is unsuitable with two listed bridge structures on route. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10047 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The current siting is not directly linked to the A64. Any development relying on access via the B1228 would create problems around Elvington, especially from HGVs. Splitting of the runway - is this appropriate, given its a unique facility - for historic and current amenity reasons. It hosts a number of events and provides a good commercial income for the City's tourism generally. The site is very close to Elvington and Wheldrake and is disproportionate to them - site should be relocated closer to the A64. There are a number of wildlife areas inc a SSSI in the vicinity and it is not clear how these will be safeguarded.</p> | |
| 10065 | ST15 | Obj | <p>This site is too close to Elvington Village and will create a large development that would create major traffic issues on the A64 & A1079. The airfield and Yorkshire Air Museum would be lost as part of this development and would be at odds with York's tourism ambitions.</p> | |
| 10074i | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object to the scale and location of this development. There are better sites in York (ST4) with infrastructures already in place which will cause less habitat destruction on Elvington Airfield and loss of leisure / tourism use on the airfield. CYC cannot guarantee the gradual phasing of the construction of the 3339 dwellings. Concerned about the increased use of the B1228, especially for HGV's. Development would swamp Elvington village - badly placed compared to Heworth or Grimston Bar / ST4 area, where the access to the A64 is better. ST15 cannot be considered without direct access to the A64, a regular bus service funded by CYC and the natural habitat protected. There are better placed locations for a garden village to the north of York.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 10097 | ST15 | Obj | ST15 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. T It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This site is likely to require a 5 year lead-in from report adoption and therefore unlikely to achieve capacity set out in the plan. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP Planning on behalf of Shepherd Homes |
| 10121 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that this site would not create and support sustainable patterns of development as it is situated in open countryside with no existing infrastructure, required buffers/landscaping would reduce developable area, the proposed number of homes are too few to support a sustainable garden village - would require a minimum of 5000-6000 homes. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Vernon and Co. |
| 10175 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned by lack of information about impact this will have on the local area and surrounding road network. Full length runway should be retained for historic and recreational / strategic value. The site if developed should be further to the north west, closer to the A64 which should be the main access point, at present it is too close to both Wheldrake and Elvington. | |
| 10214 | ST15 | Obj | Asks why brownfield land is not being developed first. Development outside the ring road risks harming the historic setting of York and does damage to the countryside. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10453 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The current siting is not directly linked to the A64. Any development relying on access via the B1228 would create problems around Elvington, especially from HGVs. Splitting of the runway - is this appropriate, given its a unique facility - for historic and current amenity reasons. It hosts a number of events and provides a good commercial income for the City's tourism generally. The site is very close to Elvington and Wheldrake and is disproportionate to them - site should be relocated closer to the A64. There are a number of wildlife areas inc a SSSI in the vicinity and it is not clear how these will be safeguarded.</p> | |
| 10730 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Safeguarded land is supposed to be land safeguarded from development. The scale of proposed development is inappropriate and within close proximity to Elvington and Wheldrake. Elvington is a rural village and proposals would expand the area by such an obscene amount. Consideration should be given to protecting villages and surrounding areas similar to that protecting York. The rural setting would be eroded and result in urban sprawl. Elvington will no longer be a village in the true sense. Impact would result on the events held on the airfield and the Air Museum also. The runway should be retained for historical reasons. There would be significant ecological impact. Traffic through Elvington would increase significantly and lead to road safety issues. The infrastructure will not be able to cope creating congestion and safety hazards. Impact would be felt on the A64, A19 (adding to the increased traffic as a result of Germany Beck) and Hull Road. A severe impact on the countryside will result.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10888ii | ST15 | Obj | Goes into detail on their reasons for opposing development: it would overwhelm local infrastructure (sewage, water, electricity, roads, flood defences, broadband), the loss of the airfield, the fact that Elvington has already accommodated new housing in recent years, the impact it would have on the already congested A64, schools do not have the capacity and nothing has changed since previous planning rejections. | |
| 10895 | ST15 | Obj | The term garden village is inaccurate as the maximum population for a garden village is 2500, this is a town, it is not replicating a "village settlement" and calling it otherwise is misleading. Objects to the loss of agricultural land. There is not the infrastructure in place to support such a size of development and the roads to support it will need to be A roads. As adjacent to Elvington Airfield Industrial Site there should be a direct link to the A64 through the development, this is a great opportunity to build a road suitable for HGVs to serve both the new development and Elvington rather than the B1228. As this is open space such a road could be planned to reduce impact on residents and would reduce the need for secondary roads to the new development. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10919 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Has previously commented in July 2013, July 2014 and September 2016, remains concerned. Welcomes that the site has been reduced in size and located further from Tilmire Common SSSI however is concerned by the additional open space that is proposed to the east of Tilmire Common and Fulford Golf Course. Allowing public access here will be damaging to the Tilmire SSSI, the best barrier to protect the SSSI is worked farmland and this use should continue. Remains concerned about the lack of information on the sustainability of the site and in particular information regarding access arrangements. Essential the new development has its own separate access road network for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians, this should be achieved with minimum loss of agricultural land.</p> | |
| 11419 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Concerned by additional traffic that will be generated and impact it will have on the B1228 that serves Elvington. Opposes destroying airfield as currently proposed, should be retained for its historic and strategic value. It is a major tourist attraction that York would be losing. If ST15 is to be built it should be further north, this would allow retention of the airfield runway, and further west to minimise distance from the A64, this would have minimal visual / auditory impact on Heslington. Placing the site further away from Wheldrake and Elvington would prevent them being overwhelmed by a disproportionately large settlement.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12160i | ST15 | Obj | Consider that it would be better to add development to existing villages rather create a new garden village. Concerned about the removal of land from food production and its environmental impact for openspace; alternative locations should be identified. Concerned about impact of new population and dogs on ground nesting birds; alternative openspace needs to be provided away from Tilmire. Land in this area is under the Higher Level Stewardship Scheme (biodiversity related). | |
| 12184 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned by loss of Elvington airfield for recreational activities, would also mean a financial loss for Yorkshire Air Museum and York in general. Appreciates the need to build new houses and welcomes the scaling back of other measures around Elvington Village but does not understand why the site isn't located directly abutting the A64 where the access is proposed rather than a site which has a leisure use. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12497 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Provides additional comments to their original response to consultation from 2016. Would support provision of grassed bunds established prior to site construction (as per those established when mines were built in the York / Selby area previously) to protect visual amenity of the countryside and minimise noise pollution. Previous comments from 2016: appreciates that new housing must be built for the young to buy or rent with low wages. However their property is one of a small number that form a long established settlement that will be overlooked by the proposed garden village. Wheldrake Woods are an excellent recreational space for locals and many other Yorkshire residents to travel to visit. Bunding would protect the views from Wheldrake Woods and residents' homes would still be of the natural environment. This would also mitigate noise pollution. Major concerns about impact on road network, Elvington Lane could accommodate bus traffic but nothing more, does not have capacity for thousands of extra vehicles. A new junction to join the A64 directly may be possible but traffic into the city centre will only exacerbate existing problems on Fulford Road and the University / Heslington village. The only acceptable access for construction traffic would be a direct access from A64, the villages of Heslington, Wheldrake and Elvington cannot cope with this traffic and construction traffic will ignore any signs that tell them otherwise. Parts of the airfield have been used as a racetrack, if impenetrable barriers are not put in place between the site and the rest of the airfield from day one cars and motorbikes will continue to race along the accessible runways posing danger to life and causing considerable noise nuisance.</p> | |
| 12515 | ST15 | Obj | Requests to move site closer to A64. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12560 | ST15 | Obj | ST15 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. It is considered that this site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. T It is contested that the site will deliver 1200 homes in the plan period; consider that this is more likely to be 840 as a high estimate. This site is likely to require a 5 year lead-in from report adoption and therefore unlikely to achieve capacity set out in the plan. This questions the long-term level of housing delivery. It is suggested that an aspirational but achievable level of development should be established in the Local Plan | DPP on behalf of landowner |
| 12650 | ST15 | Obj | Traffic is already a concern, can take 45 minutes to get through Elvington Lane at peak times. | |
| 12959 | ST15 | Obj | It is not clear how public transport (or any vehicular traffic) would get from the site to York. With all the hurdles to overcome (SSSI's, transport, flood risk) it seems unlikely anyone would want this site. Would affordable housing be provided? There should be at least 30% affordable housing. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13030 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Development at site ST15 would introduce built form into an area which is mainly agricultural land, although the airfield within the southern part of the site and to its east and west changes the land use in this area. New development will impact on a number of ecological and wildlife assets and the effects should be carefully assessed in order to provide suitable mitigation. The site is flat and is well contained by woodland to the north and south, however, there are partial views to the southwest and some long distance partial views to the northeast. If access is taken from the A64, this will impact on an additional area of farmland to the north. Development would inevitably result in a substantial loss of agricultural land within the countryside and its replacement with housing infrastructure and open space. This allocations cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. The Draft Local Plan is unsound as a result. The question of deliverability is a critical one for York, particularly in being reliant on a small number of very large sites to meet its housing requirement. For example, site ST15 is proposed to deliver 2,200 dwellings over the plan period. At this stage, no evidence is presented which outlines when this site might be expected to come forward and how it will deliver an average of 130 residential dwellings per annum over the entire plan period. Based on average rates of delivery amongst the main national housebuilders, this will require between 3 and 4 house builders to be delivering this site at any one time. There are few, if any, precedents for single sites delivering at this rate in the north of England.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |
| 13100 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The alignment of the proposed access route is not technically deliverable as it would bring the on/off slip too close to the existing Grimston Bar junction. It is considered that the allocated ST15 boundary would be unattractive and unviable for bus operators.</p> | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13100 | SS13 | Obj | <p>Disagree with the following in the criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria vi- The nature conservation area is not designated clearly on the proposals map. - Criteria Vii - Ecological mitigation to be delivered 5 years prior to commencement of development is unnecessary and unduly burdensome. It will delay delivery of housing in the plan period. - The scale of OS10 is unwarranted and not evidenced. - Highway as indicated is technically undeliverable. | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |
| 13100 | ST15 | Obj | <p>ST15 Alternative - "Langwith". The developer objects to the allocated boundary and housing number. Alternative boundary is re-submitted, which concurs with previous submission in 2016 for 246 ha and 4,500 dwellings (circa 2,400 within the plan period). The would be delivered at a 60% net site area at 35-45 dph density. Outline planning circa 2019 with site delivery starting in 2021 with a development trajectory of approximately 23 years. An updated masterplan is attached which includes justification for the alternative boundary. It sets out that in the extension to the north of the site (41 ha), there would be a school and community farm as opposed to residential development. An extension to the east along Elvington airfield is also made (by circa 87,78 ha). The western part of the airfield is proposed mitigation for ecology. A Habitat Enhancement Area (46.43 ha) and ecological offsetting area (90.66 ha) would be provided to mitigate for ecology impacts and is based upon updated ecology impacts and compensation evidence (attached). No net loss of biodiversity is anticipated through this scheme. Also provided would be 2 primary schools, 1 secondary school(8 ha) commercial centre with retail and employment as well as social infrastructure. (cont...)</p> | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13100 | ST15 | Obj | <p>(cont...) The alternative site has joint willing landowners but excludes third party land included within the allocation. The change increases the brownfield land take from 46 ha to 103ha meaning to 41% of the site being brownfield. It is considered that this alternative has a greater ability to deliver more homes within the plan period, is viable and therefore deliverable, will create a sustainable community through supporting appropriate facilities and transport connections, including a safe access off/onto the A64, will support renewable energy technologies and respect the historic character and setting of the city. Technical suite of evidence ebase previously supplied is still relevant. This demonstrated that there are no insurmountable environmental or technical constraints to delivery. Evidence attached includes Trajectory of delivery, Updated Biodiversity Accounting Assessment, Master panning document and commentary on previous representations.</p> | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |
| 13100 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The allocated ST15 is unsound on the basis that it is unviable, the biodiversity impacts have not been quantified and therefore the attributed openspace is likely to be unacceptable, it is of insufficient scale to deliver housing needed in York with required facilities, to make a sustainable development It is unviable to deliver the highway infrastructure required and it contains third party ownership which complicates delivery. The site reduces the biodiversity value of the remaining parts as it fragments the airfield compared to the alternative boundary. This boundary is likely to result in an overall decline in biodiversity. The alignment of the proposed access route is not technically deliverable as it would bring the on/off slip too close to the existing Grimston Bar junction. The number of housing may not warrant the provision of secondary education.</p> | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13102 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Concerned that the proposed allocation of land to the West of Elvington Lane [Allocation ref. ST15] would not create and support, sustainable patterns of development for the following reasons: 1. ST15 is situated in the open countryside in an isolated location, with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the proposed levels of development. This would result in a long lead in time as the provision of infrastructure is a long, complex and costly process. ST15 could therefore only provide new homes towards the end of the plan period and there is no certainty over the potential supply due to the complexities of delivery. It is also important to highlight that there is no known developer interest in this site at this time. 2. The necessity to create and maintain an appropriate landscape setting and substantial buffers would result in the loss of developable area and not make the best use of the land. 3. The vision for ST15 is to create a 'garden' village which includes shops, services and community facilities to meet the needs of future residents. In the case of ST15, the Council has failed to recognise that new settlements need to be of a sufficient size to support the required range of social and physical infrastructure. For example, in order for a new settlement to be truly sustainable, it would need to provide a secondary school. This would require a minimum of some 5,000-6,000 homes.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13102 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Concerned that the proposed allocation of land to the West of Elvington Lane [Allocation ref. ST15] would not create and support, sustainable patterns of development for the following reasons: 1. ST15 is situated in the open countryside in an isolated location, with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the proposed levels of development. This would result in a long lead in time as the provision of infrastructure is a long, complex and costly process. ST15 could therefore only provide new homes towards the end of the plan period and there is no certainty over the potential supply due to the complexities of delivery. It is also important to highlight that there is no known developer interest in this site at this time. 2. The necessity to create and maintain an appropriate landscape setting and substantial buffers would result in the loss of developable area and not make the best use of the land. 3. The vision for ST15 is to create a 'garden' village which includes shops, services and community facilities to meet the needs of future residents. In the case of ST15, the Council has failed to recognise that new settlements need to be of a sufficient size to support the required range of social and physical infrastructure. For example, in order for a new settlement to be truly sustainable, it would need to provide a secondary school. This would require a minimum of some 5,000-6,000 homes. ST15 has been subjected to a Sustainability Appraisal but for whatever reason appears to score no differently to other Strategic Sites in terms of accessing all local services. Given its remoteness, this would suggest there is a flaw in the scoring system. Figure 5.3 informs of the main transport corridors in relation to the main urban area.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 13103 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that this site would not create and support sustainable patterns of development as it is situated in open countryside with no existing infrastructure, required buffers/landscaping would reduce developable area, the proposed number of homes are too few to support a sustainable garden village - would require a minimum of 5000-6000 homes. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |
| 13104 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that this site would not create and support sustainable patterns of development as it is situated in open countryside with no existing infrastructure, required buffers/landscaping would reduce developable area, the proposed number of homes are too few to support a sustainable garden village - would require a minimum of 5000-6000 homes. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. |
| 13106 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned that site would not support sustainable patterns of development, namely: infrastructural requirements to serve an isolated site would be long, complex and costly. There is no certainty of supply due to complexities of delivery; there is no known developer at this time; extensive landscape buffering would not make the best use of available land; providing a self sustaining new settlement would require some 5,000-6,000 homes...site is not big enough; | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |
| 13234 | ST15 | Obj | Disagrees with development as the site is on greenbelt and fears this will open the door to future expansion / intrusion into the countryside. | |
| 13327 | ST15 | Obj | Strongly objects to the principle of the airfield being developed - will destroy a historic area and kill the leisure activities that are currently held on the site. Many hundreds attend each year and their spending boosts the City's wider economy. Also notes the likely impact on congested local roads, particular Elvington Lane. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13328 | ST15 | Obj | Local facilities (Elvington) cannot cope with the current population so how will it cope with an additional 3400 houses? | |
| 13331 | ST15 | Obj | Major concerns about additional traffic arising from the site, is pleased that there is no access through Heslington village, but funnelling of traffic through Grimston Bar roundabout is already heavily congested at rush hour. Also concerned about provision of education, both primary and secondary but especially secondary. | |
| 13337 | ST15 | Obj | Elvington Airfield is a significant leisure hub for many activities. Included in these activities are motor sports and model aircraft flying which, by their very nature, have limited places which can be used. The building of properties at ST15 so close to the airfield will effectively stop these activities as they, by their very nature, create noise. There is nowhere locally suitable where most of these leisure activities will be able to relocate so they will have to end. | |
| 13349 | ST15 | Obj | This is a huge number of homes in the green belt. Objects to development on the grounds that it would exacerbate congestion. Would prefer village expansion. | |
| 13352 | ST15 | Obj | Concerned about the massive increase of traffic on a minor road, already heavily trafficked because of lorries from M62. Identified shortage of local amenities already. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13366 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The construction of the new houses on ST15 will have a severe impact upon the traffic flow between Elvington and York and through the village itself. There are already long queues to the traffic lights at Grimston Bar Roundabout every morning and congestion in the evenings with traffic blocking the roundabout. The construction of ST15 houses so close to Elvington will mean that Elvington will cease to be a village and become a sprawling extension of York. The proposal to utilise the airfield is a backward step in protecting the heritage and tourism of York. The air museum is a major tourist attraction and the airfield stages a number of events throughout the year. The proposal will also impact local wildlife, the fields around Elvington and between Elvington and York are an important habitat for many species which are under pressure due to loss of habitat.</p> | |
| 13372 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Opposes any development that will impact recreational uses of Elvington Airfield. The site is of significant historic value and the recreational events held there bring substantial economic benefit to York.</p> | Speed Record Club |
| 13374 | ST15 | Obj | <p>ST4 is a better site with less destruction, local habitat will be destroyed, removal of airfield will damage tourism. Traffic will increase on B road, no weight limit on fragile bridge between Elvington and Sutton. ST4 already has easy access to A64.</p> | |
| 13403 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Whilst the reduction in the number of houses and the new open space is welcomed, it doesn't go far enough. ST15 remains the largest single development and will require infrastructure inc schools, roads, shops, bus routes etc. There is serious concern about the impact on the water table which may damage adjacent farmland and the SSSI. Will also generate large amounts of additional traffic unless alternative transport is developed. The access road should go straight on to the A64 avoiding Heslington. The existing lane to Heslington should be a cycle track.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13404 | ST15 | Obj | Object to ST15 on 2 grounds: Firstly, the impact on the SSSI at the Tillmire. Pleased to note the proposed mitigation on the open space, but am concerned that it will be insufficient to protect the Tillmire from increased disturbance (eg. by dog walkers) causing harm to ground nesting birds. Secondly, the lack of sustainability - particularly in terms of traffic. It is too far from key services in York and will rely on use of the car, increasing congestion and pollution (in a City already failing to meet air quality targets). | |
| 13418 | ST15 | Obj | Object to the large scale housing development (ST15) proposed on Green Belt land. | |
| 13434i | ST15 | Obj | Improvements such as widening need to be made to Elvington Lane (B1228) for safety. New access from A64 needs building. The bridge between Elvington and Sutton-on-Derwent needs a weight limit. | |
| 13445 | ST15 | Obj | Occupies valuable farming land which is urgently needed for agricultural purposes, substantial increase in traffic volumes (to dangerous/unacceptable levels), increase pressure on essential services (schools, medical, sewers, drains) | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13466i | ST15 | Obj | <p>In general, support revised local plan as an improvement on previous drafts and as ST15 is now predominantly brownfield land. Does include greenfield land in agricultural use especially for the new road infrastructure. Affordable housing is needed but no good on ST15 away from public services and public transport. Infrastructure is a main issue. Currently unrestricted access into Heslington but if the additional cars from the proposed ST15 development, there would need to be a physical barrier to prevent cars from using the narrow country lanes currently used by local pedestrians and dog walkers. A new junction onto the A64 is essential if ST15 goes forward but it should be closer to ST27 to minimise destruction of farmland and will also provide a direct link for the university to the A64. Concerned due to inclusion of green field areas and productive agricultural land in a time when home grown food production should be increased. Suggests adding more housing to brownfield sites in villages with existing infrastructure. Affordable housing in an isolated area far from public transport and services may not be helpful. Currently have unrestricted road access to Heslington which needs to be retained for existing residents and businesses, as ST15 may cause traffic congestion in Heslington. To stop this, suggest restriction onto Long Lane and Langwith Lane to maintain character of village.</p> | |
| 13471 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Additional infrastructure needs to be built prior to the completion of housing particularly public transport and school places. Concerned that development will detract from tourism to Elvington Airfield.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13490 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Objects to change of land use from green field to housing as ruins view, and increases noise and light pollution. It will also impact wildlife and ruin a historic site. Elvington road is already congested and Broad Highway is in poor condition. Should put measures in place to stop people going in Wheldrake Woods over private lands. Concerned about increase in crime and decrease in house value. Developers plans are also different to councils proposed plans.</p> | |
| 13491 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Objects to change of land use from green field to housing as ruins view, and increases noise and light pollution. It will also impact wildlife and ruin a historic site. Elvington road is already congested and Broad Highway is in poor condition. Should put measures in place to stop people going in Wheldrake Woods over private lands. Concerned about increase in crime and decrease in house value. Developers plans are also different to councils proposed plans.</p> | |
| 13503 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Garden village of such size is a town rather than a village. Fears it will eventually merge into Elvington causing Elvington to lose its village feel, would also merge into Heslington through the university leaving no green belt between the centre of York and River Derwent. Opposes development of Elvington airfield, would be a loss of historic value and damaging to tourism / York. Mentions retaining the airfield leaves open the possibility of a commercial airfield in future. If ST15 is to be built it should be further north away from the airfield and further west closer to the A64. Does not know where the jobs to support new housing are going to come from, says shops in the city are losing out to internet sales and does not see large companies relocating to York. New housing will add to existing congestion and put off repeat visitors, damaging York's main industry (tourism). Has not seen mention of supporting infrastructure - roads, shops, schools, doctors etc.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13526 | ST15 | Obj | Site has not been assessed against reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal, nor is it deliverable or developable when considered in the context of the NPPF. | Lichfields on behalf of Wakefield Properties |
| 13532 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Disagrees with suggested access road as it would divide a small close knit community as it cuts through farms, there should be better link up with the existing park and ride on Hull Road. Says development will ruin the farming community in Heslington by taking away profitable farm land, making areas inaccessible and making the area unliveable for residents. Cutting off the development from Heslington altogether would reduce the risk of studentification or a high proportion of houses being bought to rent out. Housing provided should be affordable.</p> <p>Disagrees with using Tilmire Farm for nature conservation as we are leaving EU and should focus more on growing our own food, small farms provide the most environmental benefits so should be preserved. Concerned about impacts development will have on local businesses, mentions two equestrian livery businesses in Heslington and fishing lakes on Long Lane, all will suffer as a result of increase in traffic. Also concerned impact traffic will have on the safety of horse riders, bridleways will become busier and equestrian businesses will move away. Mentions government promotion of health and well-being initiatives and health benefits of horse riding. States that the collapse of these farms and rural businesses will have a knock on effect on Heslington village, local businesses will struggle to survive leading to increased studentification and subsequent loss of country-village feel which it has been agreed is important to preserve.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13534 | ST15 | Obj | <p>CYC needs to consider the impact on the setting and special character of the City. The cumulative impact of developments like this one will be disastrous. York already has a serious traffic / congestion issue. ST15 is a huge development which would have a major urbanising influence on the rural landscape. The area forms an important part of the Green Belt which encircles York and gives the City its special character. Additionally, the development would result in increased noise and disturbance in an area greatly valued by local residents. The combined result would destroy the character of the Green Belt, and significantly increased traffic congestion - large scale development would be almost up to the A64, the A19 is already near max capacity and the special character of Fulford Conservation Area would be damaged.</p> | |
| 13537 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Object in principle to this over large development outside the ring road. Access and increased traffic - will access be from a new junction on the A64 or from the tiny local roads? Will community amenities (school, church, shops, community space etc) be included? Where will people work? What is being done to encourage businesses to locate in York and retain university graduates?</p> | |
| 13540 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The proposed development cuts along an existing bridleway and there are two large livery yards on Long Lane, Heslington, which will be affected by these proposals. These facilities are limited already. The Tillmire Common has restricted access for horses and dogs - what alternatives will be provided?</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13550i | SS13 | Obj | Object to the policy as it will take place on productive agricultural land and in the Green Belt. Also object to the low density housing rather than high density apartments. Garden Villages will also mean reliance on the car, this is counter to the Council's policy of trying to reduce car journeys. | |
| 13555 | ST15 | Obj | Whilst both Elvington and Wheldrake Parish Councils are broadly supportive of the proposed new 'garden village' as it would alleviate pressure on already over-stretched services and infrastructure and limit future infill in these villages, presently the sewerage systems are at capacity; the roads are barely adequate with additional traffic only being seen to exacerbate the situation. The current bus services are barely adequate for villages with an aging population, many of whom do not drive, and there is only one shop in each of the villages of Elvington and Wheldrake. | Wheldrake Ward Councillor |
| 13556 | ST15 | Obj | ST15 will destroy Elvington Airfield, this must be preserved. This development will increase the traffic onto Elvington Lane and on the A64. The size of the development is out of proportion with the village. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13562 | ST15 | Obj | Disagree with this site. It takes part of the runway, which should be preserved for historical reasons and recreational uses. The site should be moved further north and west closer to its original location. Do not agree with the new site location - it uses the runway that should be preserved for historical and recreational reasons. It encroaches on current recreational facilities at the Museum, Air Forces Memorial and the Airfield which are important for local and national history preservation and tourism. The proposed site should be moved further north and west closer to its original location. | |
| 13606 | ST15 | Obj | With limited green space in the area it would be unfortunate to lose this to development. This space could be put to good use to provide safe playing area for the community. There is a deficit of local green space - this would have a further negative impact. Traffic is also a huge concern as Boroughbridge Road is already very congested and the safety of school children is going to be compromised. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13607 | ST15 | Obj | <p>The allocation ST15 sits to the east of Heslington Tilmire and have concerns on the significant impact this site would have on the bird interest and SSSI. This has been partly addressed by the movement of the site boundary and by mitigation proposals, however, the allocation now has a large part of Elvington Airfield included on the southern side. The airfield has long been recognised as an important wildlife site (botanically, birds and insects) and previously designated as part SINC/part candidate SINC and recently the whole site designated as a SINC. The allocation would divide the airfield and leave each part inadequate to retain its value for waders and ground nesting species - and not adequately taken into account in the mitigation proposals or in fact the impacts on grassland. The alternative site proposals by QUOD removes even more airfield including areas of species rich grassland which is not accompanied by a change in mitigation area of OS10 and no increase in mitigation to offset the loss. There are opportunities to move the allocation north and limit impacts to the Tilmire and airfield. OS10 needs to be carefully considered and may not be compatible.</p> | |
| 13624 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Extending infrastructure to this area will be prohibitively expensive for any house buyers, should not be building in a place where there is no infrastructure (roads, public transport, utilities) nearby.</p> | |
| 13629 | ST15 | Obj | <p>There are few if any places for jet model aircraft pilots to fly from, asks why an airfield is being destroyed.</p> | Elvington Model Flyers |
| 13653 | ST15 | Obj | <p>Concerned that this site would not create and support sustainable patterns of development as it is situated in open countryside with no existing infrastructure, required buffers/landscaping would reduce developable area, the proposed number of homes are too few to support a sustainable garden village - would require a minimum of 5000-6000 homes.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Yorvik Homes |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Provided that Natural England's concerns regarding the sustainability of ST15 regarding the impacts on Heslington Tillmire SSSI or the potential for impacts on the Lower Derwent Valley SPA birds are considered the criteria in Policy SS13 is broadly welcomed. In particular the identification of the biodiversity mitigation / compensation area on the proposals map is welcomed as is the ambition for no net loss and to maximise further benefits for biodiversity in criterion v. and vi. The requirement for the provision of compensation five years prior development in criterion vii of great importance considering the sensitivity of the location in relation to internationally, nationally and locally designated sites. In addition the requirement for the site to be retained and monitored in perpetuity is very welcome in this context. The mitigation of recreational impacts on Heslington Tillmire is of the upmost importance. Broadly welcome the requirement for the provision of a detailed site wide recreation and access strategy to minimise indirect recreational disturbance resulting from development and complement the wetland habitat buffer, advise that the council considers whether this mitigation should be set through a Masterplan at the plan stage in order to ensure delivery.</p> | Natural England |
| 4 | SS13 | Supp | Welcomes the statements within key principle (xi) | Highways England |
| 10 | SS13 | Supp | <p>Welcomes the reference in Policy SS13 (xi and xii) to addressing its transport impacts, including the cumulative impacts of the site alongside other relevant allocations, and the necessary provision of transport infrastructure to access the site.</p> | East Riding of Yorkshire Council |
| 46 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Welcomes reduction in size of the proposed new town as this will reduce pressure on the A64 and Hull Road, also glad the site is now further away from the SSSI of Tilmire Common. Note concerns re open space and access arrangements.</p> | Heslington Village Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 48 | ST15 | Supp | Welcome reduction in size and fact that development is partly on brown field land, more should be done to further minimise building on green belt. Note concerns re impact on SSSI/open countryside and on access/traffic. | Heslington Parish Council |
| 59 | ST15 | Supp | Concerned about the impact of ST15 on Elvington Lane and the Grimston Bar roundabout. Therefore strongly support the statement that the development cannot go ahead unless a new two-way access to the A64 is built in advance of the development starting. | Dunnington Parish Council |
| 79 | ST15 | Supp | The Parish Council fully supports the proposed garden village to the south of York and strongly supports the developer's proposal to increase the number of dwellings within the revised boundaries, which will more fully justify the infrastructure necessary. | Wheldrake Parish Council |
| 86 | ST15 | Supp | Likes the proposal to keep a footway/cycle link along Long Lane / Common Lane, and a good quality cycle track here and on to the University and city centre is an obvious answer for people willing and able to cycle. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 238 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Support the principle of development, as part of a strategy to accommodate growth. The degree of harm caused to the openness of the green belt in this location could be far less than would be cause should the housing in this settlement be located, instead, on the edge of the existing built up area of the City or in its surrounding settlements. The site's size/location appears to have taken account of the relationship which York has to its surrounding villages - identified within the Heritage Topic Paper as being part of the character of the City - and to define it as a separate settlement in rural landscape. It has been designed to ensure development does not threaten important views from the ring road. Would have significant concerns were the size of this settlement to increase. Also concerned that the impact of required infrastructure (grade-separated junction on the A64) could cause considerable harm to the setting of the City in this location. There is considerable work still to do to demonstrate that the infrastructure necessary to deliver this scale of housing can be achieved in a manner which will minimise harm to the rural setting and does not harm other elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.</p> | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 863 | ST15 | Supp | <p>The current plan has many good features and is an improvement on previous plans, particularly the reduction in size of the site on land to the West of Elvington Lane (ST15). Also support policies in SS13. To reinforce the protection of Heslington Village the following should be added 'The primary access via the A64 should not connect with any of the small local roads which feed into Heslington village, including Ox Close Lane, Low Lane, Long Lane and Langwith Stray. At the same time current access for local people to properties on these routes must be maintained.' There is obviously some sense that the junction of this road could also feed into the new University site (ST27) in some way. So, to fulfil xvii in the SS13 policy the road should be designed to include a cycle path, encouraging cycling between the new town at ST15 and the University Campus. Provision of new conservation area OS10 is welcomed.</p> | |
| 1641 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Supports the principle of proposed new village, with the following conditions: appropriate infrastructure is created (esp GP surgery/pharmacy, village hub, shops with post office facility, green space, access to school, safe walking routes); agreement is reached on the environmental/wildlife concerns; ensure there is no risk of flooding; ensure good public transport for new residents; ensure appropriate provision for parking; access should be available from both the A64 and Elvington Lane; speed calming.</p> | |
| 1668iii | ST15 | Supp | <p>Support the principle of development (note objection to boundary - suggest boundary is amended to include land to northwest)</p> | <p>PB Planning Ltd obo Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes</p> |
| 1673 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Generally supportive of the allocation and the potential synergies between the University and the proposed new village, including access from the A64 and a location for staff and students to live.</p> | <p>O'Neills Associates on behalf of University of York</p> |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1883 | ST15 | Supp | <p>The newly proposed location at ST15 is a better location than that previously proposed for the Whinthorpe plan. Broadly supportive that development should be focused on brownfield land and be kept as far away as possible from farmland and Heslington Tilmire to reduce the impact on important habitats. Supportive of the reduced number of houses but concerned that this is still a significant number and any supporting infrastructure should be carefully planned. Not wish to see an increase in housing numbers and would support a reduction in housing numbers given the Greenfield productive land. Supportive of OS10 the open space but this should be kept as productive farmland. It should not have public access. Support the proposed allocation of the land at the end of the runway being protected as a site important to local nature conservation. The access point to the A64 should be kept as far away from the Tilmire as possible and not cut across OS10. Avoid the access road becoming a rat run to the A1079.</p> | |
| 2578 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Pleased the Local Plan has incorporated green spaces for wildlife and appears to have extended the Tilmire which is a Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> | |
| 2595 | ST15 | Supp | <p>Supports the principle of a new village, providing its own facilities and amenities and with less impact on existing residents.</p> | |
| 2649 | ST15 | Supp | <p>No Comment</p> | |
| 2994iii | ST15 | Supp | <p>Support for the site, noting that it is good to see a new allocation of open space. Concerned about single access to the site.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 3046 | ST15 | Supp | Supports one large development but feels the original location of Whinthorpe, closer to Grimston Bar was better. It would still be separated from Heslington by A64. The Air Museum and airfield is an important tourist attraction and site of heritage and historical importance from WW2. The nearby Maize Maze should be protected, and situating the town far from the A64 causes more commuter miles and pollution. There are underground fuel pipelines in the airfield so may have contamination issues. Elvington village should be respected as a small and separate village with character and not have the development too close. | |
| 3979 | ST15 | Supp | Strongly support for ST15 and even stronger support for the developer to increase housing numbers to 5000. The site would provide an appropriate range of shops, services and facilities including social infrastructure such as health, social, leisure, cultural and community uses. It would provide new on site education provision (nursery, primary and potentially secondary). The site will have the necessary transport infrastructure with the primary access via the A64. | |
| 5259 | ST15 | Supp | Support for the principle of one large development in preference to disproportionate and unsustainable development in villages. | |
| 5710 | ST15 | Supp | Support the principle of development at ST15. Support a larger boundary to meet more housing need and justify new infrastructure. | |
| 5816 | ST15 | Supp | Supports the principle of one large development rather than piecemeal village development. Site should return to its original location closer to Grimston Bar - this would preserve the heritage value of the airfield, provide easier access from A64, avoid potential contamination from underground pipelines at the airfield and reduce impact on rural village of Elvington. Elvington retains its old village character, and this should be respected and protected. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 9432 | ST15 | Supp | Supports garden village development. Must be adapted in a way where they do not become extended suburbs and have good transport links. | |
| 10463 | ST15 | Supp | If a new garden village is required, should preserve the green belt to all 4 sides in keeping with York's character. In this position the development would just become an extension of Elvington, spoiling the character of the village. Elvington Airfield runway should be retained for historical reasons and to support tourism. Suggests moving the site further north as it would dominate the area. Should also include a A64 junction to ensure the B1228 does not become too congested, wider public transport and cycling opportunities, and improved services and infrastructure. | |
| 10907 | ST15 | Supp | As development will incorporate many facilities including a new school and access to the A64 it seems an appropriate site. | |
| 11204 | ST15 | Supp | This Garden Village is an opportunity for a new self sustaining development with all the necessary infrastructure and services. Although it would need to be closer to 5000 houses in order to sustain the level of services needed. This would remove the need to over develop nearby villages. | |
| 12251 | ST15 | Supp | Site would provide the most logical build and could accommodate the 147 homes proposed for ST33 without incurring the same impacts on local service/amenities. | |
| 12320 | ST15 | Supp | Support from third party landowners for proposed allocation of 20.2 ha of land. Consider that the shape of the allocation represents the optimum compact shape and size with the western boundary well-defined by hedgerows and trees. Further studies commissioned to support site allocation. Consider that this site is capable of being delivered comprehensively with adjoining land to create sustainable garden village. | |
| 12836 | ST15 | Supp | Supports alteration of site from previous plan. States open space should not have roads or buildings on. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13100 | ST15 | Supp | Supportive that inclusion of ST15 (alternative site boundary) will help the green Belt boundaries endure in the long-term. General support for the location of a new village in this area, which has been deemed appropriate for a new settlement. Access of the first phase would be on Elvington Airfield which would allow reclamation areas and ecological management areas to be established. | Quod on behalf of Sandy (York) Ltd and Oakgate/Caddick Group |
| 13555 | ST15 | Supp | Both Elvington and Wheldrake Parish Councils are broadly supportive of the proposed new 'garden village' as it would alleviate pressure on already over-stretched services and infrastructure and limit future infill in these villages. Overwhelming support has been for an enlarged 'garden village', as proposed by the developers, which would support a new junction onto the A64, thereby relieving traffic and congestion on the B1228 should the development proceed, and which would take up the overflow from the villages, rather than have them stretched to the point where services will start to fracture. Note concerns re local infrastructure. | Wheldrake Ward Councillor |
| 13565 | ST15 | Supp | Fully supports the development but investment is needed for supporting infrastructure - schools, shops, healthcare, community centres etc. Development should be sustainable e.g. Renewable heating sources, solar etc. Careful consideration needed regarding road access, perhaps a new junction on the A64. A cycle track across the airfield to link into Wheldrake would be a positive development. | |
| 13581 | ST15 | Supp | ST15 offers a once in a lifetime opportunity to create a self-sustaining village with supporting infrastructure adjoining the A64. It would also remove the need to build on land adjoining villages, destroying their character and changing their entire nature. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13611 | ST15 | Supp | Support this site and would support an uplift to the housing numbers, as then there would be sufficient funds to build a road onto the A64 with an appropriate junction. As the plan is to build an appropriate amount of services and infrastructure (schools, doctors surgery, shops etc) to enlarge this development would remove the need to build in Wheldrake where these facilities do not exist. | |
| 13637i | SS13 | Supp | The proposed garden village is welcomed and in principle supported provided it is planned and developed in accordance within the Policy. It is vital to provide the essential physical infrastructure to allow sustainable alternatives to the private car for access to York University/Science Park employment zone. The protection of the Tilmire SSSI and Lower Derwent valley SPA/RAMSAR site is essential, suitable buffers and more areas for nature conservation should be provided. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |
| 13646 | ST15 | Supp | As a wholly new development, at 3,339 houses the site will be insufficient to support a full range of facilities. Site should be increased to provide 500+ homes, to support self-contained community. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS14: Terrys Extension sites (ST16) | | | | |
| 386 | SS14 (policy) | Comm | There is no reference to affordable housing on this site. A principle requiring affordable housing should be added – this site which was originally subject to widespread resident consultation has hugely disappointed by delivering housing and other services that are way beyond the budget of most local residents. | York Green Party |
| 386 | SS14 (policy) | Comm | Regarding Terry's Car Park site: Support this principle: ii. Be of a low height and complement existing views to the factory building and clock tower from the Ings, Bishopthorpe Road and the Racecourse. Add 'Development should complement the rural character of the Ings up to where it joins the cycle path and incorporate a suitably graded disabled accessible route between Bishopthorpe Rd and the riverside.' Add 'v) A full controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing must be provided to facilitate access between the main site and this extension.' | York Green Party |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 4355 | SS14 | Comm | <p>In relation to Phase 3 Land to the Rear of Terry's Factory fully supports allocation for housing however the suggested yield of 56 dwellings, based on an assumed density of 50dpa is too low, a density of around 100dpa would better reflect the circumstances of the site which in character terms is not suburban but is more akin to a town centre site which such densities are considered the norm. This would accord with guidance in policy H2. The Design Code for this site, approved as part of a previous outline consent for mixed use development, envisages the development of 3 or 4 office storey pavilions in this area which, if reimagined as apartment blocks would deliver significantly more than the 56 dwellings anticipated. There is also potential for development to go slightly higher in some parts of the site. Goes into further detail later in response. Regarding ST14 Site 2 (it is noted that ST14 is still referred to as site ST16 on the Key Diagram and Policies maps an elsewhere in the pre-publication draft which requires correction): goes into detail making the case for an extension to the site boundary and subsequent change to the inner Green Belt boundary. Diagrams, photos and visual renderings enclosed.</p> | ELG Planning on behalf of Henry B |
| 13182 | ST16 | Comm | <p>A series of individual letters promoting each site including ST16 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations.</p> | Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barrett and David Wilson Homes |
| 13388 | ST16 | Comm | <p>Site should have a requirement added to Policy SS14 - be of a low height and complement existing views to the factory building and clock tower from Bishopthorpe Road, the Racecourse and Knavesmire Wood. Maximim building limit should be restricted to 2.5 stories.</p> | |
| 13637i | SS14 | Comm | <p>Concern raised as the policy does not refer to the need to deliver an appropriate mix of housing. This would ensure a mix of housing and tenures was delivered on this site located within walking and cycling distance of local amenities and close to public transport routes. Hopes the houses are affordable for ordinary people.</p> | CPRE - North Yorkshire |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|-----------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2416 | ST16 | Obj | The relative size of Site ST16 needs to be carefully considered. ST16 probably needs to be larger if it is to be a self sustaining as a community. | |
| 13347 | ST16 | Obj | Traffic and bus services are poor down Bishopthorpe Road, housing on Terry's site will worsen this. | |
| 238 | ST16 ext1 | Supp | <p>Re Ext 1. Supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: achieves high quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider site and buildings or architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas. Supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: delivers high quality urban design, given the site's association with the wider Terry's factory site and location as an entry point to the City. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas is of low height and complements existing views to the factory building and clock tower from the Ings, Bishopthorpe Road and the Racecourse. Constraints development to the boundary of the car park, including any open space requirements. Re Ext 3: Supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: retains and enhances the formal gardens area adjacent to the site; achieves high quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider site and buildings or architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas; complements existing views to the Factory and clock tower.</p> | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 4355 | SS14 | Supp | Support the proposed allocation of the former Terry's Clock Tower (ST14 - Phase 1) for housing. (It is noted that ST14 is still referred to as site ST16 on the Key Diagram and Policies maps an elsewhere in the pre-publication draft which requires correction.) Supports the allocations of the three Terry's Extension Sites (Phases 1, 2 & 3) as housing allocations under Policy H1, would however like to point out a minor typographical error in that all three sites are listed under Strategic Site ST14 rather than ST16. Amendments are needed to Table 5.1 to address this and other consequential site numbering errors. | ELG Planning on behalf of Henry B |
| 13439 | ST16 | Supp | General support for the site. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS15: Nestle South (ST17) | | | | |
| 386 | SS15 (policy) | Comm | Suggested amendments: iv. Maximise accessibility and connectivity to the city centre and local area by pedestrian and cycle routes, including direct access from the site to the Foss Island Cycle Path which runs alongside the site boundary. vii. Assess appropriate access from both Haxby Road and Wigginton Road along with associated junction improvements as necessary through Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Access between Haxby Road and Wigginton Road will be limited to public transport and walking/cycling links only. Strongly support. Add 'serrated, purpose built cycle link'. Add: Phase 2 must include an assessment of the need for any further on-site community facilities such as community meeting space, local shops, cafes, doctor's surgery, childcare facilities, onsite open space and play areas. These requirements should be included in more detail in the site principles both in order to provide appropriate amenity for residents and to reduce the need to travel in an area where the traffic impact is going to be very challenging. Why is there no more detail in the site principles? Phase 2 should include areas of car free development with car club provision. | York Green Party |
| 1466 | SS15 | Comm | One of the key entrances to this site [ST17] will be via the Bootham Level Crossing - a high risk crossing located on Wigginton Road. Network Rail would be pleased to discuss the concerns it has about the increased use of the crossing. | Network Rail |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 5826vii | ST17 | Comm | Consideration should be given to opening up the proposed connecting road between Haxby Road and Wigginton Road across this site to all traffic (not just bicycles and public transport). Enabling all vehicles to utilise this link would relieve pressure in front of the hospital and at the congested junction to the north of Clarence Street by completing a missing link allowing east-west traffic to circulate further out from the city centre. Does not understand the benefits of a bus-only link here as existing routes are radial and the location does not appear to lend itself to any other options. | |
| 4 | SS15 | Obj | Add the following to the list of key principles: 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.' | Highways England |
| 262 | SS15 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1466 | SS15 | Obj | <p>Wigginton Road is a saturated commuter route. The train line speed is 70mph and there is a planned increase in train numbers along the Scarborough line from next year which will double the number of trains and increase the times the crossing will be closed. Network Rail (NR) notes that there is a current 2010 planning application for the development of the site [ST17] but understands that it is to be treated as finally disposed of. NR has already been in discussion with the Council's Road safety section about the need for the crossing to be removed and considers the likely increase in the use of the crossing resulting from the development of the Nestle site will increase the risks on the level crossing. The Nestle site can only be supported as an allocation if the existing level crossing can be permanently removed and replaced with a road bridge or alternative measures are put in place to limit access across the level crossing. Suggest that wording is added to the policy which seeks consideration of the level crossing as part of future development proposals . NR would object to the allocation without the inclusion of a reference to the level crossing upgrade</p> | Network Rail |
| 13420 | ST17 | Obj | <p>Concern that there is no through road from Wigginton Road to Haxby Road and the effect of over 800 new dwellings on Wigginton Road. It will also increase the congestion on the Ring Road. Hope that much of the proposed housing will be affordable.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST17 | Supp | Endorse the stated planning principles, especially the requirement that development: achieves high quality urban design which recognises the distinctive character of this part of the city and respects the character and fabric of the factory buildings of distinction including those on the Haxby Road frontage, including the library. Conserves and enhances the character and/or appearance of the Nestle/Rowntree Factory Conservation Area; retains mature trees along Haxby Road frontage and protects the setting of the site. These measures will help to ensure that the development of this site takes place in a manner which reflects its sensitive location. | Historic England |
| 13382 | ST17 | Supp | Thinks the development will be good for local community around Nestle. The current plans do not have a through road to Haxby Road which is a good idea as it would pollute the new development. Asks if there are dates for when this will be completed. | |
| 13461 | ST17 | Supp | Supports development for housing. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS16: Land at Tadcaster Road (ST31) | | | | |
| 4 | SS16 | Comm | HE would not expect this to have a substantial individual impact on the operation of the A64. However, HE's previous modelling of Local Plan aspirations did identify capacity issues on the A64 west of York in future years. The developer should quantify the impact of the site on the junctions of the A64 with the A1036 and A1237 in the Transport Assessment. The list of key principles does not include any reference to traffic, so add the following to the list of key principles: 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.' | Highways England |
| 42 | SS16 | Comm | This site is close to the reserve at Askham Bogg and SSSI. Pleased to see the intention within the policy to protect the SSSI. More clarity required at point ii. Covering design of open space. Supports connecting up the GI corridor. The policy needs to cover the potential for damage and disturbance on the reserve from extra visitor pressure. Attached article in the CIEEM 'Human Impacts on Nature Reserves - The Influence of Nearby Settlements' (2017) by Fin Rylatt, Lauren Garside and Sara Robin analyses the damage and disturbance on Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserves in relation to their proximity to development. This gives an idea of the problems on nature reserves which nearby developments can cause. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 13286 | ST31 | Comm | This expansion of houses into the upper boundary of Copmanthorpe looks to be unkind to the eventual residents, very much giving them the worst option not the best | |
| 13316 | ST31 | Comm | Concerned about impact of additional traffic joining (already congested) Tadcaster Road | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13634 | ST31 | Comm | Supports the draft local plan as it impacts Copmanthorpe however does take issue with the housing density proposed of 158 units, a more conservative density should be used in keeping with the design plan for the village. | |
| 57 | ST31 | Obj | Object to the inclusion of the whole site ST31 (8.1ha) instead of the limited development proposed for this site in the emerging Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan using part of his land (3.0ha). Also think that to maintain the current average housing density in the village, the density should be no more than 25 units per ha. This would result in 75 units as opposed to 158 in draft Local Plan. | Copmanthorpe Parish Council |
| 238 | ST31 | Obj | Recommends deletion of the site. The development could harm a number of elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City. Site is perceived as being part of a swathe of open countryside south of the ring road; would impact on the relationship of copmanthorpe with the City of York, in which the village is currently identifiable as a freestanding settlement; cumulative impact of P+R site at Askham Bar with proposed allocation would reduce the gap with the urban edge to less than 1km. | Historic England |
| 262 | SS16 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 2371 | ST31 | Obj | Building on this green farmland would make the entry into the village just a housing estate and ensure a brick out character entrance to this lovely village. The land floods and no thought has been given to the character of the village entering from York. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 4423 | ST31 | Obj | Housing development takes up whole site of ST31 instead of part of land proposed by local Neighbourhood Plan (no more than 25 units per ha.) | |
| 4754 | ST31 | Obj | The Local Plan does not set sufficient weight to protect these natural habitats - this is against paragraph 113 of the NPPF. | |
| 6347 | ST31 | Obj | The Plan states that the Parish Council support this site but the Neighbourhood Plan only supports part of the site. Historic England has objected in principle to this site on the basis that it reduces the gap between Copmanthorpe and the urban edge. | O'Neill Associates on behalf of Mr M Ibbotson |
| 9381i | ST31 | Obj | Strongly object to this allocation and recommend it s deletion as an allocation.. The allocation of ST31 goes against the Council's own historic character and setting evidence base. Development of this site will result in a greater level of harm to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and other material consideration than comparable sites. The site is located on the entry to the village and causes visual harm. Development of the site may result in harm to the SSSI due to the proximity of the location. The site is not well related to the urban area of Copmanthorpe and is a distance from the village services. Concerns are raised in relation to the standard of amenity with regard to noise levels in private gardens and air quality. ST13 would be better alternative site to ST31. | DPP Planning on behalf of Linden |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10097 | ST31 | Obj | Strongly object to this allocation and recommend it s deletion as an allocation.. The allocation of ST31 goes against the Council's own historic character and setting evidence base. Development of this site will result in a greater level of harm to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and other material consideration than comparable sites. The site is located on the entry to the village and causes visual harm. Development of the site may result in harm to the SSSI due to the proximity of the location. The site is not well related to the urban area of Copmanthorpe and is a distance from the village services. Concerns are raised in relation to the standard of amenity with regard to noise levels in private gardens and air quality. ST13 would be better alternative site to ST31. | DPP Planning on behalf of Shephe |
| 10233i | ST31 | Obj | Development will ruin current open access to Copmanthorpe. It will damage Askham Bog Nature Reserve, overall the aesthetic and ecological damage is unacceptable. Traffic in and out of the site will be unsustainable, local services (medical, school & retail) will not cope with additional demand. | |
| 10968 | ST31 | Obj | A disproportionate number of houses are being planned for Copmanthorpe. 158 new houses on ST31 and 88 houses proposed at H29. It is not reasonable to build 258 houses in Copmanthorpe when the village is already finding traffic and parking a problem. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12717 | ST31 | Obj | <p>ST31 is on green belt land, the field in question is, as named on Copmanthorpe Parish Council's website, one of three remaining medieval sites in Copmanthorpe - York Field is listed as a site of special interest on the proposed Copmanthorpe Heritage Trail. The site should be removed from the plan in order to preserve its historic value and so it can continue serving green belt purpose. Goes into detail about the proximity of the site to Askham Bog and damage that will be done. Copmanthorpe's infrastructure cannot support the additional demand, schools and drainage at capacity. Asks why the number of dwellings was reduced from 170 to 158, asks what type of dwellings are planned, concerned by the lack of information and doubts the proposed number will fit on site. Goes into detail on the planning history of the site, Gladman Developments aggressive approach and speculative development in green belt locations by Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Gladman. Asks when did Gladman make the application and if it was to the Parish or City Council. Reaffirms that brownfield land should be prioritised and the damage this development will do.</p> | |
| 13027 | ST31 | Obj | <p>Strongly object to the allocation as it is considered that ST12 is comparatively a better site for development. This Site is known to have objections from Historic England in respect of historic character and setting as it is part of an area 'preventing coalescence' (parcel G3). Whilst the site is contained by physical boundaries these are not visual boundaries and therefore visual coalescence cannot be avoided. Potential impacts are also identified on the SSSI Askham Bogg. Site also scores worse in the Sustainability Appraisal (2017) on a number of objectives.</p> | PBPlanning on behalf of David Wi |
| 13418 | ST31 | Obj | <p>Objection to ST31 if the site is too close to Askham Bog Nature Reserve.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1705 | ST31 | Supp | Support the identification of the Land at Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe as a strategic housing allocation. It is supported by the local community through their neighbourhood plan and is available, achievable and deliverable. Attached: Appendix 1: A Sustainable Future for Copmanthorpe: Assessing Housing Need and Vitality and Appendix 2: Land at Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe Development Statement. Object to the wording of clause (ii) of Policy SS16 as the provision of open space prior to the commencement of development cannot be implemented. In order to deliver the openspace adjacent to the SSSI it would require the construction of the access road which would constitute commencement of development. The clause as it is currently written could therefore not be complied with. Also object to para 3.69 of the Local Plan as the Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe site is not located within the Tadcaster Road or Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Area. This reference should therefore be deleted. | Gladman Developments |
| 10008i | ST31 | Supp | This is an appropriate extension of Copmanthorpe but constrained by road and railway. Development of the existing footpath from the railway crossing to the Farmer's Way area into a cycleway / paved footpath would give good access to the village centre. | |
| 13253 | ST31 | Supp | It would be nice to see new homes built west of York as not many have been built in this area. | |
| 13290 | ST31 | Supp | Originally objected to development in this area sue to Askham Bogs which is not considered in this document. Need affordable housing - suggests builders should be given incentives to build this. Objects to more student accommodation and layerthorpe type development. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| SS17: Hungate (ST32) | | | | |
| 262 | SS17 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |
| 5167 | SS17 | Obj | It is not clear which elements of the Hungate scheme the 328 dwellings relates to or how this figure has been calculated. Further clarification required on this matter to ensure that this figure is consistent with the consent and future proposals of the site. Scope should be explored to increase the potential of such sites to deliver even more new homes. It is not necessary for the plan to state that this must be delivered in accordance with the agreed site masterplan through existing outline and full planning consents. This is unnecessary and should be more flexible to allow for change in the future to respond to changes in policy and circumstance. | Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd |
| 5167 | SS17 | Supp | Support for the continued allocation of the Hungate site as a strategic housing site and its ability to deliver 328 homes over the remaining phases. Support for the strategic site ST32 Hungate which is a brownfield site and occupies a sustainable city centre location. This site can help support substantial levels of development and an appropriate mix of uses including many new homes. | Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---|---------------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS18: Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33) | | | | |
| 4 | ST33 | Comm | The potential impact of this site in combination with others on A64 junctions at Grimston Bar and at A19/Fulford Road need to be investigated, alongside appropriate mitigation. | Highways England |
| 42 | SS18 | Comm | ST33 is close to the reserve at Wheldrake Ings. The Trust agrees with point iv that a comprehensive review of evidence with regard to biodiversity is required. Point vii need for a general recreation space and dog walking opportunities away from the nature reserve but within or accessible to the housing development. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 2649i | ST33 | Comm | Proposed site at Station Yard is best option, though 147 buildings is too much and local traffic, schooling and doctors would struggle. | |
| 10463 | ST33 | Comm | Comments on whether the development could be reduced to be of a more proportionate size of the current village. | |
| 13224 | ST33 | Comm | Wants more affordable housing for young people to remain in the village and wants facilities (e.g. The school) to have sufficient funding in order to expand to meet new demand. | |
| 13513 | SS18 (policy) | Comm | Policy mentions walking and driving but not cycling, racks should be provided by default. | |
| 13536 | ST33 | Comm | Generally support the proposal, but am concerned that the condition stating that finance is available is not strong enough. Education facilities are critical for future expansion - would like the condition to be subject to a robust plan being submitted that demonstrates how local facilities will be expanded and one that has been agree in principle with local schools and LEA. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 13622 | ST33 | Comm | Elvington Medical Practice's branch surgery at Wheldrake allows the elderly and people without transport access to primary care services, if more housing is to be built at Station Yard it is essential that Wheldrake surgery is improved to meet current standards and future need. There is no public transport between the villages of Elvington and Wheldrake. The recent application for development of Elvington surgery was rejected by the Vale of York CCG. Support and recognise the need for sheltered housing in the area but it is essential that funding is provided for development of the existing health care facilities. | Elvington Medical Practice |
| 13625 | ST33 | Comm | The development as proposed is too large for the village to support, a smaller development or extension of ST15 would be preferable. Building any houses would necessitate: expansion of primary school facilities, expansion of health services, improvement of drainage and sewerage system, vastly improved bus services and the creation of a cycle route into York. | |
| 13637i | SS18 | Comm | Development of this site remains a concern to CPRENY - it is considered the development of this site would limit the expansion of industrial activities at the existing employment site. And potentially restrict current businesses from expansion. Public transport, services and facilities are not considered adequate. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |
| 79 | ST33 | Obj | The Parish Council and villagers object to the size and scale of the proposed development as it is completely inappropriate for Wheldrake. The infrastructure is already at capacity. Significant proportion of the site is on good quality agricultural land and is currently recognised as Green Belt. Object to the scale of this proposed site as well as its proximity to the industrial estate. A planning application was refused for that part of ST33 nearest to the industrial estate for reasons of potential noise and other impacts. | Wheldrake Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 454 | ST33 | Obj | Site is unsuitable for development in the form and scale proposed for the following reasons: lack of local infrastructure; conflict with the Village Design Statement; proximity to the adjacent industrial estate (the area to the s/w of the industrial estate, previously identified for its expansion, should be retained in the Plan for that purpose and not developed for housing); a significant part of the proposed site is on greenfield land within the green belt; Inspector's previous report rejecting previous proposals to amend the green belt boundary; scheme would sit better as part of ST15. | |
| 1200 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: primary school is full; sewerage system is not good now. | |
| 1355 | ST33 | Obj | Has concerns regarding oversubscription in school places. Congestion on the A19 at rush hour is already a significant issue for villagers and 147 extra properties will exacerbate this. This concern must be addressed for Wheldrake residents to be convinced of the viability of this site at the current housing level. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 3347 | ST33 | Obj | Building on green belt for housing is unacceptable. Roads to Wheldrake already congested, more traffic will be a health and safety risk to residents and pedestrians. Wheldrake already has drainage problems that will be exacerbated. School is already over-subscribed. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 3979 | ST33 | Obj | <p>This site does not comply with Policies (DP2, DP3, SS2, EC1, EC2, GB1 & H2). The Local Plan states that Green Belt should not be redrawn beyond the 6 mile outer boundary. Almost 100% of the site is designated as Green Belt and Grade 2 Agricultural land. 147 houses is well above the target density of 35dpha for rural/village locations. The school is already at capacity. There would be a loss of existing permanent jobs and loss of previously earmarked employment land (part of the site has existing consent for industrial usage). Over 1/3 of the site lies outside the 'access to services' boundary for primary school provision. It is less accessible than already removed sites. The site lies between important nature conservation sites. There are no 'very special circumstances' to remove the land from the green belt. The exiting road infrastructure is inadequate which will get worse if other proposed developments along the A19 and A1079 gain approval.</p> | |
| 5560 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Wheldrake's infrastructure is already over-capacity. School is already oversubscribed, proposed expansion would exacerbate the pressure and impact intake at Fulford School. Doctors surgery also at capacity. Extra traffic will have a knock-on effect on major exit routes at Crockey Hill and the Hull roundabout, on-street parking already an issue and additional traffic poses a threat to safety of pedestrians. Development will lead to a permanent loss of jobs on the industrial estate. The site is close to the Derwent Valley Nature Reserve and development will lead to loss of habitat. It would make more sense to expand the proposed garden village ST15 and provide it with independent infrastructure rather than exerting further pressure on existing villages.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5614 | ST33 | Obj | Wheldrake cannot possibly sustain the number of houses recommended for this site. The village has not got the required infrastructure - the school is already full, medical facilities having difficulties now to support the present population, traffic generated from the new site would be more than could be accommodated. The Main Street is like an assault course with cars, lorries and vans and is an accident waiting to happen. | |
| 6209 | ST33 | Obj | Site will put pressure on oversubscribed school, generate traffic, lose green belt and agricultural and employment land. Would need a new doctors, and is also close to a nature reserve of scientific interest. Supports idea of garden village being increased to 5000 houses instead of adding houses to Wheldrake. | |
| 10907 | ST33 | Obj | Objects on the grounds that the school and doctors is already oversubscribed. Also, additional traffic will cause congestion on North Lane which has a single pavement and is used by school children. Site is also close to the Derwent Valley Nature Reserve. | |
| 11204 | ST33 | Obj | Wheldrake has already been developed beyond the capacity that its infrastructure is able to cope. School is over subscribed, the sewerage system is inadequate, the public transport system is not fit for purpose and there is a constant threat that the services could be reduced further. The development proposed near Elvington and Escrick (Selby Local Plan) will have a huge impact of the roads around Wheldrake. The development would result in an incursion into the green belt and a loss of agricultural land. Should prioritise housing on brownfield sites. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12251 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: sites is contained within Green Belt, the essential characteristics of which are their openness and permanence; loss of valuable agricultural land; land within the site has already been refused planning consent following public enquiry; local infrastructure and amenities are over stretched; limited public transport; development is out of scale with the village (noting Village Design Statement); potential loss of hedgerow and dyke; | |
| 12286 | ST33 | Obj | Opposes building on green belt / agricultural land and on the basis that development of the site is not in-keeping with a village of Wheldrake's size. Brownfield land should be prioritised. Appreciates the need for housing and suggests building on only the brownfield land within the site designation but warns this will still require new infrastructure to avoid overwhelming the current. Much of the village's infrastructure is already at / over-capacity, school is over subscribed, sewage system inadequate and poorly served for public transport. Supportive of the proposed garden village south of York, suggests that in order for this to be a self-sustaining village with requisite infrastructure / services the number of houses should be increased, this would eliminate the need to over-develop nearby villages. Closes by saying they hope views will be listened to and not just be a white-wash. | |
| 12286i | ST33 | Obj | Objects as site is in green belt and good quality agricultural land and out of keeping in a village of its size. Wheldrake has already been developed past its capacity for infrastructure- school is oversubscribed, sewage system is full, public transport limited. The proposal is out of character for the village. Should restrict development to brownfield land, but infrastructure improvements are still needed. Suggests moving housing to ST15 which can become a self sustaining village if there are more houses. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12539 | ST33 | Obj | Objects due to level of noise and congestion created as a result of development and more vehicles. There will also be a loss of local long-term jobs and agricultural land and disturbance to a nearby nature reserve. The doctors and primary school will have to be enlarged. Suggests incorporating additional houses to ST15 garden village instead. | |
| 12617 | ST33 | Obj | Serious concerns over the suitability of ST33 for building. The proposal is not inline with the Village Design Statement. The majority of the site is Green Belt and planning permission has already been refused at a public inquiry on ST33 because of this. Concern over the impact on existing infrastructure in Wheldrake. The village school is already over subscribed, the local shop is too small to cope with demand with inadequate parking, restricted doctors/surgery opening hours, public transport is limited. There would be unacceptable levels of noise from the Industrial Estate to warrant residential building. The roads serving Wheldrake are unsuitable for the increase in traffic flow from such a large scale development - the two main roads are already solid at rush hour, the sewerage system is already inadequate to meet existing demand, the planned development at ST15 would fulfil the future needs of the area, so ST33 is not required. | |
| 12891 | ST33 | Obj | The negatives outweigh the positives at this site, point number 7 made in the cons section of the report is the absolute best suggestion. | |
| 12931 | ST33 | Obj | Village infrastructure cannot accommodate additional housing - school and medical centre already at capacity and being stretched. Main street is highly congested and dangerous, this will only be made worse. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13084 | ST33 | Obj | As a business based on the Industrial Estate we have serious reservations regarding the impact of this additional housing both on the village and the adjacent Industrial Estate where we are situated. We operate on a busy industrial estate where many of the businesses including ourselves receive regular van and articulated lorry deliveries throughout the day. Access is such that the Lorries often reverse into the industrial estate in order to gain access to the units. Currently in the main the only people on the Industrial Estate are the employees of the various businesses and visitors and they act with due care and attention when moving around the Industrial Site so lorries can operate in and out safely. It raises serious safety concerns if this area was to become a public thoroughfare. Goes into detail about safety concerns particularly around children being around the site, access issues, noise pollution, dust / air pollution, traffic, schools, public transport and provision of amenities in Wheldrake village. | Stone Connection Ltd |
| 13112 | ST33 | Obj | Serious concerns over the provision of school places to support the 147 new houses proposed on site ST33. The local primary school is already beyond capacity with very large school class sizes. Where is the evidence that the school can be expanded without losing the current playing field? Also, what would be the timescale - would the expansion to the school be incorporated into the timeline of the proposed development? At what point will an official assessment of school expansion be carried out? | |
| 13227 | ST33 | Obj | States that the infrastructure of Wheldrake will not cope with development of the site. School is already over-subscribed, roads do not have the capacity and feel it is unrealistic to say that services will expand to cope with additional demand. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13227i | ST33 | Obj | Wheldrake cannot retain its character with more developments, this will create unsustainable levels of traffic. The school is over-subscribed and large class sizes are impacting attainment, any expansion will eat into the school playing fields. The new garden village will impact traffic flow through the village anyway, reluctantly says that it would be more sensible to increase the size of the garden village and build independent infrastructure rather than overwhelm the existing. | |
| 13351 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: proposed 147 dwellings represents an increase of 17.5% when compared to 2011 census, far too large for a village the size of Wheldrake; impact on traffic and congestion, already apparent on the A19; lack of school space; uncertainty over provision of additional infrastructure (developer has stated that it is not their responsibility to provide). | |
| 13370 | ST33 | Obj | Opposes development on the basis that greenbelt should not be built on - 147 is too many houses, there should be a maximum of 30 restricted to the brownfield land. Schools cannot meet the additional demand, nor can utilities i.e. Sewage or the roads. | |
| 13413 | ST33 | Obj | The development at ST33 will have an adverse impact on Wheldrake, the infrastructure and road systems are not suited to the amount of proposed properties. No need for extra strain in Wheldrake due to the new garden village proposed at ST15. | |
| 13419 | ST33 | Obj | Concern over the following issues in relation to ST33: 1. building on the Green Belt, 2. loss of agricultural land which should be maintained, school is already over subscribed, increase in traffic volumes with no current traffic calming equipment or crossing points, job losses in the local community, additional strain on the GP surgery. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13423 | ST33 | Obj | Concern over the lack of school places, the GP surgery, the lack of public transport, the lack of an access route without going through the Industrial Estate with a serious lack of parking. | |
| 13424 | ST33 | Obj | Access to the site is very restricted and the main route is through the industrial area which is already congested with parked cars. The road will become a bottle neck and effect businesses. The village structure is not of a size to accommodate these extra homes on this scale. | |
| 13425 | ST33 | Obj | General objection to the site. | |
| 13432 | ST33 | Obj | Objects as the Village Design Statement does not support the proposed development. It is close to the industrial estate which may impact properties. It is also on good agricultural land and within the green belt. Village does not have the infrastructure to cope with more housing (schools, one shop, parking, traffic, sewerage). The road leading to the A19 and access route to York via Elvington is congested and dangerous. | |
| 13441 | ST33 | Obj | Will cause too much traffic and overcrowded school. | |
| 13443 | ST33 | Obj | Will cause too much congestion. Schools too small. Access through industrial estate is extremely dangerous. | |
| 13444 | ST33 | Obj | Will cause too much congestion, schools too small, shop too small, traffic at Crockey Hill already bad, A19/Designer Outlet roundabout already bad and will get worse with new houses in Fulford. | |
| 13445 | ST33 | Obj | Occupies valuable farming land which is urgently needed for agricultural purposes, substantial increase in traffic volumes (to dangerous/unacceptable levels), increase pressure on essential services (schools, medical, sewers, drains) | |
| 13449 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to green belt and agricultural land being used. Would support smaller development on brownfield land. Wheldrake is at capacity with one shop and oversubscribed school. The main street is narrow and more cars would ruin the village character. Extra facilities are rarely delivered. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13450 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development as will add to pressure on village on oversubscribed school, doctors, traffic and loss of jobs at the industrial estate. Suggests houses to be relocated to ST15. Includes map of area. | |
| 13451 | SS18 | Obj | Objects to development as school is oversubscribed, road network is already inadequate and site is on mostly green belt land. Suggests adding these houses to the ST15 garden village. | |
| 13451 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development as school is oversubscribed, road network is already inadequate and site is on mostly green belt land. Suggests adding these houses to the ST15 garden village. | |
| 13452 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to development as school is oversubscribed, traffic increase will lead to safety issues for children and pedestrians and increased pollution. Also loss of green belt land and beautiful countryside. | |
| 13456 | ST33 | Obj | The village cannot support 147 more homes, with hundreds more cars. Concern over lack of school places, these houses should be added to ST15. | |
| 13468 | ST33 | Obj | Objects to size of development, as 3/4 is on green belt and agricultural land. Suggests moving proposed housing to ST15. | |
| 13517 | ST33 | Obj | A further 147 houses will detract from an already over-extended village, building further housing without plans to expand local infrastructure does not make sense. Primary School is at capacity and the roads in a state of disrepair, more residents will worsen both. The loss of green belt and small businesses on the proposed site would further detract from the village structure, other sites should be utilised. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13523 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Site is too close to industrial businesses. There is already noise pollution from heavy vehicles for local residents, with houses 'shaking'. Development would add cars to minor C road to the A19 which would be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as polluting village and causing traffic jams. The schools and doctors are already oversubscribed. Part of site was previously allocated employment land E7, which has been changed to brownfield land between 2014 to now. The Derwent Valley Nature Reserve (SSSI) is part of the proposed site, and habitat and wildlife would be lost. There will be a loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, and a loss of permanent jobs for the local community on the industrial estate. Suggests transferring housing for ST33 to nearby ST15 as Wheldrake does not have the infrastructure to cope.</p> | |
| 13524 | ST33 | Obj | <p>There are insufficient services to support the new dwellings. The local primary schools are already over subscribed/full. The doctors surgery doesn't open full time and does not have the funds to expand. Concern over the number of new cars on a C road which links the village to the A19. It would make the route dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Concern over extra car emissions and pollution. Three quarters of the site is Green Belt and Agricultural Land which will be lost forever. Part of the site was previously E7 employment site which is now brownfield changes between 2014 and current administration. The site is too close to the SSSI of Derwent Valley Nature Reserve. Loss of permanent jobs on the industrial estate. The location is too close to the industrial businesses and the HGV's will make the new houses shake. ST15 should be made larger so ST33 doesn't need to be built.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13555 | ST33 | Obj | <p>The residents and Parish Council are wholly against ST33 as it currently stands. A previous planning application for part of that site was rejected for reasons of potential noise and other impacts associated with building residential properties near to an existing industrial estate. A large proportion of that site is located on good quality agricultural land and, therefore, it is considered that brown field sites should be explored instead of building on green fields. There is limited support for a small development of homes with the overflow being taken up by the 'garden village'. The school is oversubscribed with pupils from Wheldrake attending Elvington and Nab urn schools as Escrick have now stated that they are unable to take any more children from outside of their own boundary. It would be difficult to extend capacity at Wheldrake school as in its current location it is bounded on all sides which is restrictive. The Doctors' surgery in Wheldrake is only open two half mornings per week and although there is a large new practice at Elvington unless patients have access to a vehicle it is not possible to use that facility.</p> | Wheldrake Ward Councillor |
| 13581 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Objects to development on the following grounds: overdevelopment in village without sufficient infrastructure (transport, sewerage, schools) to accommodate it; site is an amalgam of previously promoted employment land, green belt and some Brownfield land; impact of wider development proposals in the vicinity - ST15/Elvington and Escrick (Selby District); loss of agricultural land; scale of ST15 should be increased to accommodate development planned within local villages.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13582 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Opposes the combination of brownfield and green belt land. Wheldrake village infrastructure already at capacity, mentions school, drainage, poor public transport. Brownfield land should be prioritised, concerned by loss of agricultural land. Goes into detail about the land owner planting a hedge and trees across the southern boundary of his field before the last public enquiry 23 years ago in order to disguise the open nature of the plot and the fact that it is part of the green belt. This was something that the inspector raised in the 1994 enquiry and therefore refused planning permission. Supportive of the garden village south of York and sees it as a once in a lifetime opportunity to establish an self-sustaining settlement with its own doctors, school etc. This will remove the need to overburden nearby villages but suspects the number of houses there will have to be closer to 5000 if it is to be truly independent.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13597 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Objects as doesn't comply with several policies in the local plan (listed), plan states green belt should not be redrawn beyond the 6 miles outer boundary, area is designated green belt and grade 2 agricultural land, and houses proposed is above the target housing density for rural locations. In addition, the school is at max capacity, there will be a loss of permanent existing jobs and employment land, part of site has planning permission in place for Industrial use, 1/3 of the site lies outside the access to services boundary from Primary School Provision, and the whole site lies outside this boundary for all other education provision. The brownfield element is questionable according to NPPF definitions, it should have failed the assessment criteria 2 - Openspace (NPPF) and over scored in Sustainability Assessment. Proposed open space is limited in accessibility, more suitable sites have been rejected on this basis though this site is least accessible. Sits between several sites of Importance to Nature Conservation. There are no special circumstances to justify removal from green belt. Existing road and communications infrastructure is inadequate. Previous planning inspectorates decisions are being ignored, and is an inappropriate development for a rural village according to NPPF.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13599 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Objects as doesn't comply with several policies in the local plan (listed), plan states green belt should not be redrawn beyond the 6 miles outer boundary, area is designated green belt and grade 2 agricultural land, and houses proposed is above the target housing density for rural locations. In addition, the school is at max capacity, there will be a loss of permanent existing jobs and employment land, part of site has planning permission in place for Industrial use, 1/3 of the site lies outside the access to services boundary from Primary School Provision, and the whole site lies outside this boundary for all other education provision. The brownfield element is questionable according to NPPF definitions, it should have failed the assessment criteria 2 - Openspace (NPPF) and over scored in Sustainability Assessment. Proposed open space is limited in accessibility, more suitable sites have been rejected on this basis though this site is least accessible. Sits between several sites of Importance to Nature Conservation. There are no special circumstances to justify removal from green belt. Existing road and communications infrastructure is inadequate. Previous planning inspectorates decisions are being ignored, and is an inappropriate development for a rural village according to NPPF.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13611 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Object to ST33 - as insufficient services to support new dwellings in Wheldrake - all local primary schools are oversubscribed, doctors surgery only opens part of the week and does not have funds to expand. The village is connected to the A19 by a 'C' road and the development would add potentially an additional 300 new cars on this route making it more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Additional emissions would create more pollution for the village and there is potential for rush hour traffic jams. 75% of the land is green belt agricultural land that will be lost forever and will remove a previously allocated employment land site (E7). The site is too close to the SSSI that boasts a unique range of wildlife. There will be a loss of permanent jobs that support the local economy.</p> | |
| 13618 | ST33 | Obj | <p>Object to the proposed inclusion of green belt land with the small brownfield site to form ST33. The development is out of proportion to the village. Existing amenities are already over subscribed (school is full, limited medical services, poor public transport, traffic problems with parked cars on Main Street and accessing York along Fulford Road that will be worsened due to the Germany Beck development, one shop, one pub, and lack of playing areas for children). 75% of the site is good quality agricultural land that should be retained. The new garden village (ST15) could easily absorb an increase of 147 homes planned for Wheldrake. This site (ST33) is adjacent to industrial use that could injuriously affect residential amenity making it less attractive to potential house purchasers.</p> | |
| 13636i | ST33 | Obj | <p>Wheldrake is a small village with few amenities, this development is disproportionately large and will overwhelm the local infrastructure such as schools, roads, leisure and recreation facilities. Not opposed to building more housing but the appropriate infrastructure needs to be developed alongside.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST33 | Supp | Welcome the requirement for development to conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the conservation area. | Historic England |
| 2595 | ST33 | Supp | Supports this site if housing in Wheldrake is essential, as is would be less intrusive than other potential plots. | |
| 3547 | ST33 | Supp | Supports site as feels it would have least impact on the whole village of Wheldrake. | |
| 13023 | ST33 | Supp | Support the site coming forward for development. Re-confirms 2016 response that the site is suitable, deliverable and viable with no insurmountable constraints to preclude development. The site is available in the short -term and will deliver housing in the early part of the plan period. The site does not undermine the purposes of the Green Belt and would help ensure permanence by making a significant contribution to housing demand in a suitable location. Support for the allocation of ST33 within the Local Plan. There is a pressing need to review the Green Belt boundary in York to meet its OAHN. Site ST33 would make a significant contribution to this, whilst ensuring a permanence to the refined Green Belt beyond the plan period and a protection of the surrounding hinterland. In accordance with the NPPF the allocation will respond positively to the three strands of sustainability, notably the economic, social and environmental aspects. | Quod representing Vernon Land Partnerships |
| 13224 | ST33 | Supp | Supports the revised location of new housing in Wheldrake. | |
| 13296 | ST33 | Supp | Thinks that housing development in Wheldrake is a good idea. Feels, as a young person, that housing development in villages are the only way young people can afford to stay in the villages they grew up in , as there is a shortage of houses in the village. Additionally, a development will lead to enhancements of the services for the village. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13565 | ST33 | Supp | Fully supports the development but investment is needed for supporting infrastructure - shops, healthcare, community centres etc. but school capacity is in particular need. Would like a cycle path from Broad Highway across the airfield into the back of Heslington. Suggests resurrecting the old Derwent Valley Light Railway for a tram route, it would be of great benefit to outlying villages. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35) | | | | |
| 2 | SS19 | Comm | In relation to ST35, without further information identified as being required with regards to the HRA and further assessment it is not considered that this site is likely to be deliverable which may affect the soundness of the plan. Notwithstanding these concerns broadly happy with the content of policy SS18 as it stands. Advise that should further assessment suggest that this site is deliverable without adverse impact on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC, the requirements of SS19 should be updated in light of these findings. Keen to see detailed masterplanning detailing how urban edge and recreational pressures can be avoided. | Natural England |
| 4 | SS19 | Comm | The Transport Assessment will need to address the additional traffic generated by the development seeking to use Towthorpe Moor Lane to access the A64. When the scheme to upgrade the A64 in the vicinity of Hopgrove is brought forward in the future roads period, it may be possible to include design measures to mitigate this impact should the associated timescales fit. | Highways England |
| 60 | ST35 | Comm | It is noted that the proposed development of the army barracks at Strensall would inevitably lead to a considerable increase in the volume of traffic passing through Earswick village. The Parish Council are prepared to work closely with the City of York Council and potential developers to identify measures to mitigate against any such increase in traffic flows. | Earswick Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 77 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Site ST35 and the explanations 3.77 and 3.83 are broadly supported with the exceptions of clause 'xiii' (last 2 sentences) and 'ix', which does not fully address the issues concerning foul sewage and the obsolescence of the existing Severn Trent facility. Clause 'xiv' does not specifically address the need to address potential issues at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction. The high proportion of public open space on the site (40%) is welcomed - to protect the current open feel of the site and provide much needed play/leisure areas in the village. The retention of the Military identity is welcomed (inc screening existing buildings to see if worth designating & retaining - para 3.77 & 3.78). The conversion of some buildings to a care home or hotel may be suitable. Clause 'vii' (retain as many trees as possible) is supported. The intention to fully protect Strensall Common SSSI/SAC is supported & a full Ecological Assessment to be carried out first (Clauses 'i-iii' are supported, as these are critical in protecting the SSSI/SAC). The suggestion that a completely new drainage system is required is supported. The intention to allocate a new school is supported (an existing building on site may be suitable for conversion to a school) and more retail on site is also supported - Clause 'xi' is supported to achieve these aims.</p> | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 77 | ST35 | Comm (continue) | <p>The existing cycle link to the City is unsafe and a dedicated off road cycle track is requested, which runs along Strensall Road, using developer contributions (Clause 'xvi' is supported). A major upgrading of the Towthorpe Moor Lane / Strensall Rd / Towthorpe Rd junction will be needed (Clause 'xv' is supported). Take issue with the implication that Towthorpe Moor Lane should not be the principal route for access & egress from the A64. Consider it to be essential to prevent further congestion on Strensall Road and the A1237. A major junction improvement at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction is absolutely necessary to the success of this development - this is to allow traffic from Strensall Rd to access the A64 quickly and safely without using the A1237 junction - and to reduce the risk of further accidents. Agree that no access to the site should be from the northern section of Scott Moncrief Rd (the first 2 sentences of clause 'xiii' are supported, to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC). Does not agree with officers suggestion that the southern area of Scott Moncrief Rd, connecting the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks site to Towthorpe Lines should not be improved.</p> | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 77 | ST35 | Comm (continue) | <p>This should be one of the major accesses into the site - any minor harm to the least sensitive part of Strensall Common would be offset by a major reduction of traffic on Strensall Road. The last 3 sentences of clause 'xiii' are not supported - to reduce traffic flows on Strensall Road and to provide a more rapid access to Towthorpe Moor Lane and the A64. An access will be required to the Army Cadets Building at the east of the site (in separate ownership) - the access being taken off the northern part of Scott Moncrief Rd is strongly opposed (to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC. Parliament will need to amend or repeal the Strensall Common Act 1884 before any development takes place (it may also be necessary to ensure that the development limit of 250 acres is not exceeded, unless the Act is amended). The future of the ranges is currently uncertain - if the Army retains some accommodation on site, the developable area / number of dwellings may have to be reduced. Also, security issues if munitions are stored on site.</p> | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |
| 238 | ST35 | Comm | <p>No objection to the principle of development, however the site is part of the long military associations with the City. Policy must ensure the significance of the area, of any buildings and open spaces on site would influence proposed new development. Suggests alternative wording as follows re policy SS19, criterion v: The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused; Policy SS19, criterion via: "...identity and character that in its layout and spaces, reflects the site's long use as a barracks, its landscape context..."</p> | Historic England |
| 456 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Joined up thinking would be good but would require a bold approach. Link to the railway and new stations?</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1355 | SS19 | Comm | <p>Key principle ix indicates 'further work regarding drainage of the site'. He expects extensive investigatory work to take place into the potential impact of the additional 578 properties at Site ST35 on the drainage system at Walbutts Farm, and appropriate action taken. Welcomes the proposal of a new primary school to support residents of the development. Population growth in Strensall and the surrounding area over the past few decades has not been supported by significant improvements to road infrastructure and local facilities. This is extremely important to consider in the context of the proposed 578 dwellings at the site. Residents concerns about increased traffic on Strensall Road at the Towthorpe junction must be considered when deciding on access to the development. Scott Moncrieff Road is being considered as a major access point tom the development. This would likely create further traffic issues in Strensall given the scale of the site. Local amenity must be protected, particularly the mature trees from the Strensall Road and Towthorpe junction into the village. The potential benefits of these two large predominantly brownfield sites in helping to meet York's future housing need is significant, but these benefits will only pay dividends if the necessary facilities and infrastructure can be secured.</p> | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 1466 | SS19 | Comm | <p>Has no objections to the principle of the allocation however a transport assessment should support the application that looks at any likely increase in the use of the level crossing in Strensall</p> | Network Rail |
| 1675i | ST35 | comm. | <p>The site will face challenges in coming forward such as the SSSI. Considering the ecology and provision of a school/shop will impact on viability of the site.</p> | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor |
| 2513 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Queries whether development would deliver stated affordable homes.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 2846 | ST35 | Comm (continue) | <p>The existing cycle link to the City is unsafe and a dedicated off road cycle track is requested, which runs along Strensall Road, using developer contributions (Clause 'xvi' is supported). A major upgrading of the Towthorpe Moor Lane / Strensall Rd / Towthorpe Rd junction will be needed (Clause 'xv' is supported). Take issue with the implication that Towthorpe Moor Lane should not be the principal route for access & egress from the A64. Consider it to be essential to prevent further congestion on Strensall Road and the A1237. A major junction improvement at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction is absolutely necessary to the success of this development - this is to allow traffic from Strensall Rd to access the A64 quickly and safely without using the A1237 junction - and to reduce the risk of further accidents. Agree that no access to the site should be from the northern section of Scott Moncrief Rd (the first 2 sentences of clause 'xiii' are supported, to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC). Does not agree with officers suggestion that the southern area of Scott Moncrief Rd, connecting the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks site to Towthorpe Lines should not be improved.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2846 | ST35 | Comm (continue) | <p>This should be one of the major accesses into the site - any minor harm to the least sensitive part of Strensall Common would be offset by a major reduction of traffic on Strensall Road. The last 3 sentences of clause 'xiii' are not supported - to reduce traffic flows on Strensall Road and to provide a more rapid access to Towthorpe Moor Lane and the A64. An access will be required to the Army Cadets Building at the east of the site (in separate ownership) - the access being taken off the northern part of Scott Moncrief Rd is strongly opposed (to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC. Parliament will need to amend or repeal the Strensall Common Act 1884 before any development takes place (it may also be necessary to ensure that the development limit of 250 acres is not exceeded, unless the Act is amended). The future of the ranges is currently uncertain - if the Army retains some accommodation on site, the developable area / number of dwellings may have to be reduced. Also, security issues if munitions are stored on site.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2946 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Site ST35 and the explanations 3.77 and 3.83 are broadly supported with the exceptions of clause 'xiii' (last 2 sentences) and 'ix', which does not fully address the issues concerning foul sewage and the obsolescence of the existing Severn Trent facility. Clause 'xiv' does not specifically address the need to address potential issues at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction. The high proportion of public open space on the site (40%) is welcomed - to protect the current open feel of the site and provide much needed play/leisure areas in the village. The retention of the Military identity is welcomed (inc screening existing buildings to see if worth designating & retaining - para 3.77 & 3.78). The conversion of some buildings to a care home or hotel may be suitable. Clause 'vii' (retain as many trees as possible) is supported. The intention to fully protect Strensall Common SSSI/SAC is supported & a full Ecological Assessment to be carried out first (Clauses 'i-iii' are supported, as these are critical in protecting the SSSI/SAC). The suggestion that a completely new drainage system is required is supported. The intention to allocate a new school is supported (an existing building on site may be suitable for conversion to a school) and more retail on site is also supported - Clause 'xi' is supported to achieve these aims.</p> | |
| 3256 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Wants to emphasise the value of Strensall Common for its biodiversity and rare species. It is under risk due to nearby housing developments, dog walkers and other recreational activities, and protection of it's special biodiversity will be challenging.</p> | |
| 5826vii | ST35 | Comm | <p>Any upgrade of the Strensall Road / Towthorpe Moor Lane junction should be replacement of the existing staggered cross-road (including Towthorpe Road) with a roundabout. A signalised crossing would not be in-fitting with the rural nature at this location.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|---------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5826vii | ST35 | Comm | Provision of an off-road cycle path along Strensall Road from Strensall to the A1237 Ring Road would be of great benefit to this site and adjacent settlements, and installation of such a route should also incorporate appropriate pedestrian / cycle underpass at that roundabout. | |
| 6514 | ST35 | Comm | Strensall has grown significantly in the past 25 years and doubled to around 6500 population (more if you include Earswick) without improvements to village facilities and does not have the infrastructure to support any kind of significant growth. A solution to access this site from Towthorpe Moor Lane to mitigate some of the traffic away from the village. This would provide a link to a much improved hazelbush crossroads on the A64 that would direct considerable traffic away from Strensall village and ease traffic pressures through Earswick. Notes significant traffic congestion and likely additional commuting. Notes additional impact of ST35. Villagers though in Strensall and Earswick need to be compensated with some infrastructure/road access and amenity improvements. Assuming this site is adopted in the Plan a second primary school is imperative. Two schools may even promote more cycling and walking rather than local car journeys. Need for further supporting facilities, including: medium sized grocers and cafe; retention and improvements to sports facilities and open space; affordable housing; current drainage system at Walbutts with pressures at Cobbs Cottage and from Landings Lane in Haxby - systems are already at capacity. The draft plan indicates there may be a potential rail halt in Haxby - there may be value in providing a P&R style rail halt between Haxby and Strensall which may alleviate parking issues in the villages and encourage a viable bus service. | Cllr Paul Doughty |
| 10379 | SS19 | Comm | Will bring more cars onto Strensall Road, concerned about getting out of driveways. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 10388 | ST35 | Comm | Supports use of brownfield site and improved access to Commons, suggest changing crossroads at Strensall to York Road at Towthorpe to a roundabout to combat traffic. | |
| 12315 | ST35 | Comm | Supports development for housing but is concerned about infrastructure capacity. Having been a governor at Robert Wilkinson School is acutely aware of access problems along West End and rising class sizes. The school is at capacity and will not be able to accommodate children from the 578 houses, the village will require a second school, this may alleviate the number of children that are taken to school by car from the south of the village. Mentions drainage issues on site and hopes plans are in place to deal with this and other local sewage issues. Goes into detail on traffic concerns and danger for cyclists. Concerned by the cumulative impact traffic from ST35, ST8, ST9 and ST14 will have on traffic along the outer ring road. All of the above could be massively detrimental to residents' quality of life. Strensall has maintained popularity, in part due to retaining its rural character more than say Haxby and Wigginton, but is concerned this will be lost. | |
| 12357 | ST35 | Comm | Objects to development unless improvements to roads, cycle paths, schools, doctors and leisure facilities are made first. Strensall Common's conservation should also be a priority. | |
| 12487 | SS19 | Comm | Feels the comments on pages 63-65 are too vague, area needs school, medical centre and food retailer which is listed as a potential but feels it should be mandatory. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12655 | ST35 | comm. | <p>Uplifts to the housing number is important in the context of the Government's proposed standard housing methodology, significant need indicated in the SHMA (2016) for flats, and small houses and Members rejection of a 10% markets signals uplift. Whilst support is given in general to the development principles, a number of suggested changes are suggested as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria I - assumes impact where they may be none and therefore should read "assess potential impacts and minimise effects by..." - Criteria ii - "in perpetuity" is a significant commitment and should be removed at all points from policy. Revised proposed recreational routes to "understanding of proposed access routes". Clarity is required to ensure that ecological mitigation and compensation measures relate to potential measures specific to the site and not Strensall Common SAC. Also wonder if the mitigation can be delivered prior to commencement of development. - Criterion viii - Existing openspace will contribute to provision on but is not identified in Openspaces study update (2017) <p>Consider that the supporting text to policy should not include reference to external advice from Historic England. Also that reference to archaeological assessment should be in support of a planning application.</p> | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC) |
| 12821 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Questions how proposed developments and land drainage impact Strensall Common.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13102 | ST35 | Comm | Concerned by inclusion in the plan given that the site is currently operational and development is subject to uncertainty. The text to ST35 in Policy SS19 informs the site is to be disposed of in 2021 but is not without challenges. The site lies adjacent to a SSSI and requires a sensitive approach to development. The text informs the site is remote from existing services such that the 578 dwellings will need to deliver a retail shop and a primary school. Both of these will impact upon the sites' viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS |
| 13266 | ST35 | Comm | The Council should be petitioning to save this site rather than planning housing on it. | |
| 13310 | ST35 | Comm | Suggests necessary improvements to Strensall Road - cycle lane both ways and the ability to exit safely down Towthorpe Road to the A64. Also, development will necessitate more shops with ample parking. | |
| 13409 | ST35 | Comm | Page 63 - the document does not refer to the specific use of St Wilfred's Church, which is a community asset in Strensall - should remain a community asset. It should be possible to liaise with the army to secure its future use as a church / community asset. | St Marys Church, Strensall |
| 13454 | ST35 | Comm | Including the MOD sites will not be available in time. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13520 | ST35 | Comm | <p>There are concerns that that the site will be left vacant from the anticipated end use by the MOD in 2021 and the commencement of development in 2023. The future management of the SSSI of Strensall Common must be confirmed before any development is permitted. Clause ix examines flood risk but there does not appear to be any concerns in the policy to reflect the current foul drainage system which is maintained by Severn Trent Water who have stated that the foul sewage network from QE Barracks is not suitable to accept any further capacity. Clause x refers to open space available within the barracks site and the steering group are aware that there are insufficient sports facilities within the parish and would like to see the existing facilities retained and enhanced. The steering group would like to see a master plan produced for the site as soon as possible. This requirement should be included in policy SS19. Clause xiii is not supported as the minimal effect of upgrading the existing highway between the barracks and Towthorpe Moor Lane would provide an alternate route from the development to the A64 at Hazelbush crossroads.</p> | Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 13552 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Support the development of ST35 if improvements can be made to local transport. A station could be easily provided at Strensall. This should be an essential part of the process of permission for this site.</p> | |
| 13595 | ST35 | Comm | <p>Concern over the deliverability of the site within the plan period.</p> | PB Planning on behalf of Mr K Chan |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13600 | SS19 | Comm | Consideration should be given to linking the development of this site with the provision of a railway station at Strensall. A requirement should be included to 'provide required financial support' for the construction of a railway station at Strensall to ensure some of the value of the development site is contributed to the provision of suitable public transport links. | |
| 13640 | SS19 | Comm | Need for additional schools places at site. ESFA proposals for forward funding schools in large residential developments may be of interest to council. | ESFA |
| 42 | SS19 | Obj | Objection to the allocation due to the lack of detail as to what the impacts are likely on the Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Concern over the increase of domestic pets and visitors on the Common. There are protected species on the Common. Hydrological impacts a concern. Raising or lowering the water table could affect the Common. The Trust supports the suggested policies to protect the SAC but not confident that there is enough information to make sure the impacts can be prevented. Alternative open space must be made available. Concerns that the plan could be found unsound without a final HRA screening showing no LSE, particularly in regard to site ST35 . | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| 45i | ST35 | Obj | Does not consider this site should be included as release dates are problematic and subject to government policy changes. There is public confusion about the total housing target put forward. | YEF |
| 262 | SS19 | Obj | Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy. | York Travellers Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 384 | ST35 | Obj | Object to the allocation of the use of the Army Barracks in the Plan for housing needs and should stick to the Council policy to oppose the closure and protect around 1600 existing jobs. | York TUC |
| 386 | ST35 | Obj | Serious concerns about impacts on Strensall Common. | York Green Party |
| 1668 | ST35 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST35 in relation to when and if the development comes forward. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | PBPLanning on behalf of Barratt a |
| 4690 | ST35 | Obj | Traffic congestion will worsen and sewerage system will struggle. Suggests an improvement in infrastructure. Issues such as parking, failure to take responsibility for snickets and areas left by builders, closure of the library, overcrowded schools and poor public transport are mentioned. There is also little employment in Haxby, causing people to travel out, and poor affordability. Junctions need improving. Suggests dualling the northern ring road, improved pedestrian and cycle safety, more schools and medical facilities, consideration of power lines, and respect to historical ridge and furrow medieval fields of Crooklands lane. | |
| 7902 | ST35 | Obj | Objects to development on the following grounds: site is green belt; impact on overstretched services/amenities (drainage, schools, doctors); severe congestion on York Road/Wigginton Road, feeding onto severely congested A1237. Notes increase in travel times identified by transport plan. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 9633 | ST35 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of likely increased congestion on local roads and A1237. Without dualling the northern ring road and providing further access roads to the ringroad, plans north of Haxby will simply result in gridlock/congestion/pollution. Also objects to impacts on local amenities/resources (schools, shops, open space etc). | |
| 11068 | ST35 | Obj | Disagrees with developments which may increase traffic in York/ Strensall and ring road system. | |
| 9888 | ST35 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development Ltd |
| 10121 | ST35 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Vernon and Co. |
| 11036 | ST35 | Obj | Lack of amenities, drainage, road usage, schooling, medical will become more of an issue. The roads are already overcrowded with inadequate cycling facilities. | |
| 11598 | ST35 | Obj | Proposal does not include context of road infrastructure. Strensall to York Road and the A1237 are slow moving/ at standstill. Doesn't have the capacity for more vehicles. Road infrastructure should be improved before development. | |
| 12217i | ST35 | Obj | Objects to development because local infrastructure is already at / over capacity, specifically talks about drainage, traffic congestion, shopping, medical and recreational facilities. States that the proposed development is disproportionate to the village and not in-keeping with local character. | |
| 12632 | ST35 | Obj | Development will negatively impact local infrastructure, roads unable to cope with additional traffic. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12655 | ST35 | obi | <p>It is considered that ST35 could have potentially a higher yield than allocated. Currently it is suggested that the site and Policy SS19 should allocate for a minimum of 588 dwellings. Site capacity will be reviewed in line with ongoing technical assessments of relevant physical and policy constraints. Also consider that H59 should form part of the overall strategic allocation to enable comprehensive approach to site delivery. An alternative boundary is proposed to include part of the site currently excluded and within the Green Belt; a site plan is provided. It is considered that currently the boundary is illogical and the amendment would fit national policy regarding green belts creating a clear and defensible boundary to the site. It is not considered that this parcel contributes to the Green Belt.</p> | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC) |
| 12894 | ST35 | Obj | <p>Must consider the need for really affordable housing to buy or rent, and for social housing. Strensall has a high proportion of elderly residents and young people who find difficulty getting suitable housing. There is also a shortage of local labour which is causing unfilled posts and more congestion. Need to understand the type of housing which is needed. Already issues in Strensall with school capacity, traffic, drainage, flooding and sewerage, which need to be addressed before development. Walbutts treatment works at Strensall is already at full capacity and having issues with discharging pollutants into the River Foss. There are also issues with safety on the access road to the works which is narrow and single track, and used as a public footpath which leads to a wildlife reserve and Strensall Common. The road is in poor condition.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13026 | ST35 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST35 in relation to when and if the development comes forward. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | |
| 13027 | ST35 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST35 in relation to when and if the development comes forward. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | PBPlanning on behalf of David Wi |
| 13030 | ST35 | Obj | The Plan proposes the allocation of two existing Ministry of Defence sites located at Queen Elizabeth Barracks and Impfal Barracks. Until these sites are fully vacated by their existing users, they cannot be considered to be available. Relying on such sites to deliver the plan's housing requirements presents a significant risk insofar as there is also a prospect of the current operator deciding to retain its ownership and operation of the sites. This issue arose in respect of joint Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester Core Strategy where the plan proposed the allocation of the Ministry of Defence's site at Ashchurch for 2,726 residential dwellings. During the Core Strategy Examination, the Ministry of Defence wrote to the Examination Inspector confirming that its intention to retain a significant presence on the site, reducing the amount of housing it could accommodate to 550 units. This is not to say that these sites should not be treated as part of the potential supply of housing land, rather their inclusion and the extent to which they are relied upon to meet the City's housing requirements should be approached with caution. | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|---|
| 13103 | ST35 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |
| 13104 | ST35 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. |
| 13106 | ST35 | Obj | Delivery is not immediate and uncertain. Site lies adjacent to an SSSI and requires a sensitive approach. Service requirements will impact on viability. | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |
| 13247 | ST35 | Obj | Whilst I understand more homes are needed, the infrastructure cannot cope - access/bus services/York Hospital. Need to sort issues before increasing houses. | |
| 13270 | ST35 | Obj | Existing road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of additional housing. Road between Strensall and A1237 is unsuitable for mixed traffic (cars/cyclists/buses). Strensall will need a new primary school to accommodate housing at ST35. | |
| 13271 | ST35 | Obj | Objects to the impact of development on existing congestion (notably Towthorpe junction/A64) and on local services. | |
| 13278 | ST35 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of impact on congestion/highway safety (Strensall Road). | |
| 13280 | ST35 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of impact on congestion (access to the ORR), highway safety, lack of school provision. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13367 | ST35 | Obj | <p>Concern that the Strensall Barracks site was not included in the 2014 Publication Draft Local Plan as there was no need and the land was Green Belt. The cost to developers on brownfield sites will not make it viable and therefore the likelihood of affordable housing (40%) not affordable. This 40% will not be achieved. Why can't the site be considered as a mixed use of employment and housing? Extra infrastructure will be required. Who will foot the bill, the developers or local tax payers? A small percentage of the site is in the SSSI, this shouldn't happen. Has the Council and the developer considered the cost of clearing existing buildings and the possibility of old buildings containing asbestos? The costs could spiral as this is a costly exercise.</p> | |
| 13390 | ST35 | Obj | <p>Attractive entry into village is a local asset with mature trees which should not be altered. Principal access to site should be from Towthorpe Moor Lane not Strensall Road. Concerned that proposed road is on edge of land designated SSSI. Seems illogical to permit development at the edge of the designations but not an access road, which would prevent a series increase to heavy traffic down Strensall road and support the development. Roads need to be managed for traffic at the Strensall roundabout on the ring road. Concerned water treatment works is at capacity and raw sewage flowing into the river foss.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13603 | ST35 | Obj | Strensall already has significant infrastructure problems (flow of traffic, build up of traffic into York, movement around the school). Additional homes are not an objection directly it is the resultant pressures that will be placed on already squeezed infrastructure that is a concern. There are problems surrounding the large school and lack of parking and flow of traffic down West End. The Village is difficult to access due to parking, bus route and traffic flow. The general flow of traffic is poor in Strensall around the school - even with a new school this will get worse especially on West End and up into Haxby. | |
| 13653 | ST35 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Yorvik Homes |
| 4 | SS19 | Supp | Transport issues are covered satisfactorily in key principle (xiv) | Highways England |
| 77 | ST35 | Supp | Whilst regretting the Government's decision to close Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks (and Towthorpe Lines), the inclusion of the sites in the Plan are logical and the allocation is broadly supported. It is considered that 578 dwellings is more realistic than the 850 which had previously been informally mentioned. The development of this site as soon as the Army vacates it to prevent dereliction would be supported. | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council |
| 2846 | ST35 | Supp | Whilst regretting the Government's decision to close Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks (and Towthorpe Lines), the inclusion of the sites in the Plan are logical and the allocation is broadly supported. It is considered that 578 dwellings is more realistic than the 850 which had previously been informally mentioned. The development of this site as soon as the Army vacates it to prevent dereliction would be supported. | |
| 9784 | ST35 | Supp | Support for the principle of housing site adjacent to current villages | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 12263 | ST35 | Supp | <p>Supports development with following reservations: upgrading of the junctions from Strensall and Flax ton onto the A64 must take place so that traffic (both during construction and occupation) can be directed away from Strensall. Using the current road that links to the ring road (A1237) will only add further congestion. New installations to deal with waste water and sewage must be provided as current provision is inadequate. There are already major problems with parking in Strensall, new shops will be needed. Improvements in bus services will be required, as will a cycle path to reduce the danger of travel into York by bike. Reiterating previous comments made in the 2016 consultation: pleased at the reduction in green belt land being used and prioritisation of brownfield land. Particularly pleased at the removal of previously proposed sites for Strensall and Earswick.</p> | |
| 12655 | ST35 | supp | <p>Support the site coming forward for residential use. The disposal announcement provides a high degree of certainty of the sites availability for development; the site will be available from 2021. Technical evidence submitted in March 2017 underpins current allocation but further technical assessment of physical and policy constraints is ongoing which will inform masterplanning. Development of this site supports the governments agenda for the development of previously developed land. Location adjacent to Strensall Road, considered to be a high frequency transport routes, also means that the site could incorporate higher densities than assumed allocation. Potential cycle and pedestrians links only from the site via Scot Monteith Road. Existing accesses and leisure facilities will be used. Particular attention will be given to Strensall Common adjacent.</p> | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC) |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13047 | ST35 | Supp | Support ST35. This is an opportunity to create a beautiful and model settlement in a rural setting adjacent to an SSSI. The sites should be designed properly as a whole and tightly controlled. Consideration should be given to moving the centre of Strensall Village to the area at the front of the barracks. A new village centre is needed with village green, new school and new amenities. | |
| 13520 | ST35 | Supp | Agree with the clauses which require an urgent site visit between CYC officer, the MOD, Historic England as well as members of the Parish Council to ensure that existing buildings worthy of preservation are protected. Clause xii is supported as the current primary school in Strensall is at full capacity. Also support the protection of good quality trees and their root systems. Support clause xiv as all the quoted developments will mean increased road traffic. However not understood why the Towthorpe Lines site is referenced as ST36 under clause xiii. Support clause xv as there have been a number of collisions at this junction. Also support clause xvi to improve cycle routes. Support clause xvii as the noise from the firing range is very noticeable throughout the parish. | Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |
| 13637i | SS19 | Supp | Inclusion of MOD site at Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall and Imphal Barracks are welcomed and supported provided they are master planned appropriately incorporating sustainable travel opportunities and any ecological and biodiversity constraints carefully identified, assessed and mitigated accordingly. These sites safeguards against potential further green belt releases. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS20: Imphal Barracks (ST36) | | | | |
| 4 | SS20 | Comm | The potential transport impact of Site ST36 on the SRN, both individually and cumulatively with Sites ST5 and ST15, should be addressed. Further work is required to establish the impact of development at the A64/A19 Fulford junction compared with the previous version of the Local Plan, where HE's previous modelling identified issues in future years. | Highways England |
| 42 | ST36 | Comm | Supports the comments on protecting Walmgate Stray and ensuring that grazing of the grassland can be successful in the future. Part of the site should be car free with enhanced cycle and pedestrian connections to the city. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST36 | Comm | <p>The barracks are of considerable historic interest - not least as a well-preserved example of a purpose-built Victorian Regimental Depot - and are an important part of the social history of the City. Policy must ensure the significance of this site and its buildings and open spaces would influence proposed new development. The boundaries of the Fulford Conservation Area may warrant a reconsideration to include this area. Without this assessment it is not possible to determine whether the quantum of development anticipated from this site is likely to be deliverable. Suggested policy wording: deleted Policy SS2-, criterion iii, and replace with: "The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural and historic interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused."; iv "The parade ground and other open area which are important to the understanding of the site and its buildings should be retained as open spaces in any development."; v "If, following the City Council's review of the architectural and historic interest of this site, Imphal Barracks is included within the fulford Road Conservation Area, development proposals would be required to preserve or enhance those elements which have been identified as making a positive contribution to its significance."</p> | Historic England |
| 456 | ST36 | Comm | <p>A radical approach is needed to 'address all transport issues' on the basis of improving the current poor situation. It will be interesting to see how the design might reflect the local military history.</p> | |
| 789 | ST36 | Comm | <p>Concerned about lack of transport details - A19/Hull Road likely to get busier and more polluted. How will this be mitigated?</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 912 | ST36 | Comm | Could the cycle track across Walmgate Stray be brought through or round ST36 to join Fulford Road south of the point of entry? | |
| 1355 | ST36 | Comm | The potential benefits of these two large predominantly brownfield sites in helping to meet York's future housing need is significant, but these benefits will only pay dividends if the necessary facilities and infrastructure can be secured. | Julian Sturdy MP |
| 12655 | ST36 | comm. | Criterion x - Existing openspace will contribute to provision on but is not identified in Openspaces study update (2017). | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC |
| 13266 | ST36 | Comm | The Council should be petitioning to save this site rather than planning housing on it. | |
| 13378 | ST36 | Comm | Regarding page 66 point ii of policy SS20 - 'Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.' This point alludes to the intention to eventually build purely housing on the site, which is a 'long term' issue landing post 2027 as the site will not have been fully sold off for housing by the MoD yet, if that is what they will do anyway. This assumption does not satisfy the shorter term need for the housing due to this inherent delay. In connection to page 27's 'Climate Change Framework and Climate Change Action Plan' - having only a mix of housing on the site undermines these points as people will need to travel further for work, shopping and leisure. Unemployment will likely increase overall if there are no employment sites on Imphal Barracks. | |
| 13404i | ST36 | Comm | Supportive of this site being allocated for housing as it should be sustainable. However, keen for the development to be in keeping with Fulford Road Conservation Area and sympathetic to the landscape values of the site and the adjacent green corridor (Walmgate Stray) . The development should respect historical buildings, open space and mature trees. Careful consideration should be made towards the strays. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13454 | ST36 | Comm | Including the MOD sites will not be available in time. Imphal Barracks should be kept in use. | |
| 13459 | ST36 | Comm | As a city-centre resident they are used to housing being densely concentrated, they appreciate the council's efforts to ensure provision of green space and protection of trees. Appreciates the efforts to build more housing. | |
| 13471 | ST36 | Comm | Concerned about the entire space being sold for residential purposes. Worried about employment and retail in Fishergate ward. Barracks site is a provider of skilled and unskilled jobs and is near other sources of industry (Hospital Fields Road) and excellent local retail (fulford Road, Fishergate and Broadway). Converting to entirely residential is an opportunity missed. | |
| 13595 | ST36 | Comm | Concern over the deliverability of the site within the plan period. | PB Planning on behalf of Mr K Chan |
| 45i | ST36 | Obj | Does not consider this site should be included as release dates are problematic and subject to government policy changes. There is public confusion about the total housing target put forward. | YEF |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 62 | ST36 | Obj | <p>FPC objects to this development however if the site is retained the policy needs to incorporate better safeguards for the surrounding local communities, including Fulford, as follows: 1) Criterion i) should be reworded so that the developer must demonstrate that all transport issues have been resolved and not just addressed so that (applying the NPPF test) the residual cumulative impacts on the local highway network are not severe. 2) Criterion iii) should be strengthened so that the significant features of the site’s historic environment are retained and enhanced. 3) Criterion x) should be strengthened to ensure that existing recreational facilities and areas of open space are retained and made available for community use including the playing fields adjacent to Walmgate Stray. 4) A new criterion should be added which would ensure that the environmental impacts associated with the traffic generation of the proposal are fully addressed and mitigated, including traffic noise and air quality. This could be worded as follows: Mitigate fully the environmental impacts of the increases of traffic upon the local highway network, including traffic noise and air pollution.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |
| 262 | SS20 | Obj | <p>Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy.</p> | York Travellers Trust |
| 384 | ST36 | Obj | <p>Object to the allocation of the use of the Army Barracks in the Plan for housing needs and should stick to the Council policy to oppose the closure and protect around 1600 existing jobs.</p> | York TUC |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 386 | ST36 | Obj | Do not support this being allocated for housing, particularly given the constraints of historic and Listed buildings, proximity to Walmgate Stray, fine mature trees on parts of the site, the Conservation Area status at the front of the site, and the existing congestion and pollution constraints on access from and to Fulford Rd/ A 19. We consider that IF it is ultimately closed at the end of the plan period it should be identified as mixed use to reflect its current important role in local employment as well as accommodation for army personnel. In terms of housing numbers, if the Barracks is vacated there will also be some further 70 or more 'Army houses' outside the confines of the barracks in Bray Rd, Smith Close, Broadway Close etc that will become available. Any new development would have to look closely at sustainable travel options since the A19 operates above capacity already at peak times and is an Air Quality Monitoring Area because of dangerously high air pollution levels. We would like to see a long term strategy for modern public transport such as light rail linking from Germany Beck alongside the Imphal Barracks and on towards the city centre. This should be added to the strategic transport network plan as a long term project for which initial feasibility work is commissioned now to evidence the sustainability and viability of the site. | York Green Party |
| 540 | ST36 | Obj | ST36/SS20 should not be an allocation in the Plan as the Plan itself acknowledges that the site will not be developed in the Plan period. | Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant |
| 710 | ST36 | Obj | Site will bring vast amount of traffic onto Fulford Road, need plans to ease congestion. | |
| 912 | ST36 | Obj | Concern over Site ST36 for three reasons: 1. overloading of traffic on Fulford Road 2. safety of children walking and cycling to school due to the additional traffic. 3. loss of architectural heritage. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 1007 | ST36 | Obj | Opposed to the use of the site for anything other than army barracks; the site has been considered a strategic site since roman times. CYC should be putting their energy into keeping the army here and preventing this being a place of employment. | |
| 1675i | ST36 | obi | ST36 lacks certainty and should not be allocated as a site. Whilst it may be developed this is likely to be for a later review of the plan. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor |
| 9819 | ST36 | Obj | Fulford Road is already severely congested for several hours a day, development will exacerbate this and add to pollution. Surprised the site has been put forward given the ongoing campaign to save Imphal Barracks and the jobs there. | |
| 9888 | ST36 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. Site won't be released until 20131 and development unlikely until 2033 plus there are significant heritage issues. The lack of certainty means that this site should be removed as an allocation. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development Ltd |
| 10121 | ST36 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. Site won't be released until 20131 and development unlikely until 2033 plus there are significant heritage issues. The lack of certainty means that this site should be removed as an allocation. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Vernon and Co. |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12655 | ST36 | obi | It is considered that the phasing of the site could be moved forward to 2031 in line with disposal data rather than 2033 set out in policy. It is also considered that the 769 units allocated underestimates the potential yield on site. Para 3.38 references Habitat Regulation Assessment. This is incorrect as the adjacent Walmgate Stray is not a SAC, SPA or SSSI and therefore not subject to HRA. An alternative boundary is proposed to include part of the site currently excluded and within the Green Belt to the east; a site plan is provided. It is considered that a revision to the boundary to extend the site would facilitate an enduring Green Belt boundary enduring beyond the plan period. It is considered that this parcel makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt. | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC) |
| 13003 | ST36 | Obj | Imphal Barracks will not be available within this planning period | Rachael Maskell MP |
| 13027 | ST36 | obi | Concerned with inclusion of ST36 in relation to when and if the development comes forward. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites. | PBPlanning on behalf of David Wi |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13030 | ST36 | Obj | <p>The Plan proposes the allocation of two existing Ministry of Defence sites located at Queen Elizabeth Barracks and Imphal Barracks. Until these sites are fully vacated by their existing users, they cannot be considered to be available. Relying on such sites to deliver the plan's housing requirements presents a significant risk insofar as there is also a prospect of the current operator deciding to retain its ownership and operation of the sites. This issue arose in respect of joint Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester Core Strategy where the plan proposed the allocation of the Ministry of Defence's site at Ashchurch for 2,726 residential dwellings. During the Core Strategy Examination, the Ministry of Defence wrote to the Examination Inspector confirming that its intention to retain a significant presence on the site, reducing the amount of housing it could accommodate to 550 units. This is not to say that these sites should not be treated as part of the potential supply of housing land, rather their inclusion and the extent to which they are relied upon to meet the City's housing requirements should be approached with caution.</p> | Turley representing Gallagher Estates |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|---|
| 13102 | ST36 | Obj | Concerned by inclusion in the plan given that the site is currently operational and development is subject to uncertainty. ST36 will not be released until 2031 and development is unlikely to commence until 2033, the end of the Council's housing delivery period. The text in Policy SS20 and supporting paragraphs reference a raft of heritage concerns which may impact on the quantum of delivery from the site; this will be the case should many of the existing buildings need to be retained. It is our opinion that site ST36 lacks certainty such that it should not be an allocated site. In making this suggestion to remove this site there is a recognition the site could be developed in time but that could be for a later review of the Plan. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS |
| 13103 | ST36 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. Site won't be released until 2031 and development unlikely until 2033 plus there are significant heritage issues. The lack of certainty means that this site should be removed as an allocation. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees |
| 13104 | ST36 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. Site won't be released until 20131 and development unlikely until 2033 plus there are significant heritage issues. The lack of certainty means that this site should be removed as an allocation. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. |
| 13106 | ST36 | Obj | Delivery is long term - towards the end of the Plan period. Heritage concerns may impact on deliverability. Site should be removed given level of uncertainty. | Johnson Mowat obo landowner |
| 13368 | ST36 | Obj | Objects to development on the grounds of loss of Military presence in the city and likely impact on traffic congestion (Fulford Road/Broadway) | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 13378 | ST36 | Obj | Comment on page 68 point 3.88 - 'A large area of open space will be retained on the eastern edge of Imphal Barracks' - This will have a negative impact on Walmgate Stray with increased dog walkers, this is unacceptable and no clear mitigation is mentioned. Objection to all words on page 68 point 3.89 - Disagree that the site is inherently sustainable as there were plans to reduce the service on bus route 7 that goes to the Designer Outlet which would reduce accessibility to public transport, bus is often full at present. Also doubts the extent of the cycle network on Fulford Road, the site is not near any large supermarket which many households will want to travel to, mainly by car. | |
| 13418 | ST36 | Obj | Object to the large number of houses at ST36 next to the most congested road system in and out of the city. This will cause gridlock. | |
| 13428 | ST36 | Obj | Concerned that the proposed development at Imphal Barracks will make congestion and air pollution on Fulford Road worse. This should be a mixed residential employment site. | |
| 13613 | ST36 | Obj | Object - there should be no change in usage | |
| 13624 | ST36 | Obj | Already problems with traffic congestion in this area, development will make matters worse. | |
| 13653 | ST36 | Obj | Site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. Site won't be released until 20131 and development unlikely until 2033 plus there are significant heritage issues. The lack of certainty means that this site should be removed as an allocation. | Johnson Mowat on behalf of Yorvik Homes |
| 4 | SS20 | Supp | Transport issues are covered satisfactorily in key principle (i) | Highways England |
| 42 | ST36 | Supp | Supports the comments on protecting Walmgate Stray and ensuring that grazing of the grassland can be successful in the future. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5671 | ST36 | Supp | This is a welcome addition to the Plan. It will provide good housing for York within the City. Careful consideration needs to be given to how traffic will be managed on already highly congested roads in the area - Fulford Road, A19 and A64. | |
| 12558 | ST36 | Supp | Since housing density for this site is around 42 p/ha they would like to see proposals for additional public transport links, improved cycle tracks, significantly improved pedestrian footways particularly to facilitate walks to and from school. | |
| 12655 | ST36 | supp | Support the site coming forward for residential use. The disposal announcement provides a high degree of certainty of the sites availability for development with the site becoming available from 2031. Technical evidence submitted in March 2017 underpins current allocation but further technical assessment of physical and policy constraints is ongoing. It is considered that careful design an enhanced landscaping on the eastern boundary will mitigate any impact upon Walmgate Stray. The site will include approximately 10 ha of openspace. The location of the site means that there is potential to increase the density to over 50 dph subject to compliance with other policies. Potential to use existing openspace and leisure on site. Particular attention will be given to Walmgate Stray adjacent to the site. | GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MC |
| 13320 | ST36 | Supp | Supports the principle of developing the site given its brownfield status, the need for quality, affordable housing in York and the availability of such a large footprint of land in a residential location close to the city centre and university. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13637i | SS20 | Supp | Inclusion of MOD site at Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall and Imphal Barracks are welcomed and supported provided they are master planned appropriately incorporating sustainable travel opportunities and any ecological and biodiversity constraints carefully identified, assessed and mitigated accordingly. These sites safeguards against potential further green belt releases. | CPRE - North Yorkshire |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS21: Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (ST26) | | | | |
| 4 | ST26 | Comm | HE would not expect this to have a substantial individual impact on the operation of the A64 but expect it to combine with other strategic sites to have a cumulative impact on the operation of the A64, A166 and A1079 at Grimston Bar. | Highways England |
| 61 | ST26 | Comm | A gap should be made between the existing and new estates to allow for a wildlife corridor. Units should be small, high value businesses consistent with a restriction to B1 and B8 use, as at present, and in line with CYC's economic strategy. The Parish Councils support is conditional on the imposition of a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Main Street. | Elvington Parish Council |
| 68 | ST26 | Comm | If ST21 is developed HGVs should not be permitted to access the B1228, as the road is unsuitable. HGVs should access the A64 via the proposed link road and onto the A1079, rather than using the B1228 to access the A1079. | Kexby Parish Council |
| 657 | ST26 | Comm | Development should be restricted to light industry and small business units to lessen noise and light pollution. Should place restrictions on HGVs through the village for safety. Expansion borders site of importance for nature conservation - wildlife protection should be put in place, particularly around 'Balance Pond' which has evidence of newts, barn owls, badger and deer. Wildlife corridor should be kept along northern boundary of proposed site. | |
| 1355 | ST26 | Comm | The existing traffic and congestion through the village, particularly on Main Street, indicates this expansion should also include consideration of a weight limit in the village. Community representatives generally support the extension, but believe an archaeological assessment should take place before development. | Julian Sturdy MP |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|---------------|---|--|
| 5153ii | ST26 | Comm | Expansion of airfield should provide wildlife/ habitat protection, additional development should be limited to high value businesses. HGV traffic should be routed to A64/A1079. | |
| 5153iv | ST26 | Comm | Expansion of Airfield business park is sensible providing adequate wildlife protections are put in place. Undeveloped 'wildlife corridor' should be inserted between existing and proposed employment areas. Land around 'balance pond' should be protected. Additional development should be limited for small high value businesses. HGV traffic should be routed to A64/A1079. Weight limit required in Elvington village for safety purposes. | |
| 10175 | ST26 | Comm | Has no objection to this site but supports the Elvington Parish Council condition that a 7.5 tonne weight limit is placed on traffic using the B1228 Main Street through Elvington village. | |
| 13211 | ST26 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 34 | ST26 | Obj | Expansion would increase HGV traffic and request the restrictions are imposed so that access is prohibited through the centre of villages. | |
| 5535 | ST26 | Obj | Traffic and HGVs must be diverted away from Elvington Village. | |
| 5536 | ST26 | Obj | If expansion occurs, divert HGVs away from Elvington village. | |
| 5738ii | ST26 | Obj | Increased HGV's, pollution and risk of accident in village. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5741 | ST26 | Obj | Does not support for the same reasons as Elvington Industrial Estate (road safety concerns from additional traffic and no need to expand industrial estate that currently has empty units). | |
| 9473 | ST26 | Obj | More HGV traffic through Elvington is unacceptable. The Main Street is narrow and HGVs mount the pavement endangering pedestrians. If the extension goes ahead there should be a restriction on HGVs going through Elvington. | |
| 9726 | ST26 | Obj | Concerned about additional traffic during construction and occupation. | |
| 9776 | ST26 | Obj | Elvington already suffers from a disproportionate number of HGVs travelling through the village, development would exacerbate this both during contraction and once completed. | |
| 10895 | ST26 | Obj | Objects to B8 usage as there is no mitigation on traffic flow on the B1228, B8 usage will increase HGV flow to and from the site, many of the houses along the B1228 do not have "foundations" and HGV traffic flow over 40mph has an impact on dwellings particularly between 5pm and 7am. There should be a direct link to the A64 through the proposed Winthorpe site (ST15) as this is a great opportunity for a road that is suitable for HGVs rather than the B1228. For Elvington to retain its village identity is inappropriate to have an extension of industrial space. | |
| 11419 | ST26 | Obj | Concerned about HGV movement through the village as a result of this development, already suffers from a disproportionately large volume of such traffic and this would exacerbate the situation. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13366 | ST26 | Obj | The construction of these new businesses at ST26 will have a severe impact upon the traffic flow between Elvington and York and through the village itself. There are already long queues to the traffic lights at Grimston Bar Roundabout every morning and congestion in the evenings with traffic blocking the roundabout. Also it will increase the amount of traffic and HGV's through Elvington Village, there are already too many HGV's through the village. The proposal will also impact local wildlife, the fields around Elvington and between Elvington and York are an important habitat for many species which are under pressure due to loss of habitat. | |
| 13380 | ST26 | Obj | There has been no provision for extra secondary school places here. Archbishop Holgate is already very big and further increase in size is likely to impact detrimentally on the children and their learning experiences as they become drops in the ocean rather than well-known individuals in a 'family' school environment, which they are used to at their smaller primary schools. | |
| 13434i | ST26 | Obj | Improvements such as widening need to be made to Elvington Lane (B1228) for safety. New access from A64 needs building. The bridge between Elvington and Sutton-on-Derwent needs a weight limit. | |
| 13556 | ST26 | Obj | This expansion has significant potential to increase HGV's using Elvington Lane and Main Street in the village of Elvington. HGV's are hazardous on these roads and an increase could cause a serious accident. | |
| 61 | ST26 | Supp | The Parish Council supports the extension proposed.Emphasises the need for detailed archaeological and ecological assessments before development. | Elvington Parish Council |
| 1355 | ST26 | Supp | Welcomes the proposal of using B1 and B8 units, which will provide light industry, reflecting the rural nature of nearby villages | Julian Sturdy MP |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1674 | ST26 | Supp | <p>Support in general for the allocation of additional land at the Elvington Airfield Business Park to provide 25,080 sqm of B1B, B1c, B2/B8 employment floorspace. Previous evidence submitted confirms that this is suitable, deliverable and viable. However, we are concerned with the nature of the criteria listed under Policy SS21, which set out a number of key principles, for the following reasons: 1) In relation to criterion (ii), reference is made to the retention and enhancement of historic field boundaries. However, there are no historic field boundaries within the extent of the allocation. The criterion is therefore meaningless and should be deleted. 2) The airfield was constructed during WWII by the MoD. At that time they laid the airfield out in the way in which much of it still appears today. As a result, any historic field boundaries were removed to make way for the airfield and the needs of the MoD. Furthermore, the current owners have undertaken works, such as hedge planting, within the last 20 years. The current field boundaries cannot, therefore, be considered to be historic due to the alterations made over the last few decades. Consequently, there is no justification for retaining the existing field boundaries, especially as any planning application would include a landscaping scheme to aid integration of the proposal. We would therefore like to suggest the criterion is removed given criterion (iii) refers to undertaking landscape works to mitigate against the visual impact of the proposal. This is more appropriate in the circumstances. In relation to criterion (iv) there appears to be a fundamental misunderstanding as to the nature and volume of traffic generated by the proposal. (cont...)</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy L |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1674 | ST26 | Supp | <p>Traffic, generated by the businesses on the site, is usually travelling in the opposite direction to peak morning flows. Also, traffic movements are usually outside of peak flows. What work is being undertaken to coordinate all the improvements to the junctions? With regards to criterion (v), the nature of the existing businesses needs to be appreciated, along with the types of business that will be attracted to the extended business park. To introduce restrictions (re criterion v) would be harmful to the supply of land for B2 land uses within the district on a site that does not justify the introduction of restrictions. We are unclear as to why reference is made to air quality and there is no commentary within the explanation to help with our understanding - any emissions from development would be the subject of a license or permit from either the Council or Environment Agency to ensure they are within reasonable limits. With regards to criterion (vii) please note that my client has already undertaken preliminary investigations and have an initial design of the drainage system; the intention is to direct surface water towards the south and the River Derwent. Technical, environmental and landscape information submitted previously establishes how the land is suitable, available and developable. We understand how the Council has suggested that the information does not need to be submitted again, so we would like to kindly request Officers to review previous submissions, which includes various technical reports that set out the case for the allocation of the land.</p> | Directions Planning Consultancy L |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 3046 | ST26 | Supp | Supports on basis of additional jobs for locals providing a detailed archaeological and ecological assessment is carried out prior to development. Units should be small high value businesses. 7.5 tonne weight limit should be imposed to main road through village, and traffic from E9 and ST26 should have to travel up the A1079 rather than through village. | |
| 5146 | ST26 | Supp | Support bringing jobs to the area however a detailed archaeological and ecological assessment must be made prior to development. Support is conditional on imposition of a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Main Street as there is already a disproportionate number of HGVs going through the village which are a danger to cyclists, pedestrians and school children. Development of ST9 and E9 will bring yet more HGVs which is unacceptable. | |
| 5259 | ST26 | Supp | Supports the principle of employment development on the site, on the proviso that a detailed archaeological and ecological assessment is carried out prior to development. Units should be small, high value in compliance with existing restriction to B1 and B8 use. | |
| 5816 | ST26 | Supp | Could bring jobs to the local economy, however traffic management should limit HGV access via the village. Units should be small, high value businesses in compliance with existing B1/B8 restrictions. | |
| 10047 | ST26 | Supp | Support the development but only if 7.5 tonne weight limit imposed on Main Street, in the village. Also, there should be due attention paid to the continuation of the existing wildlife corridors set up under the Biodiversity plan. | |
| 10453 | ST26 | Supp | Support the development but only if 7.5 tonne weight limit imposed on Main Street, in the village. Also, there should be due attention paid to the continuation of the existing wildlife corridors set up under the Biodiversity plan. | |
| 13555 | ST26 | Supp | Largely supported, see Parish Council's comments for detail. | Wheldrake Ward Councillor |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS22: University of York expansion (ST27) | | | | |
| 4 | SS22 | Comm | It will be essential for an assessment to be made of the traffic impact of the site both individually and cumulatively with site ST15 in a Transport Assessment | Highways England |
| 46 | ST27 | Comm | Movement of the site away from the village is welcome but as with ST15 the village must be protected from both vehicular traffic and students coming through the village (a need that was recognised in the planning consent granted for Heslington East where using the new lakes as a barrier has been successful). Any new access from ST15 must run closely adjacent to the A64 to minimise harmful impacts on open farmland and views to / from Heslington. | Heslington Village Trust |
| 91ii | ST27 | Comm | At the eastern edge of this site there is an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Esrick. Would appreciate maintaining a green way alongside the site rather than a path along boundary buildings. Same applies to Green Lane which leads down to Grange Farm. There should certainly be a green buffer and trees to screen the development somewhat from the A64. Agrees that the 23% footprint should include car parking and access roads. | York Ramblers |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1673 | ST27 | comm. | <p>The university campus East has permission for 65 ha of development land of which 35ha has been developed over the last 10 years and 30 ha remains undeveloped. Proposals for 5ha of further development is anticipated in the next 5 years. The University is a long-term presence and requires land for expansion over the time frame of the plan. Uptake of employment uses on 25ha allocated in Campus East to date has been slow. Growth in students over the last 10 years has been from 5300 to 16000 and it is likely to keep growing. the university supports 3,900 staff. Changes to government funding have resulted in the university planning more specifically for the future. Key to size are growing departments, growth in international foundation programmes for internal students and growing long distance learning. Continued success of the university is fundamental to York's economy. Projected need for the future for student accommodation includes 2 colleges in the short-term and 3 more in the long-term to 2032; extra 3 colleges cannot be accommodated on existing campus. Employment use buildings such as The Catalyst needs car parking with close proximity. Access from the A64 in conjunction with ST15 may be attractive for business users. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development as per the Campus East.</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |
| 1673 | ST27 | comm. | <p>Confident that car parking across Campus East and the new extension will be accommodated within the existing planning permission as only 27% of maximum of current permission provided. University of supportive of connectivity to the A64 alongside ST15. No vehicle access proposed through Heslington.</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2923 | ST27 | Comm | General comments regarding the how ST27 has been allocated and a point regarding access to ST27. What measures are proposed to ensure access to the site will be limited to Para 3.96 page 71? | |
| 12959 | ST27 | Comm | Support the University expansion but questions how people will access the site from Hull Road. Several alternative access points suggested. | |
| 13211 | ST27 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 13466i | ST27 | Comm | Noted potential link to ST27 via A64. Would support a new junction beside ST27 rather than anything further west as minimises destruction of farmland and provides University with direct link to A64. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 48 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Heslington still preserves its unique village character despite great pressures from the surrounding expansion of the university. A great deal of care was taken to preserve the character of Heslington and its setting in Green Belt by the creation of a buffer zone between the village and the campus and the creation of a barrier between the campus and the access to the village via Low Lane. This was achieved by careful landscaping of the lakes. Its current use as agricultural land complements the undoubted high environmental status of the university lake and the ground-nesting habitat alongside the lake. This will be lost if the land is developed. The Inspector in his report from the Public Inquiry for the current University expansion particularly comments that the lake and wetland area will provide a positive limit to built development to the south of the Heslington East site. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that: There should be no direct vehicular or pedestrian access from the site, when developed, into the village other than via Field Lane. If access from a new road from ST15 connects with ST27 Campus East then no “rat run” opportunity should be available that allows traffic through to Heslington village. The Local Plan should stipulate that the land can only be developed for the university’s own academic purposes, and not be designated as general development land. All existing public routes and Rights of Way should be retained in any completed development.</p> | Heslington Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 62 | SS22 (policy) | Obj | <p>Recognises the university's value to the city but costs of expansion have fallen disproportionately on local communities nearby i.e. Fulford, Heslington and Badger Hill. These costs are: the concentration of HMOs / students in private rented sector which leads to insensitive extensions, poorly maintained exteriors, unkempt gardens and bins left near the street; parking by staff and students on local residential roads; traffic congestion on roads linking the university with the A64 including Heslington Lane and the A19. The four policies proposed to deal with the university SS22, ED1, ED2 & ED3 should be rationalised as they duplicate each other and set out similar objectives in slightly different ways.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|----|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 62 | ST27 | Obj | <p>FPC objects in principle to Proposal ST27. The site of this proposed allocation is an important part of the green buffer along the A64 and as such contributes significantly to the setting and special character of York. It would bring large-scale development almost completely up to the A64, replicating the type of harm already seen at Clifton Moor. Its development would conflict with at least three of the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in NPPF paragraph 80. FPC must respectfully point out that the site of Proposal ST27 was not intended to be developed by the University when it sought planning permission for Heslington East from the Secretary of State. Instead the site was shown as part of the green buffer around the site. It is unclear why the University has changed its mind over such a short period of time, especially as there has been no change in the environmental value of the land. FPC does note that the proposed allocation is actually for “B1b knowledge businesses” rather than to meet any need identified for further university uses which cannot be accommodated on the existing two campuses. To FPC’s knowledge, no substantial case has been made which demonstrates a need for further land for knowledge-based businesses beyond that allowed by the 2006 Secretary of State permission. Even if there is such a need, FPC considers that sites would not have to be immediately adjacent to the University. If ST27 is retained, the following alterations should be made: 1) Criterion iv) should be altered to omit “which is clearly evidence in terms of demand” as it is ambiguous in meaning.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 62 | ST27 | Obj | <p>2) Criterion v) should be strengthened. High quality sustainable transport is vital to reduce congestion on the local road network and impacts on nearby communities. To ensure this, FPC considers the criterion should be reworded as follows: Deliver high quality frequent and accessible public transport to York City Centre and elsewhere including Campus West. Any proposal must demonstrate that such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport. Monitoring and delivery arrangements will be required in a Section 106 Undertaking to ensure that this policy objective is secured in practice. 3) Criterion vii) should be revised so that it applies the stronger NPPF paragraph 32 test as follows: Demonstrate that all transport issues have been resolved, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, so that the residual cumulative impacts on the surrounding highway network are not severe. The cumulative impact of the proposal with other proposals to the south-east of York, including ST4 and ST15, should be addressed. 4) Criterion viii) should be either deleted or strengthened. FPC is opposed in principle to a new access onto the A64 because of its harmful impacts on the environment (see below). However if it is to be provided, it is important that ST27 (and the rest of Campus East) makes use of it to benefit local roads. 5) A new criterion should be added so that only businesses linked to the university should be allowed on the site. FPC suggests the following: Demonstrate that only knowledge-based businesses genuinely requiring a location on or immediately adjacent to the University campus are allowed to occupy premises on the site.</p> | Fulford Parish Council |
| 238 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Further consideration needs to be had as to how the growth of this important institution might be delivered in a manner which best safeguards the elements which contribute to the setting of this important historic City.</p> | Historic England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-----|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 238 | ST27 | Obj | <p>The future expansion of the University should be restricted to within the Campus East and consideration should be given to the expansion of the university in a northerly direction onto site ST4 instead. Notwithstanding stated policy caveats, development could harm 2 elements which contribute to the special character and historic setting of the City, notably: the site's prominence in relation tot he A64 - development would fundamentally change the relationship which the southern edge of York has with the countryside to its south. It will alter peoples perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the city within an area of open space, and may not be successfully mitigated through 'landscaping' (previously amounting to alien earth bunding); the expansion would alter the relationship of York to its surrounding villages, in terms of distance, scale and the fact that they are free-standing and clearly definable settlements. The development would reduce the gap between the city and ST15 to 1.6km.</p> | Historic England |
| 670 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Strongly object to further expansion of the university as it will destroy the landscape and setting of Heslington. Low Lane is set beside the new East Campus and has kept its rural feel due to the fields and green belt land opposite.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 1673 | ST27 | obi | <p>Object to the disparity between the existing planning permission on campus east for up to 25ha of employment floorspace (likely to be 5.75ha / 57,500 sqm single storey) to 21,500 sqm (equating to 2.33 0 3.16 ha) in policy SS22 and ED3. The policy needs to be altered to clarify that the existing permitted 25 ha of business at 23% footprint on campus East stands plus 21,5000 sqm at the extension. Wording suggested that with agreement of the Council, the University can restrict the B1b provision on Campus East, in order to make equivalent provision on the extension, to a total of 25 ha across both sites. This could facilitate a cluster of knowledge- led businesses taking advantage of A64 location. The contradiction between ED3 and EC1 needs to be clarified to allow the campus extension.</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |
| 1673 | ST27 | obi | <p>Alternative ST27 boundary - (Option 1) 2014 version of 28ha with an external buffer of around 30ha. This would provide 26ha of developable land and negates need for landscape buffer in allocation. Preferred option thought to be most successful to meet the University's needs in the long-term. 2ha remains outside of university control. Likely to have a strong landscape scheme with high quality open parkland setting with wide southern buffer area. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. No impacts on views to Heslington although some panoramic views. Also likely to have strong green belt boundaries along historic field pattern. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting key to mitigating landscape changes similarly to Campus East. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1673 | ST27 | obi | <p>Alternative ST27 boundary - (Option 3) 32 ha extending the 2017 allocation further south including a landscape buffer of 7.5ha. This would incorporate a 7.5 ha buffer leaving 22.5 ha of developable land. 2ha remains outside of university control. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Relationship to campus is similar to the current boundary although larger scale development and open parkland setting likely to be accommodated. A major inhibitor would result from the proximity to the A64 and visibility; A considerable buffer/ noise barrier to the A64 would be required providing glimpsed views to campus. The Views to heslington would not be interrupted. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting key to mitigating landscape changes. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1673 | ST27 | obi | <p>Main objection relates to the policies which strongly support the University's continued expansion are not translated into adequate land allocation for expansion. The 14ha of development space proposed for the next 20 years will not provide the security which the university needs for long term planning and therefore will not meet the Council's own policies on growth of the University and expansion of the York economy. Taking into consideration space planning it is considered that 23.8 ha of developable land is required to 2032/22 and 28 ha to 2038 to allow for green belt permanence (2014 boundary with landscape buffer). Current allocation therefore hinders ability to respond to future requirements and need. The policy should reference knowledge based business in addition to other higher education and related uses. Object to the boundary proposed in 2017 (Option 2 referred to in response) as they consider that this would require an internal buffer to the A64 (5.5ha) and therefore only allow a 14 ha of developable land. Alternative boundaries suggested show that there is little difference between the sites in terms of visual effects. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Considered that this would have a weaker relationship to campus given only part developed on the south eastern part of the lake. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Evidence submitted includes location plans and visual assessment for alternative options and masterplan document</p> | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 5151 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Cannot support the suggested use of land for employment purposes by the University of York at ST27. The University has not yet used up available space at Heslington East campus. There is more than sufficient undeveloped land on that site to meet its needs. Conditions on the permission for Heslington East campus should still apply, i.e. a buffer zone maintained between the campus and Heslington - these have been breached by permission to allow a health centre, shops and food outlets in the buffer zone. Allowing employment space on land adjacent to the A64 is breaching the buffer zone again. Employment space on this land adjacent to the A64 suggests the possibility of a separate access/egress point to this road and could lead to traffic entering Heslington along an improved Low Lane and using the Village as a short cut. Heslington would be almost completely enclosed by the campus and its environs - the pleasure of the countryside and rural feel would be lost to its inhabitants</p> | |
| 5671 | ST27 | Obj | <p>The Inspector's report to the Heslington East Public Inquiry states that development expansion of the University on Heslington East should not cross Low Lane in order to protect Heslington Village. Further removal of Green Belt/prime agricultural land in this area seriously compromises this open land setting.</p> | |
| 10919 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Comments that were submitted in September 2016 still apply but wishes to add that any new access from the proposed new development site West of Elvington Lane must run closely alongside the A64 to avoid harming open farmland or views to and from Heslington village.</p> | |
| 13286 | ST27 | Obj | <p>Concerned that the proposed student housing will impact on the historic individuality of York. The View from the A64 is already denigrated by the new University building. Nothing will reduce the eyesore of student accommodation infill up to the road</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13464 | ST27 | Obj | Objects to developments. | |
| 13534 | ST27 | Obj | <p>CYC needs to consider the impact on the setting and special character of the City. The cumulative impact of developments like this one will be disastrous. York already has a serious traffic / congestion issue. York's special character is just related to the walled City or conservation areas - views from the outer ring road are also important particularly where they include views of the Minster. ST27 is an important part of the green buffer along the A64 and contributes to the special character of York. Additionally, the development would result in increased noise and disturbance in an area greatly valued by local residents. The combined result would destroy the character of the Green Belt, and significantly increased traffic congestion - large scale development would be almost up to the A64, the A19 is already near max capacity and the special character of Fulford Conservation Area would be damaged.</p> | |
| 13613 | ST27 | Obj | Object - should be used as a green space | |
| 4 | SS22 | Supp | <p>Transport issues are covered satisfactorily in key principle (vii). HE welcomes the statement in Para. 7.11 that Site ST27 will be accessed via Hull Road via Campus East. HE's agreement in principle to the provision of a new junction on the A64 to serve site ST15 Land West of Elvington Lane is conditional on there being no access from the A64 northwards towards Campus East.</p> | Highways England |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 863 | ST27 | Supp | The movement of land allocated to the University development away from the village is welcomed. In the same way that the village is protected from the effects of ST15 it should also be protected from this development. In this case the village should be protected not only from vehicular traffic, but also from large numbers of students coming through the village. This need was recognised in the design of Campus East using the lake as a barrier and had been largely successful. Suggested addition 'Retain Low Lane as a route for local traffic only. It is essential that there is no vehicular transport or other access from the University to Heslington village along Low Lane to ensure that the setting of Heslington village is to be maintained.' | |
| 1673 | ST27 | supp | Support the principle of allocation for University of York expansion primarily for residential colleges, academic buildings, knowledge based businesses and car parking/infrastructure. Support for employment allocation to meet knowledge-led businesses demand. Support for the site to have restrictions in relation to obligations on the university to encourage student living on campus. | O'Neills Associates on behalf of U |
| 12959 | ST27 | Supp | Support the University expansion. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| SS23: Land at Northminster Business Park (ST19) | | | | |
| 4 | ST19 | Comm | HE would not expect this to have a substantial individual impact on the operation of the A64 but expect it to combine with the other larger sites around the A1237 to have a significant traffic impact on the A64/A1237 junction west of York | Highways England |
| 238 | ST19 | Comm | No objection to the principle of development provided that, in order to retain separation between the business park and nearby villages, the southern extent of this area should not extend any further south than the existing car park to the south of Redwood House. Without this reduction development would threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which would be just 250m from the southern boundary of the area. | Historic England |
| 866 | SS23 | Comm | Feel criteria are too general to provide real guidance at the planning application stage. Criteria only repeats the premise behind the actual allocation of the land which is already stated in the policy. Suggests for it to be rewritten more clearly and include substance to shaping development. No need for criteria 4.5 as business park is within walking distance of park and ride and new development would be too. 4.7 criteria (v) and (vi) could be simplified to clarify meaning. Northminster Business Park has additional capacity beyond land currently allocated. | Northminster Business Park |
| 4689 | ST19 | Comm | Extending Business Park would lose prime farmland and green belt. Doubling the size of the site will also cause traffic and safety issues on a North End lane, a single road. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 13211 | ST19 | Comm | Potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. HV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. | Northern Power Grid |
| 71 | ST19 | Obj | Do not support expansion of the business park into green belt land. The narrow country lane cannot take more traffic and the conversion of many offices around York indicates that there is no need for additional office space. There is spare land within York Business Park - surely this should be developed before green belt land. | Nether Poppleton Parish Council |
| 71i | ST19 | Obj | Do not support expansion of the business park into green belt land. The narrow country lane cannot take more traffic and the conversion of many offices around York indicates that there is no need for additional office space. There is spare land within York Business Park - surely this should be developed before green belt land. | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |
| 74 | ST19 | Obj | Recognised that an extension to Northminster Business Park would provide significant job opportunities but the proposed scale is too large. A smaller expansion like that in PSC 2016 might be acceptable. | Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 78 | ST19 | Obj | Do not support expansion of the business park into green belt land. The narrow country lane cannot take more traffic and the conversion of many offices around York indicates that there is no need for additional office space. There is spare land within York Business Park - surely this should be developed before green belt land. | Upper Poppleton Parish Council |
| 2309 | ST19 | Obj | A strong objection to ST19. Due to the following reasons: 1. The site is directly at odds with the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan. The site is not suitable for expansion beyond its existing boundary. 2. Loss of residential amenity for the residents on Northfields Road. 3. It conflicts with Green Belt policy and harms the Green Belt. 4. It conflicts with Policy GI3: Green Infrastructure Network. Expansion of ST19 would close the crucial green corridor further and allow coalescence. It will affect the local wildlife. 5. Northfields Lane is unsuitable to support traffic for such a major expansion. 6. There is no requirement for the expansion as some of the existing business properties appear empty. 7. Loss of grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9634 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Strongly object to expansion of this site. It is directly at odds with the Upper & Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan that states expansion within the curtilage of the site would be possible - further expansion would compromise the green belt. This site is not suitable for expansion beyond the existing boundary: loss of residential amenity; noise increasingly affects the quality of life of residents not just from Northminster Business Park but also Oakwood and the caravan storage park. The only way to retain residential amenity is to bar any traffic increase on Northfield Lane; development conflicts with Green Belt Policy and harms the Green Belt. Site ST19 is not limited infilling and would be unjustified expansion. The Green Belt is dependent on being continuous and linked via green corridors yet coalescence between Poppleton and Knapton has already gone as far as it can before it becomes continuous and risks cutting off a large amount of green belt land from open countryside. Fields to the north of Knapton would become a peninsular of green belt with its habitat and diversity reduced. Policy GI3 recognises this. The expansion of Northminster Business park closes this crucial green corridor even further. Northfield Lane is unsuitable to support traffic for a major expansion. The lane is a dead end which should remain as it saves residents from more traffic; Northfield lane is used by many residents for walking, cycling, horse riding etc it provides a relatively safe pedestrian route between West York/Knapton & Poppleton. There is no requirement for business properties at this side of the city. The loss of grade 1 & 2 agricultural land should be avoided</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9966 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Opposes on the basis that expansion is directly at odds with the Upper and Nether Poppleton neighbourhood plans that were approved by 91.3% of votes in August 2017. Northfield Lane is a residential road where 6 private residences adjoin the business park, there is already heavy traffic (often lorries) because of Northminster Park's entrance being located diagonally opposite to residential properties. Significant existing noise pollution problems impacting on quality of life and lorries often block the road posing a road safety hazard, expansion will exacerbate this and the extra traffic on Northfield Lane will be detrimental to current recreational users - walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The only way to ensure compliance with policy SS23 and the commitment to ensure residential amenity is to bar any increase in the amount of traffic, especially HGVs and delivery lorries, on Northfield Lane. No expansion beyond the current boundary should be allowed. Development would be in violation of NPPF greenbelt policy as it is a major unjustified expansion as there is no 'special circumstances' that would require expansion given the number of business parks around the city that are vacant or being converted to apartments. Development would also violate local plan policy G13 as it risks cutting off a large amount of greenbelt land (between Northfield Lane and the western boundary of York north of Wetherby Road) from open countryside. Fears this development will endanger long term security of greenbelt and lead to loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 9969 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Opposes on the basis that expansion is directly at odds with the Upper and Nether Poppleton neighbourhood plans that were approved by 91.3% of votes in August 2017. Northfield Lane is a residential road where 6 private residences adjoin the business park, there is already heavy traffic (often lorries) because of Northminster Park's entrance being located diagonally opposite to residential properties. Significant existing noise pollution problems impacting on quality of life and lorries often block the road posing a road safety hazard, expansion will exacerbate this and the extra traffic on Northfield Lane will be detrimental to current recreational users - walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The only way to ensure compliance with policy SS23 and the commitment to ensure residential amenity is to bar any increase in the amount of traffic, especially HGVs and delivery lorries, on Northfield Lane. No expansion beyond the current boundary should be allowed. Development would be in violation of NPPF greenbelt policy as it is a major unjustified expansion as there is no 'special circumstances' that would require expansion given the number of business parks around the city that are vacant or being converted to apartments. Development would also violate local plan policy GI3 as it risks cutting off a large amount of greenbelt land (between Northfield Lane and the western boundary of York north of Wetherby Road) from open countryside. Fears this development will endanger long term security of greenbelt and lead to loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> | |
| 9969i | ST19 | Obj | Asking for confirmation their earlier email has been received. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10836 | SS23 | Obj | Plan opposes current agreed neighbourhood plans to not expand site. Expanding the industrial Business Park at Northfield lane is dangerous for residents on the roads and paths due to HGVs traffic and causes noise pollution. Expansion will harm the green belt and green corridors vital for wildlife, no 'special circumstances' for the area, and will lose grade 1 agricultural land. | |
| 10836i | ST19 | Obj | Objects to policy SS23, as it is at odds with Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plans, which were approved by local people. Expansion would compromise green belt. There would be a loss of residential amenity and more HGVs travelling down a residential road. Development in this area has already gone too far before it becomes continuous and cuts off a large portion of green belt land. Expansion of the business park closes this green corridor further and will impact wildlife. Northfield Lane is unsuitable to support traffic - the lane is a dead end, the junction with the A59 is already congested, and it is not wide enough for HGVs. The area is a public amenity used by many for walking/cycling etc. There are other areas in the city suitable for business properties. There will also be a loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. | |
| 12809 | ST19 | Obj | The proposed enlargement of Northminster Business Park is not necessary as there are many empty spaces on present business parks around York. This is grade 1 agricultural land and should be kept to maintain a supply for home consumption especially after Brexit. | |
| 13309 | SS23 | Obj | Plan opposes current agreed neighbourhood plans to not expand site. Expanding the industrial Business Park at Northfield lane is dangerous for residents on the roads and paths due to HGVs traffic and causes noise pollution. Expansion will harm the green belt and green corridors vital for wildlife, no 'special circumstances' for the area, and will lose grade 1 agricultural land. | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 13324 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Objects to development on the following grounds: development is directly at odds with the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plans, which oppose further expansion of the site due to it's impact on green belt; loss of residential amenity - Northfield Lane is a residential road, and is already subject to large numbers of heavy vehicles. Resultant noise affects residents' quality of life. Only alternative is to permanently shut all access (except pedestrian/cycle) from the business park onto Northfield Lane and divert traffic via a new junction on the A1237; as inappropriate development in the green belt it conflicts with national green belt policy; it conflicts with policy GI3, closing the green corridor west of York towards Knapton; Northfield Lane is unsuitable to support further traffic; Amenity - as a dead-end, Northfield Lane provides a relatively safe pedestrian/cycling/riding route; Lack of need - there appear to be empty properties at many of the business parks sited at this side of the city; Loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land - once it's gone, it's gone.</p> | |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|-------|--------|---------------|--|--|
| 13515 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Unsure how the proposed business park is acceptable within the proposed green belt. Says the proposals map north does not show Oakwood park, simply colouring the space it occupies for green belt - the Northminster site being proposed is more than doubled in area, extending south to Moor Lane yet the whole area is proposed green belt? Asks how this can be justified in light of the NPPF guidance on development in the green belt. Says this is also in conflict with Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan. Council needs to make clear how it regards the area along the Northfield Lane axis - if this is as it appears on the proposals map, green belt, what happens to the Oakwood Business Park (unmarked on here) and the adjacent area occupied by caravans? Why is the area formerly known as Wheatlands Community Woodlands (2054) east of Northfield Lane marked as open space when it has been closed to the public since the landowner's application for a caravan site was rejected as inappropriate in the green belt? Given the inconsistency with which the NPPF principles have been applied to the area the whole of Northfield Lane is at risk of turning into a ribbon development, stretching out from Poppleton to the ring road opposite Knapton. There are already two business parks, a restaurant, garden centre, park and ride, vets and caravan park along the side of Northfield Lane. Asks how much more can be built on if the site is to retain green belt status. Also has concerned that ST19 development will mean increased traffic along Northfield Lane and into Moor Lane, roads which are popular with cyclists and walkers.</p> | |
| 13628 | ST19 | Obj | <p>Do not support expansion of the business park into green belt land. The narrow country lane cannot take more traffic and the conversion of many offices around York indicates that there is no need for additional office space. There is spare land within York Business Park - surely this should be developed before green belt land.</p> | Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| 866 | ST19 | Supp | Support allocation of land to support expansion of business park for economic activity. Concerned that the council does not intend to safeguard land so commercial development will be constrained in the future due to the lack of available land for businesses outside the green belt. | Northminster Business Park |
| 1741 | SS23 | Supp | We support the designation of this land as strategic employment land. | Carter Jonas on behalf of client |

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

| ID | Policy | Obj/Supp/ Comm | Summary | Respondent (name of individuals removed) |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---|--|
| SS24: Whitehall Grange (ST37) | | | | |
| 4 | ST37 | Comm | HE has no particular concern with this site except for its potential to combine with the other larger strategic sites around the A1237 to have an impact on the two junctions of the A1237 with the A64. | Highways England |
| 13240 | ST37 | Comm | Concerned about traffic on northern ring road (A1237). | |
| 238 | ST37 | Obj | Recommends deletion of the site. The site forms part of the green wedge that extends into the north of the City, which is centred on Bootham Stray. Although there are a handful of building on this site, it is clearly perceived as a part of this open area. The loss of this site and its subsequent redevelopment would result in the considerable narrowing of this wedge and harm one of the key elements identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as contributing to the special character and setting of York. | Historic England |
| 13632 | ST37 | Obj | If anything large is developed here the sight line of the Minster from the edge of the ring road will be lost. This is important to tourists and this area of the ring road is the only place a view of the Minster is possible. | |
| 6326 | ST37 | Supp | Support the allocation of land at Whitehall grange for B8 storage use. The allocation of the site is a logical step following the grant of planning permission in April 2017 for B8 storage - note that site has been wrongly labelled ST27 on some pdf/paper versions of the proposals map. | O'Neill Associates obo Authohorn Group Ltd |