

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D1				
100	D1	Comm	Suggests that, as the Plan promotes garden villages as part of its development strategy, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement.	York Georgian Society
100	D1	Comm	Second sentence "The study of adjacent settlements <i>in particular New Earswick</i> ...in the area should be undertaken." It is suggested that the specific example of New Earswick should be cited here, for the following reasons: three sites are proposed for the creation of new 'garden villages' (ST7/ST14/ST15). Suggests that, as the Plan promotes garden villages as part of its development strategy, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. Rep references Parker and Unwin's principles for New Earswick, which it suggests should be itemised in a new sub-paragraph. Also, pg 145 point v 'Character and Design standards' - alter ' <i>appropriate</i> building materials' to ' <i>compatible</i> building materials'. Pg 147 alter " <i>Suitable</i> building materials" to " <i>Compatible</i> building materials". Note other detailed comments.	York Georgian Society
192	D1	Comm	Design Standards Paragraph (Para 8.11) Excellence in workmanship should be added as a requirement. Unless this is covered under Para 8.10. The Local Plan should include encouragement for proposed developments over a certain size to consult the Yorkshire and Humber Design Review Panel before submitting a planning application to ensure the best design possible.	
372	D1	Comm	Suggests that, as the Plan promotes garden villages as part of its development strategy, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement.	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
372iii	D1	Comm	Second sentence "The study of adjacent settlements <i>in particular New Earswick</i> ...in the area should be undertaken." It is suggested that the specific example of New Earswick should be cited here, for the following reasons: three sites are proposed for the creation of new 'garden villages' (ST7/ST14/ST15). Suggests that, as the Plan promotes garden villages as part of its development strategy, policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement. Rep references Parker and Unwin's principles for New Earswick, which it suggests should be itemised in a new sub-paragraph. Also, pg 145 point v 'Character and Design standards' - alter ' <i>appropriate</i> building materials' to ' <i>compatible</i> building materials'. Pg 147 alter " <i>Suitable</i> building materials" to " <i>Compatible</i> building materials". Note other detailed comments.	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel
544	D1	Comm	What is the intended function of 'City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance 2014. Is it intended to be an SPD under D1 iii)? What status/weight should be given to these documents.	
12655	D1	Comm	Clarity should be provided to define the level of detail required at outline planning application stage for sites adjacent to conservation areas in terms of 'Full design details' required.	GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD)
13022	D1	Comm	Support emphasising the visual dominance of Minster. Should be supported in future in managing skyline.	York Minster
13637i	D1	Comm	Place making should apply to all development proposals and will be essential in the development management process to aid sustainable development and to protect and enhance the special character of York.	CPRE - North Yorkshire
434	D1	Obj	No clear definition within the policy in supporting text of York's special qualities or the significance of the historic environment. Without clear definition the policy wording is ambiguous and unclear. These terms should be clearly defined or deleted. Deleted wording suggested.	Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
98	D1	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York. Welcome the thinking behind design principles and particularly the content of sections iv) and v). Suggests that some of the specific wording of para 1.52 could strengthen the impact of policy wording.	York Civic Trust
238	D1	Supp	Supports policy approach, helping to ensure that the elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City are safeguarded. Particularly welcome the requirement that development proposals that fail to take account of York's special qualities, fail to make a positive contribution to the City, or cause damage to the character or quality of an area will be refused. Given the international importance of the historic city of York it is absolutely right that developments which are likely to harm its character are refused.	Historic England
386	D1	Supp	Strongly support this broad approach. Regarding Iv Building Heights and views, add "In general existing tall buildings will not be modified to include more modern additional accommodation on top of existing roofscape unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this is essential for the viable conversion of the building to its new use."	York Green Party
5167	D1	Supp	Support the need to achieve high quality design on development schemes in York.	Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
13520	D1	Supp	Supports the policy and would expect the contents of the policy to be incorporated into a masterplan for the QE barracks site.	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)
Policy D2				
210	D2	Comm	Welcome the inclusion of water sensitive design, though believe should expand on what this is to make the policy effective. Suggests adding the explanation: 'Development should improve access to, along and from the waterway/ Development should optimise views and natural surveillance of the waterway/ Development should not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the waterway by virtue of noise, odour or visual impact'.	Canal & River Trust
1675i	D2	Comm	Policy D2 makes reference to the most up to date York Landscape Character Appraisal. We have been unable to locate this document. This needs to be made available in the evidence base documents.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey
12640i	D2	Comm	Cannot be presumed that the removal of trees and hedgerows can be offset by planting new ones as the ecology of these can take decades to develop and new ones may not have the same ecology.	
13103	D2	Comm	Policy makes reference to York Landscape Character Appraisal. Unable to locate this.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees
13104	D2	Comm	Policy makes reference to York Landscape Character Appraisal. Unable to locate this.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes.
434	D2	Obj	There is no clear definition within the policy or supporting text as to the meaning of York's special qualities. This should be clearly defined or deleted. Deleted wording suggested. The mature landscaping has been retained in relation to British Sugar where possible in the context of the re-profiling remediation works.	Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC
1705	D2	Obj	Policy should be reworded in order to be fully compliant with the NPPF as the impact on the landscape is one factor that should be considered by the decision maker when determining planning applications.	Gladman Developments
98	D2	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
238	D2	Supp	Support policy approach, which should help to ensure that development proposals do not harm the landscape of the City and its wider setting.	Historic England
386	D2	Supp	Welcome this and the cross reference to Green infrastructure	York Green Party
13520	D2	Supp	Supports the policy and would expect the contents of the policy to be incorporated into a masterplan for the QE barracks site.	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)
13637i	D2	Supp	Recognition of the importance of landscape and setting via this policy is especially welcomed. It is important that the most important qualities and characteristics of York are respected.	CPRE - North Yorkshire

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D3				
13342	D3	Comm	Says that York lacks public art, if done well this can create a sense of place. It would be beneficial to actively require the provision of public art for new developments of a certain size / value. This is perhaps reflected in D3 but could be strengthened.	
13342i	D3	Comm	Development proposals will be supported where they: points 3 & 4 'Do not cause the loss of' This seems a very easy point to meet? Majority of developments will meet these last two points. Would it be better to have a more positive point (like the first two) or omit these? Possibly may I not understand the thought process behind this policy.	
434	D3	Obj	A Cultural Wellbeing Plan was not required as part of the ST1 site. This requirement should not be applied to the British Sugar Site.	Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC
1675i	D3	Obj	We object to the request that strategic sites will need to assess current status and need relating to culture and provision. This is a task only the Council can perform.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey
4355	D3	Obj	Object to requirement that all strategic sites must complete an assessment of culture that is to be included in a Cultural Wellbeing Plan. This is impractical, unjustified, disproportionate on small strategic sites such as Terry's and will not be effective. Policy should be amended so this requirement applies only to strategic sites > 5 ha.	ELG Planning on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Ltd
5167	D3	Obj	The policy implies that it is the responsibility of the developer to undertake an audit of existing facilities to determine whether additional provision is required. If this is the case then the policy cannot be supported. It is the responsibility of the council to provide this evidence.	Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
12659	D3	Obj	It is not considered to be a necessary and proportionate requirement for a Cultural Wellbeing Plan to be undertaken on all strategic sites. It should be done on a plan wide level.	Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership
13103	D3	Obj	Object to request that strategic sites will need to assess current status and need relating to culture and provision. This is a task that only the Council can perform.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson and G M Ward Trustees

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13104	D3	Obj	Object to request that strategic sites will need to assess current status and need relating to culture and provision. This is a task that only the Council can perform.	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes.
98	D3	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
198	D3	Supp	Support for Policy D3.	National Railway Museum

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
12659	D3	Supp	Generally Supportive of this policy	Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership
13561	D3	Supp	Support for the recognition of the concepts of cultural wellbeing, cultural capacity and the requirement on significant sites for a Cultural Wellbeing Plan. These aspects will not only enhance the Plan but, if implemented, would potentially place York in the forefront of national best practice. Suggest further collaborative working to articulate, refine and make practice the ideas and policies within the current Plan.	York at Large sub-group

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D4				
100	D4	Comm	Pg 152, para 8.26; in the last sentence insert " <i>Alteration and</i> conversion schemes should respect the scale..."	York Georgian Society
372v	D4	Comm	Pg 152, para 8.26; in the last sentence insert " <i>Alteration and</i> conversion schemes should respect the scale..."	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel
13609	D4	Comm	This policy should include more NPPF wording relating to changes of use and loss of community benefit (See Historic England Guidance: Heritage Listing Advice Note 7)	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
238	D4	Obj	<p>Whilst we fully support much of the thrust of this Policy, in some areas it does not reflect the advice of NPPF, the duties under the Act, or its intentions are unclear. Deleted policy and replace with:- <i>"Development proposals within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be supported where they: i) are designed to preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the Conservation Area; ii) it would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area or would help secure a sustainable future for a building of risk within it; iii) are accompanied by an appropriate evidence based assessment of the conservation area's special qualities, proportionate to the size and impact of the development and sufficient to ensure that impacts of the proposals are clearly understood. Outline planning applications for development within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area will only be supported if full design details are included sufficient to show the likely impact of the proposals upon the significance of the Conservation area. Changes of use will be supported where it has been demonstrated that the original use of the building is no longer viable or appropriate and where the proposed new use would not harm the significance of the area. Harm to buildings, open spaces, trees, views or other elements which make a positive contribution to a Conservation Area will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Conservation Area will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits."</i></p>	Historic England
1705	D4	Obj	Policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.	Gladman Developments

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13182	D4	Obj	Part (i) of the of the policy is not the correct test for assessing development which affects a conservation area. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that developments within conservation areas should “preserve or enhance” the asset. The policy states that “outline planning applications for development within or adjacent to conservation areas will only be supported if full design details are included”. This should be deleted from the policy as there is no basis upon which the Council can insist on the submission of full details for an outline planning application.	Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
98	D4	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
386	D4	Supp	Supports policy.	York Green Party
13520	D4	Supp	Supports the policy. Any development must enhance existing conservation areas and consideration should be given to the unique development at Strensall Park adjacent to the QE Barracks site in order to protect its heritage and history.	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)
Policy D5				
2765	D5	Comm	It is important that Listed Buildings are used and maintained to stop them becoming derelict. It is important that new development maintains the setting of Listed Buildings.	
13342	D5	Comm	York contains a high number of highly graded buildings, Historic England should therefore be identified as a key delivery partner.	
98	D5	Obj	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York. However, this is a key policy for the City of York and York Civic Trust wishes to see it substantially reworded, as follows: "...will be generally supported only where they: i. can be shown..."; further text to be added to ii) to strengthen 'understanding': "...are accompanied by <u>a heritage statement that clearly sets out the evidence for the historical and architectural significance of the building. Only where the asset is thoroughly understood can the impact of the proposals be judged and a justification for them made.</u> "; cite Conservation Principles at para 8.29; deposit heritage statements with the HER; amend para 8.30 by changing the wording to "like for like repairs in terms of precise design and proportions and materials"; given recent cases, make explicit reference to the need for Listed Building Consent.	York Civic Trust

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
238	D5	Obj	<p>Whilst we fully support much of the thrust of this Policy, in some area it does not reflect the advice of the NPPF, the duties under the Act and, in a few places, would benefit from a slight amendment to improve its intentions. Delete Policy D5 and replace with:- <i>"Development proposals affecting a Listed Building or its setting will be supported where they: i) preserve those elements which contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the building or its setting. The more important the building, the greater the weight that will be given to its conservation; ii) would enhance or better reveal the significance of a Listed Building or will help secure a sustainable future for a building at risk; and iii) are accompanied by an appropriate evidence based assessment of the significance of the building, proportionate to the size and impact of the development and sufficient to ensure that impacts of the proposals are clearly understood. Changes of use will be supported where it has been demonstrated that the original use of the building is not longer viable or appropriate and where the proposed new use would not harm its significance. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Listed Building or its setting will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss of a Listed Building will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits."</i></p>	Historic England
1705	D5	Obj	Policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.	Gladman Developments
386	D5	Supp	Supports policy.	York Green Party
13520	D5	Supp	Supports the policy. In addition to the buildings already listed in Strensall, it is believed that on the QE barracks site there will be other buildings which should be listed.	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)
Policy D6				
13342ii	D6	Comm	D6: iii - use of the word unavoidable - should this be 'outweighed by the public benefit of the development' or similar? Harm is always avoidable through refusing development. Key Delivery Footnotes - should read Historic England, not English Heritage?	
238	D6	Obj	<p>Whilst we fully support much of the thrust of this Policy, in some area it does not reflect the advice of the NPPF. Deleted policy and replace with:- <i>"Development proposals that affect archaeological features and deposits will be supported where they are: i) accompanied by an evidence-based heritage statement that describes the significance of the archaeological deposits affected and includes a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, reports on intrusive and non-intrusive surveys of the application site and its setting; including characterisation of waterlogged organic deposits, if present; ii) would not result in harm to the significance of the site or its setting; iii) designed to enhance or better reveal the significance of an archaeological site or will help secure a sustainable future for an archaeological site at risk. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Scheduled Monument or other nationally important remains will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss of a Scheduled Monument or other nationally-important remains will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal could bring substantial public benefits. Harm to archaeological remains of less than national importance will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the archaeology. In those cases where development affecting an archaeological site is acceptable in principle, detailed mitigation measures will need to be agreed with the City of York Council that include, where appropriate, provision for deposit monitoring, investigation, recording, analysis, publication, archive deposition and community involvement".</i></p>	Historic England

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
1705	D6	Obj	Policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.	Gladman Developments
98	D6	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
386	D6	Supp	Supports policy.	York Green Party
12655	D6	Supp	Supports the needs for a heritage statement to describe the significance of archaeological remains and requested that it should be clear that this requirement should be to support a planning application only.	GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD)
13520	D6	Supp	Supports the policy. Archaeological surveys are essential on MOD sites.	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)
Policy D7				
100	D7	Comm	Suggested text amends to bring policy in closer alignment with SPD consulted on in 2012.	York Georgian Society
372vi	D7	Comm	Suggested text amends to bring policy in closer alignment with SPD consulted on in 2012.	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel
386	D7	Comm	Add bullet point in the policy specifically mentioning SPD Local Heritage List	York Green Party
5826iii	D7	Comm	Asks when the local list of heritage assets is to be finalised to enable it to play a material role in planning decisions. Should be completed ASAP.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
238	D7	Obj	Whilst we fully support much of the thrust of this Policy it needs to clearly differentiate the approach that the Council will take to applications affecting non-designated heritage assets compared to designated heritage assets. The introductory Paragraph would benefit from a slight rewording to improve its intentions. Delete the first Paragraph and replace with:- <i>“Development proposals affecting a non-designated heritage asset or its setting will be supported where they conserve those elements which contribute to its significance. Developments which would remove, harm or undermine the significance of such assets, or their contribution to the character of a place will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the heritage asset”</i>	Historic England
540	D7	Obj	This policy and the explanation at paragraph 8.35 are back to front. Without a Local Heritage List, as contemplated at paragraph 8.36, it is open season for anyone to claim - that a site or building is or is not an un-designated Heritage Asset. If the LPA considers a building or site to be an un-registered Heritage Asset, it should justify this by some means (Local List?) then it may be appropriate for an applicant to assess any development proposals against the criteria identified in the policy - but criteria for defining what might or might not be such an asset needs to come first.	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
1705	D7	Obj	Policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.	Gladman Developments
98	D7	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
13520	D7	Supp	Supports the policy to ensure that any non-designated assets are protected especially those with community significance.	Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
13637i	D7	Supp	A separate policy dealing with the significance of non-designated Heritage Assets is welcomed especially in an area containing such historic assets and often deemed less important than others.	CPRE - North Yorkshire

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D8				
100	D8	Comm	Re para 8.28, suggests a check should be made on whether the gardens at Bishopbarns in St George's Place, and at Goddards Tadcaster Road, are also included on the List of Historic Parks and Gardens. Also notes spelling error.	York Georgian Society

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
372vii	D8	Comm	Re para 8.28, suggests a check should be made on whether the gardens at Bishopbarns in St George's Place, and at Goddards Tadcaster Road, are also included on the List of Historic Parks and Gardens. Also notes spelling error.	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel
238	D8	Obj	<p>Whilst we fully support much of the thrust of this Policy, it needs to make it clear that it is dealing with only those landscapes that are Registered (other non-designated landscapes would fall within the provisions of Policy D7). It also needs to set out the considerations that would be taken into account when determining proposals which would be likely to harm such landscapes, and include and positive support for proposals which would enhance their significance. Delete policy D8 and replace with: - <i>“Policy D8: Registered Historic Parks and Gardens Development proposals affecting a Registered Historic Park and Garden or their wider setting will be supported where they: i. do not harm the layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the Park or Garden, key views into or out from the Park; ii. are sensitive to the original design intentions and subsequent layers of design and the functional evolution of the park or garden and do not prejudice any future restoration iii. would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Historic Park and Garden or would help to secure a sustainable future for a feature within it. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.”</i></p>	Historic England
1705	D8	Obj	Policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.	Gladman Developments
98	D8	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York. Could this policy include a comment on the status of public open spaces?	York Civic Trust

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13520	D8	Supp	Supports the policy to ensure that developers take account of the heritage of the development site.	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)
Policy D9				
98	D9	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
238	D9	Supp	Supports policy approach which will ensure that the results from any archaeological assessments or investigation are deposited in the HER. This will help to increase the understanding of the archaeology of York and assist in predicting the potential impacts of future development proposals across the City.	Historic England

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D10				
42	D10	Comm	Paragraph 8.48 could include enhancement of biodiversity around the walls.	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
98	D10	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
238	D10	Supp	Subject to the suggested change, we whole-heartedly support the inclusion of a Policy to manage change in the vicinity of the City Walls. Suggested change to Criterion i) to read " <i>...the elements which contribute to their significance and the six principle characteristics of the City as identified in the Heritage Topic Paper.</i> "	Historic England
386	D10	Supp	Supports policy.	York Green Party
Policy D11				

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
100	D11	Comm	Re para 8.49/8.50, suggests text amends to refer to impact of development on designated assets.	York Georgian Society
372viii	D11	Comm	Re para 8.49/8.50, suggests text amends to refer to impact of development on designated assets.	Conservation Areas Advisory Panel
540	D11	Comm	What does the penultimate bullet point mean (extensions should contribute to the function of the area and be safe and accessible). How can an extension in a predominantly shopping street contribute to the function of the area?	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
98	D11	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
238	D11	Supp	We support the policy which will help to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing buildings take place in a manner which will safeguard those elements which contribute to the distinctive character of the City.	Historic England
13520	D11	Supp	Supports the policy so that any alterations or extensions to existing buildings are able to protect or enhance the original building.	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)
Policy D12				
98	D12	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
238	D12	Supp	We support this Policy especially the protection that is given to the retention of high-quality or historic shop fronts. York has many fine historic shopfronts which make a valuable contribution to the distinctive character of the area in which these buildings are located.	Historic England
386	D12	Supp	Support explicit policy to retain existing historic shop fronts. Add reference to retaining and repairing historic features including signs, clocks etc	York Green Party
13520	D12	Supp	Supports the policy to avoid alterations to shop fronts which are not in keeping with the building's surroundings.	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)
Policy D13				
386	D13	Comm	Add reference to traditional (non illuminated) hanging signs attached to buildings being considered as alternative to A boards within the city centre where they are justified to direct customers into side streets.	York Green Party
13520	D13	Comm	Policy does not include reference to 'temporary advertising' especially in conservation areas.	Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
197	D13	Obj	The need for appropriate and sensitive signage is recognised but more flexibility would be welcome in order to generate trade and income for heritage buildings. Many people are put off by historic buildings and without signage they will not enter and use the facilities.	York Museums Trust
460	D13	Obj	Policy D13: Advertisements, only partly reflects the requirements of the legislation and national planning policy advice. Some parts of the draft policy and supporting text remain incorrect and other parts could be improved and simplified. Suggested wording given in relation to the policy and supporting text.	Chris Thomas - Outdoor Advertising Consultant representing British Sign and Graphics Association
98	D13	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York. Suggested additional reference to 'A' boards as other forms of advertising are explicitly mentioned. Concerned that reference to 'exceptions' in para 8.59 could result in unsightly advertisements of the type that the Council is clearly seeking to remove.	York Civic Trust
238	D13	Supp	We support this Policy which sets out a good framework for the control of advertisements. This should help to ensure that the character of the City is maintained.	Historic England

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
Policy D14				
98	D14	Supp	Supports Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York.	York Civic Trust
238	D14	Supp	Support policy which sets a good framework for the control of security shutters. Poorly-designed security shutters can considerably detract from the character of an area and its vitality. This Policy should help to ensure that the character of the City is maintained.	Historic England
13520	D14	Supp	Supports the policy especially in conservation areas.	Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group