

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
<b>Site H1</b>				
238	H1 (site)	Comm	No objection to the principle of development, however given the proximity of the City Walls (a Scheduled Ancient Monument) and the CHC Conservation Area, the Plan should make clear that those elements which contribute to the significance of the City Walls and CHC CA are not harmed.	Historic England
13318	H1 (site)	Comm	No objection to gasometer being removed. No objects to removal of communications mast. Consider site for Hotel rather than residential?	
2994	H1 (site)	Obj	This allocation causes concerns for, loss of Green Space, congestion and inadequate access.	
13043	H1 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: proposed density is too high - site should provide family housing rather than flatted development; site could provide a nursery and/or self-build plots. Comments on the need to remove the gas holder in advance of development taking place - to retain it could mean residents living in very close proximity for decades.	
13400	H1 (site)	Supp	The site at the moment looks awful.	
<b>Site H3</b>				
3579	H3 (site)	Obj	Objects to taking area of village out of the green belt, which contradicts the community's wish to maintain it's identity and style, and disrupts habitat and wildlife.	
13287	H3 (site)	Supp	Affordable housing should be provided.	
<b>Site H5</b>				
13358	H5 (site)	Comm	Supports the principle of delivering more affordable homes.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13297	H5 (site)	Obj	<p>This proposal for the site represents a gross overdevelopment resulting in the loss of valuable sports pitches and recreational land. CYC had previously promised that development would be restricted to the built footprint amounting to 6.5 acres of a 13 acre site. The proposed use has always been centred around accommodation for older people, to which residents did not object. A majority of residents surveyed supported the provision of accommodation aimed at older people on the former built footprint of the school. Residents specifically asked for useable public open space (the provision of sports pitches, nature reserve and allotments); all have been jettisoned to shoe horn more buildings onto the site. No surety that North Yorkshire Police or Health Centre provision is deliverable. We do not believe that the playing field should be developed but, if it is, alternative parkland should be provided on the outskirts of the City, possibly in the Askham Lane area.</p>	Save Lowfields Playing Field Action Group
13297i	H5 (site)	Obj	<p>This proposal for the site represents a gross overdevelopment resulting in the loss of valuable sports pitches and recreational land. CYC had previously promised that development would be restricted to the built footprint (2.3ha of the 5.4 ha school site). Planned use of the site - 72 homes aimed at elderly people - has risen to 168 homes plus 80 care beds, i.e. 245 units. Page 161 of the Plan indicates 161 units, with no allowance for a care home. Westfield Ward has an evidenced open space deficit - building on playing fields would make this significantly worse. Objects in principle to the Council having submitted a planning application in advance of the Local Plan.</p>	Steve Galloway

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13298	H5 (site)	Obj	This proposal for the site represents a gross overdevelopment resulting in the loss of valuable sports pitches and recreational land. CYC had previously promised that development would be restricted to the built footprint amounting to 6.5 acres of a 13 acre site. The proposed use has always been centred around accommodation for older people, to which residents did not object. A majority of residents surveyed supported the provision of accommodation aimed at older people on the former built footprint of the school. Residents specifically asked for useable public open space (the provision of sports pitches, nature reserve and allotments); all have been jettisoned to shoe horn more buildings onto the site. No surety that North Yorkshire Police or Health Centre provision is deliverable. We do not believe that the playing field should be developed but, if it is, alternative parkland should be provided on the outskirts of the City, possibly in the Askham Lane area.	
13302	H5 (site)	Obj	Object to housing being built up to my boundary and blocking light from my house.	
13294	H5 (site)	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.	
<b>Site H6</b>				
5193	H6 (site)	Comm	Objects to picture produced by O'Neill Associates Planning Consultants, which shows the proposed development as ultra modern buildings with garish colours and is out of keeping with the architecture of the Grove. Access is not clear, concerned about effect of construction on square, parking and access onto Tadcaster Road.	
12786	H6 (site)	Comm	Access through The Grove will be hazardous for safety and transport due to students entering York college on foot and bike, which leaves the road congested. Traffic should enter at Principals Rise where there is a wide island with room for parked cars. There are full border shrubberies on the site which are full of wildlife.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
1400	H6 (site)	Obj	At present 1.53 hectares of the land within the Trust's ownership is allocated for residential extra care (C3b) facilities in the Pre-publication draft local plan, as it was at Preferred Sites stage. The purpose of the representation is to set out a series of amendments to housing allocation H6 to make it consistent with the Wilberforce Trust's proposals for the site. The changes include extending the allocation to include a further 0.5 hectares of land to the north (which lies to the east of St Leonards H, with subsequent revisions to the Green Belt in order that it is more clearly defined) and removing the reference C3(b) as the use class for the development and redesignating it as use class C3(a).	The Wilberforce Trust
12235	H6 (site)	Obj	Strong objection to site allocation H6 primarily due to traffic impact on Tadcaster Road. Traffic at peak hours is already at a stand still and breaches EU air quality standards. Also cumulative impact with allocation H8. No additional development should occur on Tadcaster road until traffic flow is increased. in addition, H6 contains flora and fauna and 'breathing space' in an area that has already seen significant change. Bats are on site. Site is attractive and development should be discouraged.	
1400	H6 (site)	Supp	Rep relates to the Trust's landholdings r/o The Square, Tadcaster Road. Part of land is allocated as H6. Planning application has been submitted on H6 site (30 x 1 and 2 bed apartments providing housing, care and support for the visually impaired, plus ancillary office accommodation).	The Wilberforce Trust
6142	H6 (site)	Supp	Supports proposals to rear of Hospice and allocation of remainder of site as Green belt. Keeping land to the rear of hospice free from development is important for privacy of patients. Support proposed allocation of land to the rear of the Hospice - the allocation of part of the site for specialist housing is supported. The remainder of the site as Green Belt is also supported. This is in keeping with previous representations made by the Hospice. Keeping the land immediately to the rear of the hospice building free from built development is important in preserving the privacy and amenity of patients.	St Leonards Hospice

Site H7

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13003	H7 (site)	Obj	The roads around Bootham Crescent lack green space, and therefore consideration should be given to create some green space on site H7.	Rachael Maskell MP
554iii	H7 (site)	Supp	Support for the allocation at Bootham Crescent. There is a legal agreement with the owners of the site which allows the site to be redeveloped. There is an extant planning application which will be superseded by a new residential planning application. It is intended that once the football club moved to its replacement grounds, for which contracts have now been let, the residential redevelopment will be able to commence.	Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
<b>Site H8</b>				
5197	H8 (site)	Comm	Concerned that housing will be too dense, congestion will be an issue. This may be relieved in traffic lights at Tadcaster Roads are removed/ slowed down. Park and ride should be preserved.	
12803i	H8 (site)	Comm	Best use for this land would be for York College to buy it and use as an over-flow car park, would stop students parking on residential streets. If the land must be used for housing it should be appropriate - prioritise housing for the elderly either bungalows or sheltered accommodation.	
13292	H8 (site)	Comm	Respondent assumes that traffic flow and congestion will be part of this exercise in view of the already chaotic situation around the Tesco roundabout and college area. Confirmation of this assumption would be appreciated.	
13325	H8 (site)	Comm	Suggests that a new rail link at H8 could follow the main line into York with a link to the York Central site - new housing to follow the route of this new transport connection.	
2191	H8 (site)	Obj	Building on H8 has the potential to seriously affect the nature reserve at Askham Bogg.	
5486	H8 (site)	Obj	Objects to the site on the grounds that traffic congestion and environmental issues (rats).	
12346	H8 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: congestion; parking issues (noting proximity of York College); suggests parking is retained on old P+R site as overflow for existing residents.	
13290	H8 (site)	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)
13537	H8 (site)	Supp	Support the principle of housing here. However, some concerns over lack of a community focus in the area, esp following the development of the old college site. The local church doesn't have a building, so they would be looking to rent space within the H8 development for church activities.	
<b>Site H10</b>				
710	H10 (site)	Obj	Site will bring vast amount of traffic onto Fulford Road, need plans to ease congestion.	
13613	H10 (site)	Obj	Object - Should be used as a green space	
<b>Site H20</b>				
13282	H20 (site)	Comm	Site should allow for additional parking provision.	
8642	H20 (site)	Obj	Site would be better staying as a care home for the elderly.	
<b>Site H23</b>				
13459	H23 (site)	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.	
<b>Site H29</b>				

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
1298	H29 (site)	Comm	Comment notes that the SA identifies the site as scoring negatively in respect of the following: SA09 - use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality; SA015 - protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape. Evidence submitted provides justification to prove this is not the case, as follows: development has been formulated following significant ecological, landscape, Green Belt, flood risk, archaeology, noise and highway assessments; new homes will be designed and delivered within a sensitively masterplanned scheme; development offers significant economic and social benefits - including affordable and market homes/CIL or other financial contributions towards the city's infrastructure (schools/open space)/capital expenditure creating direct and indirect employment; nothing the conclusions of the HIA, agree that the proposed sensitive design of the scheme would ensure that any identified impact on heritage assets could be mitigated; site is of low ecological value - boundary trees/hedgerows will be retained where appropriate; site sits within flood zone 1.	PB Planning Ltd obo Barratt Homes
1298	H29 (site)	Comm	Is anticipated that the development will deliver a yield of at least 35 homes/annum, phased as follows: 2018/19 - 0; 2019/20 - 20; 2020/21 - 55; 2021/22 - 88. Associated open space (on site and financial contributions towards local community infrastructure) will be delivered commensurate with the progression of the development and made available for use as required.	PB Planning Ltd obo Barratt Homes
2381	H29 (site)	Comm	Infrastructure improvements such as roads, drainage, schools and doctors should be put in place before development.	
4423	H29 (site)	Comm	Objects to housing density proposed for site. Agree with local community's wishes of no more than 25 units per ha.	
13182	H29 (site)	Comm	A series of individual letters promoting each site including H29 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations.	Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson
13244	H29 (site)	Comm	Site can only proceed if the local road links are to be improved at the same time, which includes but is not limited to: Main Street, Copmanthorpe; Manor Heath junction to A64/A1237 which is deadlocked at school run time and is dangerous.	
13634	H29 (site)	Comm	Supports the draft local plan as it impacts Copmanthorpe however does take issue with the housing density proposed of 88 units, a more conservative density should be used in keeping with the design plan for the village.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
57	H29 (site)	Obj	In order 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 60 units as opposed to 88 in draft Local Plan.	Copmanthorpe Parish Council
2232	H29 (site)	Obj	88 more houses not sensible , overcrowded and unsafe. Between Dykes Lane to St Giles Way, too many parked cars, lorries and vans on a bus route. Station Road/Main Street is a dangerous junction and hedges block views. Main Street is a bus route.	
10968	H29 (site)	Obj	Object to the additional 88 houses at H29 due to the additional traffic congestion it will cause to Main Street and the junction with Station Road. The additional cars from H29 will make traffic conditions intolerable.	
12309	H29 (site)	Obj	Roads already at capacity, particularly the junction between Station Road and Moor Lane. Any alterations to roads should be made before, not after development.	
12637	H29 (site)	Obj	Objects as there is no access to the site by road, and the village is already congested.	
12765	H29 (site)	Obj	The density of the housing proposed for Moor Lane is inappropriate for the edge of a village at 33.2 dwellings per hectare creating a ghetto with only one access route (where as ST31 has density of 19.5 dwellings per hectare suggesting that the poorer / densely populated developments will be kept away from the nicer parts of the village). Also, if H29 is developed there will be less opportunity for a station at Copmanthorpe.	
13242	H29 (site)	Obj	Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe is a dead end so all traffic will have to come along Main Street or Station Road. 88 new homes will create car chaos. There are more suitable sites in Copmanthorpe.	
13262	H29 (site)	Obj	Work cannot be done on the site until wildlife impacts have been fully assessed, and wildlife is not going to be impacted. There also needs to be consideration for school spaces. Further, roads and amenities cannot take the additional housing without radical village development.	



Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
1298	H29 (site)	Supp	Barratt Homes fully support the proposed allocation, which have the potential to provide high quality residential development of 88 homes, alongside the delivery of public open space and associated infrastructure. Site is available now, and is under the control of a national housebuilder who are actively seeking to secure the site's allocation for residential development. Site can be considered achievable, with homes deliverable on site within the next 5 years. Planning application to be submitted in 2019, following adoption of the Local Plan; No technical or environmental constraints to preclude development. Development makes a significant contribution to CYC's housing requirement over the plan period.	PB Planning Ltd obo Barratt Homes
10008	H29 (site)	Supp	Development of the site is a logical extension of the existing development so in-keeping and restrained by the railway and Moor Lane.	
<b>Site H31</b>				
59	H31 (site)	Comm	There are significant surface water and drainage problems in the village so any development would need to ensure that that it does not exacerbate the problem. Suggested that given the topography of the site and existence of pedestrian access at the south end, any provision for older residents and/or affordable housing be located there with easy access to the surgery and shops along Petercroft Lane.	Dunnington Parish Council
945	H31 (site)	Comm	The entry to the site from Eastfield Lane and Intake Lane will need road widening.	
2505	H31 (site)	Comm	Suggest issues need to be resolved before development. Drainage infrastructure is a problem as past floods have caused raw sewage to run down the street. A traffic management scheme needs to be introduced for roads in area, which contain several blind bends. Attempts to alter Eastfield Lane by removing the ancient hedgerow, part of a conservation area, will harm the character and setting of the village.	
3213	H31 (site)	Comm	Widening of Eastfield Lane, to accommodate development, would necessitate speed humps or other speed controls or the road will be a nightmare for residents and pedestrians.	
3431	H31 (site)	Comm	Site needs further consideration of impact to roads.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
6304	H31 (site)	Comm	Can we ensure the 79 dwellings planned for the site are first time starter affordable homes and not 3/4 bed expensive types.	
8445	H31 (site)	Comm	Concerned how vehicles will access the new houses down narrow Eastfield Lane with a dangerous junction nearby.	
8588	H31 (site)	Comm	Concerned due to increase in traffic, particularly on Stamford Bridge Road, Hull Road and Pocklington. Traffic lights are needed at the Common Road and Hull Road Junction. There are 2 blind corners - Eastfield Lane/ Church Balk and Petercroft Lane/Church Street. These problems should be addressed before development.	
13182	H31 (site)	Comm	A series of individual letters promoting each site including H31 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations.	Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson
59	H31 (site)	Obj	The development is not welcome, as the access to the village centre, to the school, to public transport and other amenities along Eastfield Lane is narrow and the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk is not suitable to cater increased traffic. However, do not want the east end of Eastfield Lane widened as to discourage traffic from using it as a shortcut through to the A1079. The housing density for the site is higher than in previous versions of the plan and is likely to reduce the quality of housing leading to overcrowding of the site, lack of green space and the loss of opportunity for a mixture of housing.	Dunnington Parish Council
2362	H31 (site)	Obj	How can H31 be a suitable place to build 76 houses next to the cemetery. It is currently a quiet and tranquil place to visit.	
2511	H31 (site)	Obj	Objecting to development on the following grounds: overdevelopment in relation to existing infrastructure; lack of local school space; traffic impacts - Eastfield Lane cannot safely accommodate additional traffic, and any road widening would destroy ancient hedgerows.	
2517	H31 (site)	Obj	Suit unsuitable as it has poor access, is on green belt land and is liable to flood. Has further comments but was unable to insert.	
2628	H31 (site)	Obj	Site has access and safety issues, development will worsen flooding, lose hedgerows and impact wildlife.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
2642i	H31 (site)	Obj	Concern over the unsafe, narrow lane access, would need ancient hedgerow removal and road widening plus an extra footpath, the land is green belt and H31 could lead to further loss of green belt to east and north, ingress/egress onto Church Balk is partly obscured re traffic from A166. This junction is widely used by pedestrian and cyclist primary school pupils who are encouraged to do so.	
13667	H31 (site)	Obj	The road junction at Eastfield Lane / Church Balk will need to be addressed (traffic lights/ alteration) to cope with the potential increase in traffic volume. Parking on York Street is already severely congested. The situation will get worse with this proposal. Are there sufficient school places in Dunnington to cater for the increase in demand?	
3464	H31 (site)	Obj	Concerned about impact to Eastfield Lane's traffic. Removal of hedge could lead to drainage problems and flood risk, local school will struggle.	
3821	H31 (site)	Obj	Object to this site as it is unsuitable for development on a number of grounds. The proposal will add extra housing without taking into account its effect on Dunnington as a community. No assessment appears to have been taken on school places or access to schools. As over 900 m from the school it will encourage car use and exacerbate parking problems. It is not 'close to public transport routes' and does not have 'good access to services and facilities'. The proposed housing density is more than double that of nearby developments and is up 27% from previous suggested numbers compared to earlier versions of the Plan and out of character for Dunnington. The location of the site would encourage car usage. Local infrastructure especially highways and drainage would need costly upgrading and there are significant issues relating to access and safety along Eastfield Lane - widening of which would destroy the rural nature of the lane. Sewage and surface water drainage would be difficult issues to address.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
3821	H31 (site)	Obj (ctd)	Access to H31 is very poor and the site was rejected for Gypsy and Traveller use earlier in the Plan process on grounds that 'roads leading to the site through the village.. would be too narrow for large vehicles'. Eastfield Lane beyond the built area is a single track road and unfit to carry extra traffic. Any attempt to alter this lane would cause serious harm to the rural character and green belt. Additional traffic would exacerbate hazardous local junctions. Water drainage, surface water and water supply issues are all difficult to address. In terms of Green Belt the development is not infilling but in open countryside and thus inappropriate development.	
3952	H31 (site)	Obj	In general outright rejects the supposed need for more housing. States that development will require new drainage infrastructure, energy supplies and more frequent public transport. Dunnington already suffers from flash flooding because of inadequate drainage.	
3964	H31 (site)	Obj	Eastfield lane is single track and needs to be widened. Junction at A166 will be more congested. There will be a pressure increase on sewage system, public services and schools.	
4108	H31 (site)	Obj	Eastfield Lane is the only access and already dangerously narrow. Additional traffic generated by development will be a danger to pedestrians, road users and residents. Should be rejected for the benefit of road safety and to maintain amenity of existing village.	
13666	H31 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: loss of ancient hedgerows/haycrop - loss of natural habitats; proximity to protected species (inc great crested newts); drainage; access; impact of additional traffic on congestion/highway safety.	
5258	H31 (site)	Obj	Narrow roads, flooding in flood-prone 'Water Lane' will worsen due to proposed housing 'upstream', busy traffic in village, school full and greater doctor waiting times.	
6257	H31 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: restricted access along Eastfield Lane; loss of permeable surface/impact on flooding; unsuitable infrastructure - Eastfield Lane and dangerous junction at Church Street/Church Balk and Church Lane; unsustainable location in relation to village amenities.	
6949	H31 (site)	Obj	Eastfield lane at proposed site is single track and will not be able to cope with extra load. Concerned about bus services and routes, doctors and schools coping. Need safer access to the A166 mini-roundabout.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13027i	H31 (site)	Obj	Supporting 84 dwellings as opposed to 76 allocated in the Local Plan.	PBPlanning on behalf of David Wilson Homes.
13093	H31 (site)	Obj	Object to the inclusion of allocation H31 over H30. This site is already in active use as an employment site and will necessitate the relocation of a business, the site does not perform as well against the sustainability appraisal criteria and access will require widening of the carriageway altering the rural character.	O'Neill Associates on behalf of Jorvik Homes
13155	H31 (site)	Obj	The village is at capacity in terms of schools, drainage and traffic, cannot handle additional demand. The site is also on a very narrow rural road. Plan needs to consider nature conservation such as the hedge. Council should consider whether the York area needs expanding and whether there is more to be gained by supporting the heritage and rural nature of the area as a whole. Would like consideration and feedback to central government regarding the actual requirement for ongoing economic growth and thought given to alternatives which are more sustainable.	
13284	H31 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: intensity of use, impact on congestion/highway safety, esp A64/A166 and A1079 roundabout.	
13522	H31 (site)	Obj	Object to proposed development of houses in Eastfield Lane for the following reasons: 1. traffic problems - relative to York and Leeds the proposed site is on the wrong side of Dunnington, more traffic is using A166 causing long tailbacks to Grimston Bar. 2. Access - access to the site from Eastfield Lane is inadequate for a development of this type due to the width of the lane which is too narrow, negative effect on SA Objective 6. 3. The site is Greenfield and Agricultural Grade 2 - the site has always been considered Green Belt and should not be used, negative effect on SA objectives 8 and 9. 4. Drainage - drainage is poor in Dunnington and leads to flooding, the problem will be exacerbated with more houses, negative effect on SA objective 13. 5. Education Provision - there is currently no nursery in the village, there are no schools within 800m of the site, the primary school is near capacity, concern over secondary school places, negative effect on SA objective 3. 6. Poor water pressure which will be made worse, negative effect on SA Objective 10. 7. the development will have a considerable visual impact and will alter the look and character of the village.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13530	H31 (site)	Obj	Concerned about increase in traffic through Church Balk, road is already very busy as commuters use it as a through road; asks if something can be done to deter this. Concerned about construction traffic and its impact on road safety.	
945	H31 (site)	Supp	This is the best site ever brought up in Dunnington. Well done to the planners.	
13027i	H31 (site)	Supp	Support the allocation in the local Plan. The site is available, deliverable and achievable. There are no physical or technical constraints to preclude delivery of the site. The site is anticipated to build out at a rate of 35 dwellings per year starting in 2019/20 following a planning permission approval. Evidence undertaken previously submitted includes landscape appraisal, archaeological investigations, heritage assessment, aboricultural surveys, geophysical assessments, drainage and flood risk analysis and transport impacts. Masterplanning document (submitted previously) attached with the response.	PBPlanning on behalf of David Wilson Homes.
<b>Site H38</b>				
2548	H38 (site)	Obj	Rufforth already has a very severe sewage problem and new housing will make it worse. Middlewood Close is a narrow road and suffers from congestion. A further minimum of 33 extra vehicles is untenable together with traffic from the new piggery.	
9381vi	H38 (site)	Obj	Support by the landowner/developer for the larger alternative boundary to H38 as proposed by officers in July 2017. This is 0.99 ha in size. The site is suitable, deliverable and viable and has a willing developer. There are not considered to be any technical constraints to preclude delivery. The site is included within the Rufforth Neighbourhood Plan. The site does not perform a green Belt function and should therefore be excluded and allocated for housing development of identified as safeguarded land. Evidence base attached includes site plan and a technical report on housing issues by consultants Lichfields.	DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes
12237	H38 (site)	Obj	Area already has drainage problems, very narrow road will not cope with additional traffic.	
74	H38 (site)	Supp	Support this site as it is also allocated in the emerging Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan.	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)
3966	H38 (site)	Supp	Supports housing for families within the village and the site would also alleviate dangerous parking pressures for school drop off. However the proposed site is the maximum size the village could accommodate.	
9381vi	H38 (site)	Supp	Support the location of development and site in the plan. However, support alternative larger boundary. Evidence base attached includes site plan and a technical report on housing issues by consultants Lichfields.	DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes
12648	H38 (site)	Supp	Supports development due to good access onto main road and not an eye sore when going into the village. Rear entry to school will ease traffic and be safer. Development will keep local shops thriving.	
<b>Site H39</b>				
657	H39 (site)	Comm	Objections based on historic conservation area surrounding site and impact of traffic on currently child-friendly streets. Past inspector's report stated site should remain open for green belt functions. Site is not natural extension to village and not within walking distance to local amenities. Suggests using site H26 in preference to this site.	
5153iii	H39 (site)	Comm	Elvington has a shortage of 4-5 bedroom houses and affordable housing, housing density is not compatible with site, land at Dauby Lane (H26) more appropriate.	
13622	H39 (site)	Comm	Support the development of housing in the area but it is essential for the council to recognise the health care needs and issues for the local area. Social Care within the area is poor due to the rurality of the population, there is no reliable public transport for access to health services in York. The current surgery (Wheldrake / Elvington) is at capacity due to limitations of the building. The practice would require support from the council and developers to extend current facilities. There is a need to consider the safety of road users and pedestrians as there has been a substantial increase in through traffic recently, particularly HGVs which are causing problems for patient access at present. Development at Dauby Lane may mitigate the use of cars for surgery journeys.	Elvington Medical Practice

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
61	H39 (site)	Obj	A planning inspector previously determined that H39 served green belt purposes. H26 Dauby Lane was generally supported by residents as a means of linking the two residential areas of Elvington. Consider that 60 houses would be suitable on this site (more than H39). CYC has ignored residents views by removing H26 and keeping H39. The extra traffic that would be generated from 32 houses would adversely impact on the existing residents of Beckside.	Elvington Parish Council
1057i	H39 (site)	Obj	The proposed development infringes on a green belt field, a valued social area. It will negatively impact the wildlife, and more housing will increase drainage issues and decrease water pressure. Development of this site would be against the character vernacular of the village. Road access is unsustainable via a narrow congested lane - emergency vehicles already have difficulties. There would be destruction of important wildlife habitats for barn owls, hedgehogs, bats etc. Surface water levels would rise - this field acts as a sponge.	
1355	H39 (site)	Obj	There are concerns that the extra traffic generated from the proposed 39 properties at the site would adversely impact on residents at Beckside.	Julian Sturdy MP
3031	H39 (site)	Obj	Site H39 has been rejected previously by a planning inspector and is deemed as green belt land - nothing has changed. A far more suitable site has been proposed by the Parish Council in Dauby Lane.	
3046	H39 (site)	Obj	Opposes proposal as site serves green belt purposes, Beckside is disproportionately large and densely populated compared to the rest of the village. Additional traffic will cause a serious adverse effect on estate, and proposed density is not in keeping with existing development and will ruin character. Suggests joining two halves of village divided by open fields between school and doctors and water works. Development in site H26 would join villages without causing negative impact, and decrease cases of speeding as near houses, and would be room to provide the larger houses the village needs.	
3135	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to development as proposals for Elvington as a whole include nothing to address the adverse effect on existing infrastructure.	



## Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
3220	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to site as Inspector concluded it should remain green belt in 1994 and the inspector's arguments are still valid today. There was 91 objections to the site being removed from the green belt in 2016, but these have been ignored. The site does not have a natural boundary and would be a major encroachment on the countryside, degrading the conservation area and the rural nature of Church Lane. Church Lane is unsuitable for vehicle access, so Becksides would be used for access which would turn the estate larger and cause traffic issues. Site would cause adverse environmental impact. Would ruin character of Elvington village.	
3532	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to development of site as planning inspector ruled it would impact character of the village. Site should remain green belt. Flooding issues in Church Lane caused by field runoff and blocking the road. Development would increase traffic on B1228 which is busy already and used by children. Suggests using H26 for development instead as it would link the 2 ends of the village and lessen traffic through the centre. Facilities are stretched so would need improving before development.	
3598	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to the development of Site H39. This is due to the extra traffic which will be generated onto Becksides and the B1228 Main Street. Any development in Elvington will also create added traffic heading towards Grimston Roundabout and causing even more congestion problems at peak times. There is a problem with surface water running off this field and flooding Church Lane at times of heavy rainfall. Existing facilities e.g. school, medical practice village hall are struggling to cope with the numbers now. Any further development would cause problems for these. A Planning Inspector has already determined that this site should remain in the Green Belt. To build on this site would also cause the loss of wildlife habitats including the removal of existing hedgerows.	
5146	H39 (site)	Obj	Should not be building on green belt, extra traffic generated will be a danger to young children, increase risk of accidents and exacerbate existing parking issues. Drains in Becksides often block when there is heavy rainfall, previously floods in 2015 trapped residents in Becksides, development will put additional strain on this already inadequate drainage. Development will disrupt rural setting and damage wildlife habitats. It would be preferable for H39 to be withdrawn and replaced with H26 Dauby Lane, as endorsed by Elvington Parish Council.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
5147	H39 (site)	Obj	Should not be building on green belt, extra traffic generated will be a danger to young children, increase risk of accidents and exacerbate existing parking issues. Drains in Beckside often block when there is heavy rainfall, previously floods in 2015 trapped residents in Beckside, development will put additional strain on the already inadequate drainage. Development will disrupt rural setting and damage wildlife habitats. It would be preferable for H39 to be withdrawn and replaced with H26 Dauby Lane, as endorsed by Elvington Parish Council.	
5153iv	H39 (site)	Obj	Additional housing is accepted, however Elvington has a shortage of larger 4/5 bed and affordable housing. Housing density/type s not compatible with village. H26 would be more appropriate site for additional housing and would not impact Beckside. Would also join two halves of village together. Objects selecting H39 over H26 - feels not listened to.	
5235	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to site H39 being proposed for removal from the Green Belt. This site is inappropriate as it would seriously and disproportionately affect the rural nature of Elvington. This site has been considered several times over the past 30 years and every time has been confirmed as Green Belt, including confirmation from a Planning Inspector. The local character has not been taken into account.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
5259	H39 (site)	Obj	A previous planning inspector confirmed that H39 serves green belt purposes. Beckside is already disproportionately large and densely populated compared to the rest of the village and should not be further extended. The additional traffic from 32 houses would have a serious adverse effect on the existing residents of the estate - density is not in keeping with the existing development, so there will be a clear mismatch between old and new development. Would support fmr H26 site to bridge the gap between two halves of the village.	
5284	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to the 32 houses proposed on the green belt/ green field site near Elvington, as there are 3339 houses proposed in brownfield site Elvington Airfield 2 miles so sees no need for additional housing in the village.	
5571	H39 (site)	Obj	Development would conflict with policies regarding protection of wildlife and preservation of green space, it will change the feel of one of the most rural parts of the village and overall feel of Beckside. If there is to be additional housing residents have made clear they would prefer it to be between the school and doctors (H26) as this would not impact any rural cul-de-sacs and would bring the two halves of the village together.	
5572	H39 (site)	Obj	Church Lane is a natural area of significant value to nature conservation, development would cause this to be lost. The space between Church Lane and Beckside is not easily accessible, it will have significant impact on existing residents and change the nature of both areas. Increase in road traffic will mean children are no longer able to play in the street and pose a threat to road safety. If there is to be additional housing residents have made clear they would prefer it to be between the school and doctors (H26) as this would not impact any rural cul-de-sacs and would bring the two halves of the village together.	
5677	H39 (site)	Obj	Site is green belt, more traffic on already busy residential street, should be built on Dauby Lane with more larger houses.	
5738i	H39 (site)	Obj	Increase of traffic down small housing estate will be a struggle and is dangerous to children, concerned with loss of green belt.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
5741	H39 (site)	Obj	Planning inspector previously determined H39 serves green belt purposes, Becksides is already disproportionately large compared to the rest of the village and should not be extended. Additional traffic will be detrimental to existing residents quality of life and the proposed density is not in-keeping with the current development. Would prefer H26 to be developed as it would link up the two halves of the village, this could even make the village a safer place as drivers are less likely to speed along a row of houses. H26 would deliver more houses and could deliver large executive houses that the village needs.	
5816	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: land serves green belt purposes; impact on traffic congestion; density out of keeping with existing Becksides development; development in Elvington would be better place at fmr H26, to bridge the gap between the 2 halves of the village. Would also provide an opportunity to develop the sort of housing Elvington needs - executive style, 4 bed homes and starter homes.	
5842	H39 (site)	Obj	Land is greenbelt, previously determined by a Planning Inspector. Houses would create additional traffic in an area where the majority have young children playing in the street.	
9278	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to the 32 houses on the Greenfield site H39 for the following reasons: Elvington sits with the Green Belt. Other developments put forward as long as 1991 have been stopped on Green Belt grounds, Inspectors Reports firmly accepted the views of Elvington residents and ruled against the removal of the Elvington sites from the Green Belt, nothing has fundamentally changed. ST15 which proposes 3339 houses is less than 2 miles away and on a much more sustainable part brownfield site. There is therefore no need for these 32 houses on Greenfield land. Disruption to Elvington villages through additional pressure on the local school and surgery, more traffic, lack of public transport, loss of local wildlife habitats. Brownfield sites should be built before eroding Greenfield sites.	
9382iii	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to this site in preference of former allocation H26. Both parcels should be allocated but this site is not preferable because there is no defensible boundary to the west and therefore there is no recognisable boundary on the ground which conflicts with par 85 of the NPPF. This is fully greenfield site. Allocation over H26 is unsound and not justified nor effective.	DPP Planning 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)
9467	H39 (site)	Obj	Traffic will impact Beckside and Church Lane. Dangerous for children. Flooding issues in Church Lane caused by field runoff and blocking the road. Site is near SSSI, development would cause a loss of wildlife and habitats including hedgerows. Doctors and schools are full. Objects to development of site as planning inspector ruled it would impact character of the village. Site should remain green belt. Suggests using H26 for development instead as it would link the 2 ends of the village and lessen traffic through the centre.	
9473	H39 (site)	Obj	Would prefer H26 Dauby Lane site. Beckside is already congested at peak times and therefore it is unacceptable to add the cars of another 32 houses. An additional access via Church Lane is unfeasible due to its narrow, rural character with a tight sharp bend at the church. The H26 (Dauby Lane) site would have a much lower impact on traffic and infrastructure. It would also have the benefit of helping to unite the two ends of the village. A variety of housing is needed here – no more small 3-bedroomed houses as proposed, smaller 2-beds and larger 4/5 beds are needed.	
9640	H39 (site)	Obj	Increase in traffic would be dangerous, junction from Beckside onto B1228 is already dangerous, queues are long at peak times. Site serves green belt purposes (wildlife, recreation) and development will negatively impact character of village.	
9726	H39 (site)	Obj	Nature, drainage and inappropriate for building in centre of village.	
9776	H39 (site)	Obj	Planning inspector previously determined H39 serves green belt purposes, extra traffic will negatively impact existing Beckside residents. H26 Dauby Lane would be a more appropriate development, this would help join the two halves of the village into a cohesive whole. Draft plan is wrong where it indicates the village contains only industrial units, approximately 150 residential properties lie to the west of the school, representing around a third of the total residences of the village.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
9814	H39 (site)	Obj (ctd)	<p>Objects to the site H39 as proposed but would like to propose new residential development that could enhance the village. Considers the previously proposed Dauby Lane site H26 more appropriate as it links the two halves of the village, would occupy a semi-derelict site, is ideally sited for residents to walk to the school, doctors, sports and social club without the need for a car and could better provide a mix of housing that is needed. Would fully support the previously submitted position of Elvington parish council that H26 should be re-allocated to the CYC Plan and should replace the site H39. In the CYC Preferred sites consultation document there is a statement that 'The site currently provides a gap between the main village centre and the industrial / commercial areas to the north'. This analysis fails to recognise the extent of existing residential development within the industrial area of the village; some of which has recently extended viz. at the Conifers. Thus there is already significant residential development in the industrial estate areas of the village and the industrial estates are light industry without any direct adverse effect on residential development.</p>	
9814	H39 (site)	Obj (ctd)	<p>The 32 houses as currently proposed at H39 will mean extra traffic and adversely impact existing residents within Beckside and onto the main street. The building of 32 small houses on the proposed extension to Beckside will form a development that is of higher density and more limited mix of housing compared to the existing Beckside housing; it would not provide the diversity of housing needed in the village. The developer has suggested the site is not viable to deliver 28 dwellings; there is no justification given for the proposed increase to 32 dwellings. The proposed extension to Beckside would be on a site which has previously been determined by the Planning Inspector as serving green belt purposes and is bordered by a hedgerow of SINC quality. The hedgerow forms an important wildlife link between the nationally important Wheldrake Ings area and the statutory Nature conservation site - River Derwent. The effectiveness of the link would be severely impaired with a housing development along one side of the hedgerow, e.g. existing barn owl populations known to hunt along the hedgerow are likely to cease to do so.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
9814	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>The current green field site and hedgerow are continuous with the conservation area of the village which links to the River Derwent and they exist alongside Church Lane which is widely used for outdoor amenity by a wide cross section of the community for walking, riding, dog walks and strolls with prams and pushchairs. The lane is also important to the wider community as it forms part of the long distance footpath the Minster Way: this walk links Beverly and York Minsters and is characterised by a walk through diverse Yorkshire landscapes. Both the biodiversity importance and amenity importance of this part of the village would be impaired by the proposed development. It is proposed that there is a HRA in order to safeguard the canopy of the trees, due to the maturity of a number of oak and hornbeams there are likely to be significant root systems that would be damaged by housing foundations or tarmacked surfaces. There are existing drainage issues with occasional winter flooding which development will exacerbate.</p>	
9832	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Objects to inclusion, site is on over developed area, access is limited, and traffic would pose a risk to children. Access via Church Lane is a non-starter as the road is too narrow. Construction would cause inconvenience and traffic. Edge of site contains a country walk used by many.</p>	
9833	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>This site is completely within the green belt and accessed via a densely developed housing estate (Beckside) - further development will add to traffic on a already overcrowded housing estate. A better site (previously know as H26 off Dauby Lane) would benefit from 2 accesses from Dauby Land and York Road with little impact on other developments. More houses could be provided with a better mix that would help the needs of local families.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
10047	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Firstly, object to H39, but not against new development in the village generally, as appropriate development would enhance the village. In relation to H39, extra traffic would have an adverse effect on the village, would not provide the diversity of housing needed in the village, no justification for the increase in housing numbers proposed, site is previously determined by planning inspector as serving green belt purposes, important hedgerows / trees (some with TPOs) round the site - creates important link to Wheldrake Ings. Church Lane regularly used for walking, dog walking etc. Issues of surface water / flooding in the area - extra housing and removal of trees would make this worse.</p>	
10073	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Object to the 32 houses on the Greenfield site H39 for the following reasons: Elvington sits with the Green Belt. Other developments put forward as long as 1991 have been stopped on Green Belt grounds, Inspectors Reports firmly accepted the views of Elvington residents and ruled against the removal of the Elvington sites from the Green Belt, nothing has fundamentally changed. ST15 which proposes 3339 houses is less than 2 miles away and on a much more sustainable part brownfield site. There is therefore no need for these 32 houses on Greenfield land. Disruption to Elvington villages through additional pressure on the local school and surgery, more traffic, lack of public transport, loss of local wildlife habitats. Brownfield sites should be built before eroding Greenfield sites.</p>	
10074	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Object to building on this site, as traffic through Becks side will be much increased where children play. Church Lane is in a conservation area and the hedging adjacent to H39 is protected. Hence H39 is not viable.</p>	
10074ii	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Object to building on the H39 site - traffic flow would be increased where children play, Church Lane cannot be used for access as in conservation area and the hedges next to H39 are protected.</p>	



Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
10095	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to the 32 houses on the Greenfield site H39 for the following reasons: Elvington sits with the Green Belt. Other developments put forward as long as 1991 have been stopped on Green Belt grounds, Inspectors Reports firmly accepted the views of Elvington residents and ruled against the removal of the Elvington sites from the Green Belt, nothing has fundamentally changed. ST15 which proposes 3339 houses is less than 2 miles away. There is therefore no need for these 32 houses. Disruption to Elvington villages through additional pressure on the local school and surgery, more traffic, lack of public transport, loss of local wildlife habitats. Brownfield sites should be built before eroding Greenfield sites.	
10175	H39 (site)	Obj	A planning inspector previously determined this site serves green belt purposes. Roads already at capacity and will be detrimental to existing residents quality of life. This site should be withdrawn and replaced with H26, this would link the two halves of the village and cause very little extra traffic on the main street. Officers do not know better than residents and the parish council.	
10453	H39 (site)	Obj	Extra traffic would have an adverse effect on the village, would not provide the diversity of housing needed in the village, no justification for the increase in housing numbers proposed, site is previously determined by planning inspector as serving green belt purposes, important hedgerows / trees (some with TPOs) round the site - creates important link to Wheldrake Ings. Church Lane regularly used for walking, dog walking etc. Issues of surface water / flooding in the area - extra housing and removal of trees would make this worse. The residents of Church Lane bought their houses because of the rural aspect - this will be compromised by the proposed development.	
10459	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to development here, traffic will be dangerous for children and they will no longer be able to play in the road of the cul-de-sac; junction from Beckside onto the B1228 is already dangerous (2 accidents recently); parking issues on Beckside due to the lack of garages and small driveways. Drainage is already at capacity and causing problems with flooding in the village. The site serves greenbelt purposes, development would alter the character of the village and be detrimental to wildlife as well as recreational users - walking, horse riding etc.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
10488	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to H39. The increase in traffic volume as a result of additional houses would be dangerous to the many children that play in the cul-de-sac. The junction from Becksides onto the B1228 is very dangerous. Residents of Becksides park cars on the roadside narrowing down the width of the road and any increase in vehicle numbers would cause congestion and dangers. There are local congestion hot spots. The site serves green belt purposes and development would alter the character of the village and affect the many residents that use the area for recreational purposes.	
10527	H39 (site)	Obj	Objecting as the extra traffic will have a negative impact on existing Becksides residents and the rest of the village. There already significant problems with HGVs and parked cars which will only get worse both with construction traffic and final residents. Housing need has been identified as 'affordable' and 'top end' by Elvington Parish Council and local residents, H39 does not meet this requirement. The development area that Elvington Parish Council and residents agreed to put forward (H26) is more viable and would provide more of the type of housing needed. The boundary hedge between Church Lane and the proposed H39 site is listed, construction will almost certainly disturb the trees even if there is no official access from Church Lane to the proposed site.	
10635	H39 (site)	Obj	Development will negatively affect the character of the village, infrastructure & quality of life for residents. The village is already at capacity and drainage is an issue. The increase in the volume of traffic would be dangerous for local residents. The junction of the B1228 and Becksides is already dangerous. Traffic queues on the B1228. The site serves a green belt function and is used for recreational uses - walking / dog walking, horse riding, watching wildlife etc.	

## Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
10632	H39 (site)	Obj	Additional traffic will be extremely damaging to existing Beckside residents' quality of life and will exacerbate existing parking problems. Village already struggles with large lorries, will not cope with construction traffic. The boundary hedge between Church Lane and the proposed H39 site is listed and will almost certainly be disturbed by the construction vehicles, accidentally or otherwise. If it goes ahead then the development will be similar to the Beckside development, this is not what the village needs and will destroy the village feel with another housing estate. If more housing is required it should be at the site Elvington Parish Council put forward, H26 Dauby Lane is much more suitable for providing the type of housing the village requires.	
10641	H39 (site)	Obj	The increase in the volume of traffic would be very dangerous for residents of this cull de sac. The junction from Beckside onto the B1228 is already very dangerous due to parked cars. There is often queuing traffic on the B1228 at rush hour which increases the danger. The site serves green belt purposes and its development would radically alter the character of the village. Area is used by dog walkers, horse riders, enjoying wildlife etc for recreational purposes. Drainage is a problem	
10730	H39 (site)	Obj	H39 lies within the greenbelt and has previously determined by a Planning Inspector. Additional housing will create more traffic in an area where children play in the street - up to 128 additional journeys could be created through Beckside.	
10818	H39 (site)	Obj	H26 Dauby Lane should be used instead, that would at least join the two halves of the village.	
10888	H39 (site)	Obj	Opposes development as protecting the green belt is important, specifically mentions the value of wildlife on this site. Questions the need for 32 extra houses in Elvington that will harm the village feel and impact on road safety when the garden village with 3339 homes is being built two miles away. Mentions the additional strain that would be put on local infrastructure and the fact that this site has been rejected in the past. Nothing has changed since the last rejection. Goes into detail on their reasons for opposing development: green belt designation, flood risk, excessive traffic on Beckside, traffic on Beckside, Alvin Walk and Church Lane, loss of village feel and impact on local infrastructure. The site has been rejected before with good reason and nothing has changed since the last rejection in 2005.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
11419	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Object on the grounds that a planning inspector previously determined H39 serves Green Belt purposes. Traffic generated will have a detrimental impact on current Beckside residents. The discarded site H26 Dauby Lane would be more appropriate. The proposed draft plan indicates that the village contains only industrial units to the west of the school and should not be linked to the residential part of the village, this is not true. Approximately 150 residential properties lie to the west of the school, this is approximately one third of the total residences of the village. H26 would increase housing stock and link the two halves of the village into a cohesive whole.</p>	
11750	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Facilities in Elvington cannot cope with any additional demand, already long wait for appointments at doctors surgery, school at capacity. Roads to the development are narrow and frequently blocked with parked cars.</p>	
12312	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Site is currently in green belt till local plan is adopted, which states that the site provides a logical extension to the village and does not serve green belt purposes. However a previous planning inspector has stated the site does serve green belt purposes and its development would alter the village's character. Church Lane is not accessible to site. Access would go through Beckside and traffic would travel through a large portion of the residential area of the village. Site is nearby an SSSI. Development would bring pets, which would predate on the nearby wildlife. The River Derwent area is under restoration and this would work against that. Criticises the SA's methodology and states it is subjective- it gives the site a score of 22 but does not explain rationale behind it/ whether environmental capital is actually being protected or this is just the most appropriate land. Site is 1.25ha and would make a small contribution to housing and is not strategic. States negative effects to green belt at site but does not detail these. There is no clarity over the influence of Green Belt in the SA process.</p>	
12312	H39 (site)	Obj (ctd)	<p>Objects to lack of boundaries for green belt, which influences the clarity of the SA and the suitability of the site. Claims site will reduce impact on climate change but not evidence of this. Elvington has limited services which will lead to people travelling in private cars.</p>	
12650	H39 (site)	Obj	<p>Concerned Beckside would become congested and unsafe for children and pets. Would be out of proportion with rest of village.</p>	

## Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
12774	H39 (site)	Obj	30 new homes is disproportionate to the size of Elvington village and would be detrimental to the rural setting of the village. Has previously been proposed but denied for a variety of reasons - access, ecological damage, amenity and drainage. Would exacerbate existing traffic problems and the main road through Elvington is already dangerous. The proposals location on Beckside expands into Green Belt land so will eliminate habitat for wildlife. The entry point will mean increased traffic both during construction and occupation and children will no longer be able to play safely in the street. Surrounding land already has problems with drainage that will only be made worse. The doctors surgery is already over subscribed and additional demand will exacerbate this. Says many other residents are opposed for the same reasons - additional strain on infrastructure, traffic and setting of the village. This has been considered and denied before, annoyed / disappointed that it is being considered again. Feels that given another site nearer the airfield is being considered it does not make sense to build at H39 as well.	
12904	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to the proposed development at H39 - extra traffic will be generated from the 32 house that would have a negative impact on existing residents of Beckside. The extra vehicles would mean more traffic in the centre of Elvington which is already narrow and has to deal with existing parked cars and heavy goods vehicles. If any further development of Beckside were to take place it would need to be in keeping with the housing in the area but this does not provide the types of housing Elvington needs (affordable and top end). The development area supported by residents and the Parish Council is H26 near the school which is a much more viable option that will provide the type of houses really needed. Where will construction traffic access H39? The hedge between Church Lane and the site is listed and will certainly be disturbed by construction of the site. Request you withdraw H39 and revisit H26.	
13155	H39 (site)	Obj	Proposal is too big, questions if necessary.	
13241	H39 (site)	Obj	New development may change dynamic of village and worsen congestion.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13328	H39 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: Elvington sites within land designated as green belt; previous objections raised to development on the same site; Inspector's report (1994) accepted the views of Elvington residents against the removal of land in Elvington from the Green Belt; impact of development on local infrastructure, traffic and amenities; lack of public transport; loss of wildlife habitat.	
13366	H39 (site)	Obj	The construction of the new houses on H39 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 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.	
13434i	H39 (site)	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.	
13555	H39 (site)	Obj	Residents and the Parish Council of Elvington would prefer H39 is removed and replaced by H26. The Parish Council has submitted this rationale separately in its response to the consultation, but knows the village and residents very well. It would be very much preferred if the Parish Council's comments on these sites are heeded.	Wheldrake Ward Councillor
13561	H39 (site)	Obj	Opposed to building on the green belt, the loss of wildlife that would result and the harm to the village's character. A previous planning inspector has rejected development on this site and nothing has changed since rejections in 1992/3 and 2013. Also concerned by the overwhelming impact it would have on facilities / infrastructure such as the school, doctors and roads.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13562	H39 (site)	Obj	H39 would be detrimental to the character of the village itself and current residents. It is not a natural extension of the village and has been rejected in the past due to flood risk; traffic on Beckside and Church Lane; dangerous junctions onto the B1228 and the impact it would have on existing Beckside residents. Would much prefer H26 to be developed, as would Elvington Parish Council. H26 previously passed CYC selection criteria, serves no or limited greenbelt purposes, provides a larger area for development, provides a safer junction onto the B1228 and would not have any impact on current residents as it would be an entirely new development.	
13621	H39 (site)	Obj	Opposes development due to the impact additional traffic will have on residents quality of life and further exacerbate parking issues. Also concerned about construction traffic. The requirement that new housing be in-keeping with the current Beckside development means the new housing will not be of the type residents and Elvington Parish Council agree is needed (affordable and top end). The hedgerow between Church Lane and the proposed site is listed, it will inevitably be disturbed during construction. H26 (Dauby Lane) is preferred by the Parish Council and local residents, it is also closer to the school.	
	H39 (site)	Obj	Object to the 32 houses on the Greenfield site H39 for the following reasons: Elvington sits with the Green Belt. Other developments put forward as long as 1991 have been stopped on Green Belt grounds, Inspectors Reports firmly accepted the views of Elvington residents and ruled against the removal of the Elvington sites from the Green Belt, nothing has fundamentally changed. ST15 which proposes 3339 houses is less than 2 miles away and on a much more sustainable part brownfield site. There is therefore no need for these 32 houses on Greenfield land. Disruption to Elvington villages through additional pressure on the local school and surgery, more traffic, lack of public transport, loss of local wildlife habitats. Brownfield sites should be built before eroding Greenfield sites.	
6046	H39 (site)	Supp	Fully support the inclusion of H39 in policy H1. The policy confirms that H39 is currently proposed to be allocated for housing and is estimated to be built in the short to medium term (years 1-10) with a capacity of 32 dwellings.	Directions Planning Consultancy

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
9381iii	H39 (site)	Supp	General support for allocation, although not in preference to former H26.	DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes
13231	H39 (site)	Supp	Generally support the building of local housing but think that access to the site via Church Lane would not be viable or safe as already waste collection vehicles have difficulties. State that access via Beckside would be preferable.	
<b>Site H46</b>				
238	H46 (site)	Comm	No objection in principle to allocation but plan should make it clear that any development would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the New Earswick Conservation Area are not harmed.	Historic England
72	H46 (site)	Obj	Development of this site would remove the last remaining green recreational space in the parish	
3203	H46 (site)	Obj	Traffic congestion to area and pollution near school.	
5892	H46 (site)	Obj	No other green spaces locally for public use and preservation of wildlife. The development will also cause extra traffic and be a hazard to the school children.	
9633	H46 (site)	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).	
10351	H46 (site)	Obj	Haxby & Wigginton already have problems with the volume of traffic and drainage which development will exacerbate. Investment needed before the houses are built.	
12586	H46 (site)	Obj	Objects the field with the proposed developments provides a valuable green space in an urbanised area, is an important natural habitat for local flora and fauna, and further development will increase congestion on an already busy and dangerous Haxby Road.	
12587	H46 (site)	Obj	York road is already congested and mental health hospital here will worsen this. Plans to build on the field will disrupt wildlife and recreational activities (dog walking, school children, runners).	
13043i	H46 (site)	Obj	Policy should be extended to all sites over 1.5ha to reflect demand. Policy should exclude small house builders from accessing self-build plots.	



Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13251	H46 (site)	Obj	This area is one of the few remaining parts of open land available as an amenity between New Earswick and the ring road. Some years ago residents were successful in objecting to its use for development and nothing has changed since then.	
13303	H46 (site)	Obj	Site is unsuitable for development on grounds of flooding and traffic (impact on Haxby Road). If H46 proceeds: ensure surface water is not diverted onto adjacent properties; set back houses from Haxby Road and provide access only from Willow Bank; improve traffic flow on A1237, which is often gridlocked causing congestion on Haxby Road.	
13421	H46 (site)	Obj	This site is subject to flooding, concern over Haxby Road and the Ring Road as they are already busy, school traffic is already heavy and bound to increase.	
6383	H46 (site)	Supp	H46 and the landscaped strip along the eastern boundary is supported (previous comments made by JRHT remain valid)	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning
<b>Site H52</b>				
238	H52 (site)	Comm	No objection to principle of this allocation, but given its proximity to city walls (scheduled ancient monument) and central conservation area, policy would need to ensure that development proposals safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the conservation area and city walls.	Historic England
13487i	H52 (site)	Comm	The green open space on H52 should be registered as Local Green Space.	Cllr Hayes
5380	H52 (site)	Obj	Willows House grounds (H52) should be formally and permanently retained as public open space for the recreational use of their communities.	
13464	H52 (site)	Obj	Objects to developments.	
13488	H52 (site)	Obj	Concerned by choice to use land for student accommodation rather than accommodation for old people or green space. Hopes the pine trees will be saved.	
<b>Site H53</b>				
12809	H53 (site)	Comm	Knapton is very vulnerable to being joined to York and relies on the preservation of the green belt around it. This site is green belt but could be conceived as infill. A maximum of 4 homes is imperative to maintain the character of the village and access should only be from Main Street as back Lane is far too narrow. Off street parking should be incorporated as main street is very narrow.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
NDM4	H53 (site)	Comm	Proposed development of 4 houses at Knapton may lead to further development swamping Knapton and green belt.	
192	H53 (site)	Obj	Concern over the Green Belt boundary of Knapton. It does not need to be rounded off neatly. The site is part of the countryside setting of Knapton. It is not a sustainable site. There should be no development beyond what has been recognised as the village settlement limits. The SA states it will have a negative impact.	
1355	H53 (site)	Obj	Is not convinced the proposal has addressed the issues raised, so this development should not be included in the Plan.	Julian Sturdy MP
4140	H53 (site)	Obj	Objects to expansion of village into the green belt.	
12118	H53 (site)	Obj	Objects to housing development on the site. The site will add little to the area's housing needs and put additional pressure on utilities. Likely impact on wildlife/local green space. Objects to amended village boundary.	
12815	H53 (site)	Obj	This site is in the Green Belt, housing on the site has been recently refused due to this. Council's own planning refusal stated that it would create unwanted infill and would dominate the hamlet of Knapton. Should be removed from plan immediately.	
12815	H53 (site)	Obj	Asks for the site to be removed as they oppose building on green belt and doing so will ruin the village, also the site is elevated and will be imposing if built on. The village has no shop, no adequate public transport and new housing will increase traffic flow through the village.	
NDM4	H53 (site)	Obj	The proposed development of 4 houses at Knapton may seem minor and acceptable, but concerned this may set a precedent for further development in the future, creeping up to the outer ring road and swamping Knapton and encroaching on the Green Belt, especially with further development at ST19 Northminster Business Park.	
74	H53 (site)	Supp	Support this site as it is also allocated in the emerging Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan	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)
1294	H53 (site)	Supp	Rep submitted by Indigo Planning on behalf of Novus Investment Ltd. Novus support the continued proposed allocation of the site for residential use, and support the estimated capacity of the site of four dwellings. This figure has been arrived at following site assessments undertaken in support of a previous planning application at the site. Whilst the planning application was refused, this was on the basis of the site's location in the Green Belt. Crucially, the determination of the application has confirmed that there are no technical matters which would render the site unsuitable for residential use.	Indigo Planning
1294	H53 (site)	Supp	Novus therefore agree with the council's assessment of the site and conclusions that it is suitable for housing, This is on the basis of the following: the site is well contained with long-established boundaries on three sides; the development of the site will provide a defensible green belt boundary to the east; the development of the site will provide limited infill to the existing settlement form; there are no nature designations affecting the site; whilst a greenfield site, it does not provide any purpose; the site is well served by existing local road infrastructure and key services; it is relatively flat and has no technical constraints to development; the landowner is willing to develop the site. In summary, the site is suitable for residential development and the proposed allocation is justified in the context of paragraph 182 of the NPPF.	Indigo Planning
<b>Site H56</b>				
13211	H56 (site)	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
13541	H56 (site)	Comm	Concerned of impact to green belt. Site is significantly important to wildlife and recreation/community use. These spaces should be safeguarded. The recently published draft indicates a surplus of green space in the Hull Road Ward which is factually incorrect, as the University's site for a green space replacement is used by students and not the community. The methodology is flawed.	

## Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13559	H56 (site)	Comm	Concerned about the erosion of green spaces within the city boundary, with the impact this will have on the health and well-being of local people. Student housing being built in the east of the city to the exclusion of affordable housing, feels universities take precedence over residents. H56 (Windmill Lane Playing Fields and Woods) is of great value to the community and should be protected as a Local Green Space, significant areas of the woodland features trees that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. In the assessment of open spaces there has been a miscalculation - the land at Haxby Road is double counted and University land should not have been included as there is no legal public right of access. Wants an explanation as to why H56 was first designated as land suitable for employment and then land for housing.	
13602	H56 (site)	Comm	Windmill playing fields are of great value to locals. Other parts of the city have good green areas accessible by foot and we should keep ours. The housing requirement is on a large scale - this is a small site and would not make a dent in the requirement for new homes. Build on the outskirts of the city.	
86i	H56 (site)	Obj	The Local community values the Windmill Lane Playing Fields enormously and it has continuously used them for sport and recreation for decades, with the permission of the owners, York St John University. York has a deficit of good playing fields and the Windmill Lane ones are especially good as they do not flood, unlike their proposed replacement. The open space land has a value beyond this amenity too, as a 'green lung' and historical value. The fields have a belt of trees on two sides which is an important wildlife corridor. This area of York has a dearth of publicly accessible open spaces. The nearby University land has no public right of access and using it in calculations to say that this part of York does have enough Open Space is wrong. The site includes land which should not be up for development as it has mature trees on it protected by Tree Preservation Orders.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
86i	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>As a whole York has a low level of tree cover compared to many other cities. The land was quietly 'converted' into employment land when the plan was consulted on before. The land has been redesignated for housing, with no consultation and no transparency, and this is believed [by the representor] to be an illegal way to conduct planning matters. The land is Open Space for recreation, and should remain thus until due process has been served, i.e. a full community consultation conducted by the land owners and local authority. This land has been subject to a petition signed by over 1000 local people asking for it to be designated local green space. The Council's website states that if a petition of over 1000 signatures was submitted , it would be debated by full Council. The Council has not responded in a satisfactory manner.</p>	
10055	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>This parcel of land is currently an open, green space, with a mature border of woodland. It is of great value to the local community that has long had open access to the site. Outline planning permission that was recently granted to York St John University for a housing development on this site should not have been. Therefore, for the purpose of the Local Plan, would prefer the site is treated on its merits alone and not automatically included because planning permission has been granted. The site should be designated as green / open space as Hull Road is in deficit of open space. Concedes that it is legally owned by York St John university, but substantial evidence available elsewhere points overwhelmingly to long-standing, historical public use of this space as open green land. These facilities have not been adequately replaced. Replacement sporting facilities at Haxby Road have been doubled counted for two sites: H56 and Heworth Croft (another previous York St John sports ground). Additionally, access to nearby open space amenities at the University of York are not open to the general public and green space on the university campus is not always open to the public so green / open space remains as a deficit to local people.</p>	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)
10055	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>If this green space is developed there will be no green space left available in this corner of the city that is within easy walking distance. Planners should also ensure that suburban areas have ample green wedges available - a principle which is employed along other arterial routes into the city, but almost completely ignored along Hull Road. The H56 site would be a valuable part of limited green wedge available either side of Hull Road as visitors travel into the city. York St John's planning application sought to maintain woodland on the site but this offers no long-term protection of wild woodland. Inevitably we may see applications in the future for removal of tree preservation orders and so the residual green space (after any development) will be eroded further. Previous draft local Plans have used different methodologies to count this land as unsuitable for anything, suitable for employment, and finally suitable for housing. This is inconsistent and disregards the Deramore Family's stated wishes that the site be site for playing fields in perpetuity.</p>	Hull Road Ward Councillor
12728	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>This site was previously designated as an Open Space, but has been changed to employment use without local consultation. The reasoning has not been explained apart from YSJ's wish to sell the land. The green space and woodland forms a valuable wildlife corridor and is a green wedge protecting the character of Heslington Village, as well as a recreational amenity. Will be a huge loss to community. A petition of 1300 to protect this green space presented to CYC has been ignored. This is private land with no legal right of public access and must not be included in the calculation of Amenity Greenspace available in the Hull Road Ward.</p>	
12905	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>This site should be kept as open space. Concern over the loss of the woodland area which is fundamental to the character of the area and important for wildlife. The Council is short of accessible playing fields. The site being removed only adds to that deficit.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
12922	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Concern over the granting of outline planning permission for 70 houses on land at Windmill Lane-Hull Road (site H56) in advance of the of the Local Plan. This green wedge was previously open space, was altered to land for employment and then switched to housing which appears to have been done without consultation. It is questionable whether that makes it available, meeting the necessary guidelines and, is therefore, a sound decision. Concern as the land was made available to York St John for sporting and community uses in the 1930's by the Deramore Estate not for 70 houses. Concern over the substitute space at Haxby Road Sports field and the distance of 15 minutes. This has been amended to 20 minutes by public transport in the site selection methodology again without consultation or explanation. This does not take regard for the fact that it could involve changing buses and not everyone will have the same start point. Concern over the type of housing that will be provided on this site specifically in relation to student housing and if this is not needed in the future it should be returned to the open market for the general public. Hundreds of mature trees are threatened, the woodland has stood for generations at Hull Road.</p>	
13239	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Objects to development on the following grounds: loss of green space; increased traffic congestion; disruption from building traffic and plant if it goes ahead.</p>	
13252	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Strongly objects to the proposed development - it is one of the few remaining green spaces in the area. Building there will damage the environment and increase air pollution.</p>	
13406	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>It is a well loved area of green space that is critical to maintaining the essential character of the local environment. If it changes to housing, it would entirely ruin my families enjoyment of our new home. I strongly object.</p>	
13426	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Object to the designation of H56 which was changed from open space to general housing without any consultation or notification.</p>	
13464	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Objects to developments. Has rare green/ amenity spaces here. Traffic is dangerous and congested and pollution levels too high.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13469	H56 (site)	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: should be protected as local green space (note petition submitted to CYC); woodland/to trees are vital for offsetting pollution; the city is short of accessible playing fields, and University of York's open space should not count towards local provision since it is not publicly accessible; the historic nature of the land should be considered - it was passed to York St John by the Deramore family in the 1930s; to take this land away would diminish the area, and the quality of life of its residents.	
13475	H56 (site)	Obj	Our green spaces need to be protected. Playing fields and green spaces should not be sacrificed in an already congested area.	
13479	H56 (site)	Obj	The site is of great value to the community for recreation, sport, wildlife and open views. Without it pollution be much worse and more houses / traffic will be detrimental to the health of existing residents. The alternative playing field at Haxby Road is too far to walk and therefore an impractical solution. Development would be losing a space of great value to the community and local history as the land was passed to St John's by the Deramore family.	
13480	H56 (site)	Obj	An assessment of public space must take into account public access to the land, the majority of University of York land does not have legal right of public access so should not be included as open space in calculations for this area. The land is used for recreation, sport, fresh air and open views, it is part of the city's heritage and a haven for wildlife. The petition with 1,300 signatures is clear that local people would rather open space than housing. Many of the trees are protected and the woodland is fundamental for maintaining local air quality, without it pollution would be much worse and residents health much worse. Roads already at capacity, no more traffic needed.	



Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13516	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>The site has been protected as a local green space and passed to St John's by the Deramore family in the 1930s for use as playing fields, the proposed housing goes against this and the wishes of the local community. The removal of woodland as part of any development would damage wildlife and the character of the area. Should be noted there are tree protection orders in place. The proposed alternative play fields are too far away to be accessible and given that there is a shortage of green space / playing fields in the city / local area generally, the space should remain protected as a local green space.</p>	
13533	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Wants the sports field off Hull Road to be protected, talks about the importance of green space for recreation, sport, wildlife, heritage etc. If York has a housing problem we should be reducing the number of students. H56 should be protected as a local green space. States that Haxby Road playing field has been double counted, stated as replacing both H56 and Heworth, it is an inadequate replacement for both. Assessment of open space must take into account public access to the land, University of York land has no legal right of public access so should not be included in calculations. Says rate paying citizens are not being listened to.</p>	
13546	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Objects to removal of open green space and woodland which is irreplaceable. Site forms a valuable wildlife corridor, and is a green wedge protecting the character of Heslington Village. It is a recreational/community asset. The small number of houses proposed is not worth the loss of green space. Change of site use was not notified to village. Petition to protect site has been ignored by CYC.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13594	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>Must be kept as open space to prevent the coalescence of the York Urban Area and the village of Heslington, this is essential for maintaining the village's rural character and is evidenced in the Heslington Village Design Statement which was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Other sites have been removed for this reason, it would be unfair not to remove this site also. H56 allocated in the Local Plan is only part of the playing field, the site has been illegally sub-divided resulting in the loss of 0.64Ha of playing field without replacement, this is in violation of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010. H56 is part of a green corridor which connects Walmgate Stray and the University of York Campus. H56 should be designated as a Local Green Space as requested by the petition that gained 1300 signatures, it meets all of the 3 conditions specified in NPPF 77 to be suitable for designation. H56 is in the Green Belt when assessed by the RSS. It was also in the Green Belt as defined by the 1991 Green Belt Local Plan and the 1995 post modifications version. Site H56 failed part 1.2 of the site selection methodology and is therefore ineligible to be included in the Local Plan. It is not sustainable to select sites by any method other than the site selection methodology. Other sites which have failed the site selection methodology have been removed before the consultation and so site H56 has not been assessed against all reasonable alternatives.</p>	
13594	H56 (site)	Obj	<p>There has been no proposed replacement greenspace of equivalent size / quality / location. It has already been stated by officers at the Local Plan Working Group that H56 will not be removed from the plan regardless of any consultation responses received, since the outcome of the consultation is predetermined this is a sham consultation. Reiterates comments about LA failing to establish exceptional circumstances which would necessitate the removal of land from the Green Belt and the role of the local plan in regards to defining the green belt. H56 is in the green belt as defined by the H56 and should be retained. Values in sustainability statement are wrong, H56 is unsustainable.</p>	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13596	H56 (site)	Obj	Object to the development of H56 - Land at Hull Road and is equally relevant to many open spaces within York boundary. The value of open green space has been rightly recognised by documents issued or supported by the council (York Health and Wellbeing Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Community led Local Development Strategy and Children and Young Peoples' Plan - to name but three). Its time members and officers stood up for the principles of such documents. In the case of York St John Playing Fields a vibrant local community is ready to work in partnership with CYC and others towards goals including better health outcomes and economic performance of local communities. This site should not be allocated for housing until all community led options have been explored.	
48	H56 (site)	Supp	Comments made by HPC in support of this proposal still apply. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that: The site provides good family accommodation and affordable housing for people of all ages. The continued preservation of the mature trees around the site.	Heslington Parish Council
5671	H56 (site)	Supp	If sensitively developer with low density affordable family housing, protection could be given to the surrounding residential area. Trees should be planted to provide good shielding. Entry to the site should be only from Hull Road's existing infrastructure.	
<b>Site H58</b>				
56	H58 (site)	Comm	Support the principle of redeveloping the site but object its sole use for housing. Site has been a community facility within Parish for years and would like to see this is not lost. Support use of site as a new base for Salvation Army.	Clifton Parish Council.
238	H58 (site)	Comm	No objection in principle to allocation but plan should make it clear that any development would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the Clifton (Malton Way and Shipton Road) Conservation Area are not harmed.	Historic England

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13283	H58 (site)	Obj	Objects to potential overdevelopment of the site, impact on house prices.	
13283	H58 (site)	Obj	Objects to potential access to Fairway, lack of local primary school space.	
<b>Site H59</b>				
77	H59 (site)	Comm	H59 (Site 921): Site lies within the broader area of the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks but outside the secure area. It is considered that this site could be developed before the final closure of the Barracks. It would provide much needed low cost / social housing in Strensall at the earliest possible date.	Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council
2846	H59 (site)	Comm	H59 (Site 921): Site lies within the broader area of the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks but outside the secure area. It is considered that this site could be developed before the final closure of the Barracks. It would provide much needed low cost / social housing in Strensall at the earliest possible date.	
6514	H59 (site)	Comm	As pointed out by a resident the development of this site will require construction of a suitable entry access road - avoiding the SSSI land, a good access route to the proposed new homes on the QEB site.	Cllr Paul Doughty
9432	H59 (site)	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.	
12357	H59 (site)	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.	
12655	H59 (site)	Comm	The Preliminary Ecological Assessment (March 2017) identified that this site should be subject to a botanical survey and subsequently to assess whether the presence of any of these areas of habitat represents a constraint to the future development of this site. This needs to be undertaken.	GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD)

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
5961	H59 (site)	Obj	The village has very few facilities and school is over-subscribed. There is no bank or post office, three pubs and one Tesco Express. The Main Street is chaotic with residents parked on both sides of the street and buses have great difficulty getting through currently. Development will exacerbate existing traffic problems. Safety concerns about the ongoing use of the firing and grenade range, people not being aware of the danger area behind the targets and will walk there. The grenade range will be a magnet for people trying to find grenades.	
11030	H59 (site)	Obj	Concern over the number of additional cars and how they will integrate into an already congested road system. There needs to be a dedicated off road cycle track. In conjunction with the A1237 roundabout improvements there should also be a dedicated pedestrian / cycling crossing such as a bridge. The longer term solution would be to dual the A1237. Concern over where the construction traffic is going to access the Barracks site. There should be an access point off Towthorpe Moor Lane. The A64 junction (Hazelbush cross roads) would require major improvements due to the additional traffic. Dualling of the A64 should be considered with associated slip roads for the Strensall and Stockton-on-the-Forest sides. Yorkshire Water should be involved in the site development consultation.	
11030	H59 (site)	Obj	There is a major problem with surface-water flooding and waste water. What facilities and amenities will be provided? Strensall Village facilities are at capacity, there would need to be a new supermarket, dentist, doctors surgery, a new primary school. Plenty of green space would be important. The existing army buildings should be re-used where possible. Queries the type of new housing that will be built. Queries whether there would be a more frequent bus service from Strensall to York. A parkway railway station should be built in an effort to prevent too many cars.	
11598	H59 (site)	Obj	Proposed housing developments should be positioned within context of road infrastructure and community facilities. Large developments could overwhelm rural communities and ruin their character.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
12894	H59 (site)	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>	
13280	H59 (site)	Obj	<p>Objects to development on the grounds of impact on congestion (access to the ORR), highway safety, lack of school provision.</p>	
13613	H59 (site)	Obj	<p>Object - there should be no change in usage</p>	
12217i	H59 (site)	Obj	<p>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.</p>	
13411v	H59 (site)	Obj	<p>It is of a great concern to all stakeholders of the York Local Plan that it should be considered sound. It is crucial the Plan is positively prepared to meet the objectively assessed need and infrastructure requirements. Currently the Plan is inadequate for the number of dwellings needed during the Plan period, it does not account for market signals or comply with national methodology. Deliverability is also a concern - the Plan relies too heavily on a few large new settlements which would have a long time frame for delivery and are less sustainable than many smaller sites. It is safe to say the current draft plan would not be effective as described in Para 182 of the NPPF. There is uncertainty about the availability of the MOD land within the Plan period and also infrastructure requirements for sites ST14, ST15 and ST5. The undersupply of housing should be dealt with early in the Plan - it should also find a greater number of small and medium sized deliverable sites to help the 5-year supply.(e.g. Site 191)</p>	Pilcher Homes

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
77	H59 (site)	Supp	Site H59: Support the inclusion of this site in the Plan and support its early development. The site is largely formerly developed and derelict land which could provide much needed low cost and affordable housing in Strensall. Site lies within the broader area of the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks but outside the secure area. It is considered that this site could be developed before the final closure of the Barracks. It would provide much needed low cost / social housing in Strensall at the earliest possible date.	Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council
2846	H59 (site)	Supp	Site H59: Support the inclusion of this site in the Plan and support its early development. The site is largely formerly developed and derelict land which could provide much needed low cost and affordable housing in Strensall.	
12263	H59 (site)	Supp	Supports development with following reservations: upgrading of the junctions from Strensall and Flaxton 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.	
12655	H59 (site)	Supp	Support the site coming forward for residential development	GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD)
13294	H59 (site)	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	
13520	H59 (site)	Supp	Supports this site and would propose that this site is released quickly to provide a development site for affordable housing.	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)
<b>SP1: The Stables, Elvington</b>				
61	SP1	Comm	The previous planning inspectors report was clear. CYC should abide by this.	Elvington Parish Council
3046	SP1	Comm	Questions why travellers are allowed to live there if site was rejected as residential development.	
5237	SP1	Comm	Planning inspector previously ruled that the site would be returned to green belt use in June 2016, the site never should have been considered for development in the local plan. Wishes to stress this comment is related solely to planning issues and does not relate to individual personalities involved.	
10175	SP1	Comm	Has no objection to this site.	
10596	SP1	Comm	Supports use of the Stables site by the Peels. Objects to the idea that the site is green belt as has been developed on before, site is kept tidy. States objections made against the site are due to a prejudice about the sites owners. Access road to the site is already used by HGVs so the sites trailers and vans will add little congestion.	
13555	SP1	Comm	The permissions on this site are on a temporary basis and subject to the Planning Inspector's recommendations.	Wheldrake Ward Councillor
657	SP1	Obj	Planning inspectorate allowed temporary use of site for 5 years, then site should be returned to green belt to prevent harm to green belt objectives. Special circumstances no longer apply to site as children are of primary school age and dependant relative does not live on site. List of agreed equipment has been contravened. Elvington is a rural village community and NPP states mixed use sites are not permitted in rural locations. Site is not between industrial estates, it is surrounded by residential dwellings, and near B1228, close to a blind bend and dangerous for manoeuvring large equipment. Attaches map of The Stables SP1 and 6 residential houses and CYC criteria 4 failure re Stables SP1.	
1666	SP1	Obj	Previous planning application refusals identify the proposals at the Stables as inappropriate development and very special circumstances have not been demonstrated. Well over 200 objections have previously been submitted against this proposal and have been ignored. The family do not lead a nomadic lifestyle and the information provided about the family is inaccurate. An alternative brownfield site should be found for this proposal for example, part of ST26.	
5146	SP1	Obj	Previous planning inspector's report was clear, CYC should abide by that analysis / decision.	
5147	SP1	Obj	Previous planning inspector's report was clear, CYC should abide by that analysis / decision.	



Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
5153	SP1	Obj	Objects as CYC and the planning inspectorate have refused permission for a permanent site twice, so should be excluded from plan. Planning inspectorate also said the land should be returned to greenbelt. Questions whether this is a legal issue. NPP identifies site as being unsuitable for travellers and travelling showpeople. Site is next to 7 residential dwellings and not industrial estates as suggested in proposals. Suggests site is preferential treatment not equal treatment.	
5259	SP1	Obj	Objects to development on the following grounds: planning inspector's report clearly states that permission was granted on a temporary basis; NPPF requires 'fair and reasonable treatment for travellers', not preferential treatment. No member of the settled community would have been given planning permission to occupy the greenfield site. Just because CYC has failed to find a more suitable alternative site, this does not mean that the site itself has become suitable.	
5535	SP1	Obj	Requests to keep site green belt.	
5536	SP1	Obj	Feels the site should be kept green belt.	
5677	SP1	Obj	Planning inspector gave temporary permission for 1 site in 2011, which has been extended beyond expiry date - council should abide this decision.	
5738	SP1	Obj	Concerned with loss of greenbelt, impact of vehicles on paddock, site is untidy and ruins character of village, site should be returned to green belt.	
5816	SP1	Obj	Planning Inspectorate has give temporary consent and NPPF requires 'fair and equal (not preferential) treatment'. Just because CYC field to find a more suitable site does not mean that site ha become suitable.	
5842	SP1	Obj	Permission was originally granted on a temporary basis, at which point the land would revert back to green belt. The Council should abide by the Planning Inspector's ruling. Entrance/exit to the Stables is dangerous for the movement of large equipment, existing onto a 40mph road.	
9832	SP1	Obj	There has been a failure to find an alternative site as required by inspector's ruling. The claim that this ruling has expired is unjust. The use of the site is unsuitable. Road is busy and access onto blind bend on B1228 is poor.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
9833	SP1	Obj	This site is a travesty of the planning process - originally refused consent but granted on appeal only on the basis that no other sites were available in York. Consent was temporary and once expired a more suitable use was to be found. York have never put forward one alternative site for show people and now rely on the fact that as the show people are already there no one will mind - the site is still unsuitable. Screening has been minimal. CYC have capitulated on all matters as they do not want to upset a minority group, but are happy to upset local residents.	
10047	SP1	Obj	Concerned that the proposal for 3 permanent pitches is contrary to the original court ruling on the temporary occupancy of the land and contrary to government policy on development of green belt land. It opens CYC up to challenge for development on the green belt in other places and for unfair discrimination against local families who would seek to remain in the village, but for whom the ruling on no build on green belt would have been upheld. CYC should be seen to be upholding the court ruling and at the very least conforming with the approach in the NPPF "Traveller sites in the green belt are inappropriate development and should not be approved except in very special circumstances."	
10065	SP1	Obj	Temporary consent does not imply permanent use as in this case. The Council should find a more suitable site as per Planning Inspector's comments on the consent. Site lies in green belt and is not suitable for proposed use.	
10453	SP1	Obj	Concerned that the proposal for 3 permanent pitches is contrary to the original court ruling on the temporary occupancy of the land and contrary to government policy on development of green belt land. It opens CYC up to challenge for development on the green belt in other places and for unfair discrimination against local families who would seek to remain in the village, but for whom the ruling on no build on green belt would have been upheld. CYC should be seen to be upholding the court ruling and at the very least conforming with the approach in the NPPF "Traveller sites in the green belt are inappropriate development and should not be approved except in very special circumstances."	
10463	SP1	Obj	Site has been previously refused applications due to being on green belt land and degrading the rural character of the site. Feels the circumstances have not changed, the site ran out of its temporary permission in June 2016. Site is in conflict of the decision made by the Planning Inspectorate. There are also traffic and road safety issues, as the site is located on the corner of a busy road, with poor sight lines, which makes it dangerous for towing caravans and trailers.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
10730	SP1	Obj	Permission for the use of this site was granted on a temporary basis and should revert back to green belt - a decision made by the Planning Inspector that should be abided by. The entrance to the site is on a dangerous bend and could result in a road traffic accident.	
10818	SP1	Obj	Objects to travelling show people development at this site.	
12650	SP1	Obj	Concerned that travellers on site are linked to nearby crime.	
13366	SP1	Obj	Concern over the increase in traffic through Elvington and the impact on the local wildlife. The fields around Elvington are an important habitat for many species which are under pressure due to loss of habitat.	
13503	SP1	Obj	CYC should abide by previous planning inspector's decision.	
13556	SP1	Obj	This land is Green Belt. There are no medical, social or educational needs that warrant this land being developed into a permanent travelling show people residence. This development will increase the number of large vehicles using Elvington Lane.	
1722	SP1	Supp	Support the identification of the travelling show persons site (SP1) that provides a much needed home to the family that live there. This site is the only one identified in the local plan and is vitally important to meet the proven need for the showmen and their family. The site is not too close to the village of Elvington to disrupt village life and lies between two industrial estates. The site benefits from good road access and safe pedestrian access and benefits from its own eco-friendly sewage system. The site is screened from Elvington by mature woodland. The family are already registered with the local doctor so no additional pressure will be added on the system.	
4320	SP1	Supp	The family need a permanent home and it is not a newly proposed site. The family have integrated well into the community, they often offer their equipment for local events and the children are settled well in the local school. The site is out of the way of the main village and so is no detriment to village life. The site is well screened and not over-looked by anyone.	
6504	SP1	Supp	Supports use of site by travelling show people as only suitable location to meet their needs.	
13433	SP1	Supp	Support for Policy SP1 and the travelling Showpeople that are living on The Stables site in Elvington. The family have integrated well into the community.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13434	SP1	Supp	Supports the Travelling Showpeople living at The Stables site in Elvington. States the family keep the site tidy, the site is not in close proximity to village so doesn't cause disruptions, and the site has its own eco-friendly sewerage system so doesn't add to village systems. The site is in a business area between 2 industrial estates so is appropriate. The children are settled into the local school and the family are an important part of the community.	
13527	SP1	Supp	Fully support SP1. The travelling family raise no problems and have integrated into the community well. It is proportionate and appropriate.	
13529	SP1	Supp	Support the proposal to make this is a permanent plot for a family of travelling showpeople. The family involved have lived there for a number of years and have integrated well into, and being involved in, community life, their 3 children attend the local schools. The site is tidy, well screened from the road and has its own eco-friendly sewage system.	
13557	SP1	Supp	Support for Policy SP1 and the travelling Showpeople that are living on The Stables site in Elvington. The family have integrated well into the community. The site is also well screened and unobtrusive. The site is proportionate to the needs of the family.	
13558	SP1	Supp	Support for Policy SP1 and the travelling Showpeople that are living on The Stables site in Elvington. The family have integrated well into the community. The site is also well screened and unobtrusive. The site is proportionate to the needs of the family.	
13608	SP1	Supp	Support the identification of the travelling show persons site (SP1) that provides a much needed home to the family that live there. This site is the only one identified in the local plan and is vitally important to meet the proven need for the showmen and their family. The site is not too close to the village of Elvington to disrupt village life and lies between two industrial estates. The site benefits from good road access and safe pedestrian access and benefits from its own eco-friendly sewage system. The site is screened from Elvington by mature woodland.	
13612	SP1	Supp	These people have lived here for several years and contribute to the local school , village life etc. Show people through Policy H6 should be provide with land and somewhere to live. This home is between 2 industrial estates an is causing no harm to anyone - if made permanent screen should be used to remove from view the equipment they use. Some residents are pursuing a witch hunt based on prejudice and unfounded reasoning. The traveller site opposite bizarrely appears to have no objections. This family needs to be accommodated somewhere - they are keen participators in village life and they own land alongside so will not require CYC to give them land to live on.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp / Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13647	SP1	Supp	Supports development on the following grounds: established family who are active in the village, with dependent children attending local schools/healthcare; site is owned by the current occupiers, who maintain it well; site is self-contained and screened; scale of development is proportionate and appropriate; there is an identified need for Travelling Showpeople and there is a proven need for the site and for the family to remain there in permanent residence.	
<b>SH1: Heworth Croft</b>				
238	SH1	Comm	No objection to the principle of allocating the site. Policy should state that development proposals for the area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the Heworth Green/East Parade/Huntington Road Conservation Area are not harmed.	Historic England
9510	SH1	Obj	Objects to more student accomodation.	
13594	SH1	Obj	The replacement sports provision has been double counted for this site and H56, there is not enough land at Haxby Road to replace H56 alone or (H56 & SH1). Also wishes to participate in any public enquiry in order to put concerns to the inspector directly about the unsound plan.	
38	SH1	Supp	Supports policy.	York St John