

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
<b>Policy GB1</b>				
42	GB1	Comm	Support for maintaining the Green Belt around York. However it is important that the protection of areas of Green Belt which are arable land, which is low in biodiversity and does not support or buffer important semi-natural areas do not receive more protection than brownfield land with high value for biodiversity.	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
540	GB1	Comm	In terms of the 9th bullet point (essential engineering operations) it is appreciated this is included to safeguard the Council's interests at Harewood Whin, but who is to determine whether engineering operations are essential? Essential to whom? Is an embanked slurry lagoon or a large concrete hardstanding on a farm essential?	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
10379	GB1	Comm	Objects to development on green belt to retain recreational and social activities.	
62	GB1	Obj	The policy should follow more closely the format of paragraph 89 of the NPPF. In particular, it should not make reference to renewable energy schemes being potentially appropriate forms of development. The NPPF is clear (paragraph 91) that most such projects would comprise inappropriate developments. There are no special circumstances in York to justify a different view. Indeed large renewable energy projects in the Green Belt have the potential to cause major damage to the setting and special character of the historic city.	Fulford Parish Council
220	GB1	Obj	Considers the Green Belt designation to be unduly restrictive and any works within the main area of the racecourse are deemed 'inappropriate development'. Former national policy allowed for 'major developed sites in the green belt' which was reflected in the 2005 version of the local plan. Other sites previously identified as 'major developed sites' such as the designer outlet and Askham Bryan College are removed from the green belt in this version of the plan. Request that the area of the racecourse previously identified as a major developed site, should be removed from the green belt as it does not serve green belt purposes.	Turnberry Consulting on behalf of York Racecourse

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
540	GB1	Obj	<p>This policy as drafted is inconsistent with NPPF Green Belt guidance. Appeal Inspectors have in some instances treated roads as inappropriate development in the Green Belt since vehicles using them would detract from the openness. Any built development within the General extent of the Green Belt is bound to encroach to some degree on the countryside. As drafted, the policy precludes most forms of built and other development in the Green Belt whether appropriate by definition or not. Paragraph 10.4: No justification for removing permitted development rights from residential developments - the GDPO does not preclude extensions in the Green Belt, so why should York? Paragraphs 10.8 &amp; 10.10: These paragraphs need reconsidering (and GB1 amending if necessary). There are a significant number of buildings in the open countryside round York which can be converted to residential or business use or from business use to residential either as permitted development or within policy, resulting in a development which can be less visually acceptable. Policy GB1 should facilitate redevelopment in these circumstances (It may be that the 7th bullet point of the policy is intended to achieve the same objective - please advise if this is the case).</p>	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
540	GB1	Obj	<p>Policy GB1 and paragraphs 10.8 and 10.10 amended to facilitate redevelopment where this would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness (in conjunction with the deletion of criterion 'iv' of policy GB3) .</p>	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
540	GB1	Obj	<p>How is the word 'limited' to be interpreted in the 4th-7th bullet points of the policy? In relation to the 3rd bullet point, is this one house? In relation to the 5th bullet point, some guidance of scale should be provided - 40%, 50%, 100% - should it be volume or footprint? There is no case for limiting 'alterations' to existing buildings. It is assumed that 'limited' in relation to affordable housing means limited to the local needs identified - if so, the word 'limited' should be omitted.</p>	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
42	GB1	Supp	Support for maintaining the Green Belt around York.	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
59	GB1	Supp	Support this policy to protect the setting of the village and its green approaches.	Dunnington Parish Council
238	GB1	Supp	We support this Policy especially Criterion iii. This will help to ensure that any development in the Green Belt safeguards those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City.	Historic England
244	GB1	Supp	Support the identification of Park & Ride facilities as being appropriate in the Green Belt in Policy GB1 / para 10.14.	NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet
386	GB1	Supp	Generally support this policy with following amendment: minerals extraction, provided high environmental standards are attainable and including all the safeguards specified in the Minerals and Waste Plan.	York Green Party
13520	GB1	Supp	Policy is supported to ensure that inappropriate development is not carried out in the Green Belt.	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>Policy GB2</b>				
540	GB2	Comm	There is some confusion between Policy GB2 criterion iii and the explanation following 10.18. If 'infilling' is to be interpreted as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage then perhaps it would be helpful to qualify this by limiting the number of dwellings to perhaps 1 or 2. The policy & explanation would be acceptable as drafted if the washed over villages were all loose knit settlements with gardens, paddocks and other breaks between buildings but in general they are not. Most villages surrounding York do not justify being washed over and all should be looked at again.	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
62	GB2	Obj	FPC objects to the proposal to exclude the York Designer Outlet from the Green Belt. Instead, the site should be shown as overwashed and treated as a previously developed site in the Green Belt. It would be subject thereby to the restrictions on development set out in the last bullet-point of NPPF paragraph 89 which allows development compatible with the site's status as previously developed and its location within the Green Belt. Goes into detail explaining why including the Designer Outlet in the Green Belt would be consistent with the history of the site. Excluding the site from the Green Belt allows unrestricted development within the boundaries of the inset (subject to other policies in the plan), this will likely lead to a loss of much of the landscape setting of the Designer Outlet which at present mitigates impacts of existing built development upon the wider Green Belt.	Fulford Parish Council
540	GB2	Obj	No justification is provided for washing over certain settlements (e.g.. Naburn - this is not a village where the open character of the village makes an important contribution to the Green Belt) - see NPPF para 86. Such settlements should be inset based on their merits and all villages currently washed over should be reassessed to ensure compliance with NPPF para 86.	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
1733	GB2	Obj	Object to the Green Belt boundary washing over Clifton Gate Business Park. Consider that this will be restrictive to expansion of existing businesses in future as GB policy applies.	

Local Plan Pre- Publication Draft 2018 Summary of Consultation Responses

ID	Policy	Obj/Supp/ Comm	Summary	Respondent (name of individuals removed)
13520	GB2	Supp	Policy is supported where villages are washed over by the Green Belt. Consideration should be given within this policy to identify such villages.	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>Policy GB3</b>				
540	GB3	Obj	<p>Permitted Development Regulations which permit the conversion of agricultural buildings to dwellings do not require the buildings to be within 800m of a defined settlement limit &amp; there is no sound reason for criterion 'vii' of the draft policy. Additionally, there is something wrong with the wording of criterion 'iv' which requires the character of the building to be in keeping with the character of the building - assume its a typo? However, it appears to be the intention of the criterion to prevent re-use of buildings which are not entirely in keeping with their surroundings - is this what is intended? If so, how can it be sustainable to prevent the re-use of a permanent &amp; substantial construction because it is not of a sympathetic design? Consequently this criterion should be deleted and Policy GB1 and paragraphs 10.8 and 10.10 amended to facilitate redevelopment where this would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness.</p>	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
74	GB3	Supp	There are a number of buildings within the parish which come under the category set out in GB3 and therefore support the policy.	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
13520	GB3	Supp	Policy is supported to reuse existing buildings located in the Green Belt unless the design is such that it impacts on the openness of the Green Belt.	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>Policy GB4</b>				
62	GB4	Comm	<p>No objection to the principle of this policy however it requires clarification to prevent abuse:</p> <p>1) Criterion i) should be amended to make clear that it applies only to existing rural communities. This is to avoid exception sites being put forward on the edge of the main urban area. 2) An additional criterion should be added to prevent exception sites being allowed on particularly sensitive areas of the Green Belt such as those shown by Figure 3.1. The wording of Policy H5 could be reused: Do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhancing York's historic and natural environment. This includes the city's character and setting and internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites, green corridors and areas with an important recreational function.</p>	Fulford Parish Council
540	GB4	Obj	<p>Rural exceptions sites should be located immediately adjacent to a settlement, not up to 800m from it - how is this sustainable for those in need? Furthermore, once detailed Green Belt boundaries are established in an adopted Plan, the opportunities for developing such sites are greatly restricted. Criterion 'iii' provides an opportunity for pockets of 100% affordable dwellings being dotted around the open countryside, not connected with any settlement - is this really what is intended?</p>	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant
13520	GB4	Supp	<p>Policy is supported as it will enable the building of affordable homes on housing site H59.</p>	Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group