

ID Ref	Q1: Thinking about the Local Plan as a whole, to what extent do you support the Labour Council's plans for over 16,000 houses on York's greenbelt? (Non FSC Comment)	Q2: Do you agree with us that the overall scale of development Labour are proposing is unsustainable and is likely to outpace investment in infrastructure? (Non FSC Comment)	Q3: Do you agree with us that Labour's Local Plan is in appropriate for a historic cathedral City like York? (Non FSC Comment)	Q4: Give us your thoughts on the Local Plan proposals as a whole. (Non FSC Comment)	Q5: Turning to the recent Local Plan 'Further Site' proposals in your area to what extent do you agree that the Elvington Traveller Site proposal should be withdrawn on account of it's rural greenbelt location? (Site Reference 747)	Q6: Do you support the Council's plans to provide three permanent pitches for Travelling Show people families at the Stables in Elvington? (Site Reference 22)	Q7: Do you agree with us that the Council should not 'safeguard' land for future development if it is not required to do so? (Non FSC Comment)	Q8: Do you agree with us that the Council should not allocate land for wind and solar farms if it is not required to do so? (Non FSC Comment)	Q9: Give us your thoughts on the Local Plan 'Further Sites' proposals in your area. (FSC General Comment)	Any further issues of concern? (FSC General Comment)
1008(ii)	Opposed		Yes	Ill thought out in relation to timberland and accession housing. Opposed to travellers sites.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	no emphasis placed on water power to generate electricity from Ouse & Derwent. Badly maintained cycle paths. Overgrown neglect of grass areas by roads. Why no cycle access to York from Elvington & Wheldrake. Clean Road signs and overhanging plants.	
1150(iii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Yes		
1175	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Strongly oppose any use of greenbelt land for any development. Strongly opposed to the integration of Travellers into residential areas it can only cause friction between the 2 parties. Also object to the 3 extra showman's sites. The plan as a whole is totally unacceptable.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the plan as a whole.	
1894	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Local plan is inappropriate. Greenbelt damage would be irreparable. Travellers site inappropriate for a small village. Whinthorpe would be a commuter town for Leeds. Elvington plans are inappropriate given already creaking infrastructure.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Travellers site not appropriate for a rural green belt and play ground location. Limited amenities and infrastructure.	
3063(ii)	Opposed	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't like greenbelt being compromised. Keep the villages and change character and devalue the environment.	Strongly Agree	No	No	No	Agrees with Wind and Solar but needs to be in a joined up approach.	
5146 (iiiiiii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Proposed plans will affect residents, quality of life with additional strains on schools, traffic jams, pollution, reduce green spaces for health and outdoor activities and destroy character of York. Therefore negative impact on tourism business.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Suggestions not in keeping with local area. Not a local need for levels of housing. Unemployment is high therefore new jobs needed. Any building should take place on Brownfield sites.	

5284(iiii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Local plan feels like imposed on us, little consultation and key details hidden away on councils website. Agree housing needed but what about Brownfield sites?	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	The local plan calls for approx 25 houses at the rear of my property and further 90 + behind the school, but no details about any improvement in schools, bus services, roads, surgery or any formal infrastructure. Why green belt sites when there are Brownfield sites around the airfield.	Grass cutting of verges. Cycle route Elvington to York via airfield and Heslington. Could there be permission for one that would be safe on the airfield.
5536 (i)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	York already has many properties owned by people who do not live and work in the area. We must be careful to keep a good balance of community feel.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	The land proposed for the travellers site would be unsuitable for such use. Set in the park and sports club vicinity it would cause extra traffic onto an already very busy stretch of road, with no footpath or bus stops. We already have a substantial new site of low cost housing nearing completion on the edge of the village and just a short distance away. A small village like Elvington could not sustain more such development.	An allotment for the community would be a better use of the sit. No wish for further development in the village.
57419(iiii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	Travelling show people families are already using the land and have been for some time. It is no longer green belt. However the traveller site proposal would take land currently greenbelt away and is situated within the village where as the traveller site is outside the village.	
6036(i)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Waste of Public monies. Need to priorities _ roads, Paths, safety measures.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Not agree with proposals.	
6196	Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
9283 (iiiiii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Opposed to changes in Elvington Village. Travellers will mean increase in crime, mess.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
9447(i)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Disagree	No	Yes	Yes		
9470(ii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Village will double in size, losing character. School has no more room for pupils. Mains drainage and sewage is already at capacity. Road infrastructure not suitable for plans.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Don't Know	Disproportionate for village. The traveller site will change whole character of the site and bring along new challenges.	
9551 (ii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	No	Shouldn't accommodate, especially in villages	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	No travellers	
9710 (iiiiii)	Supportive	Yes	Don't Know	Agree with need for more housing and jobs. But preserve existing green belt and quality of life.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	No	Need to compromise on green energy. We will need to accept alternative such as wind farms.	
9776(ii)	Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Yes		
9958(iii)	Strongly Opposed		Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Opposed to traveller site. Rural community already congested and near a primary school Health and Safety of Children. Lack of amenities and facilities, nearby village with more had a proposal withdrawn due to greenbelt location.	
10196(i)		Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Don't Know		
10540(i)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	No		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		

10832(i)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Consider plans inappropriate, over ambitious and lack of support in term of infrastructure. Proposals not to the benefit of York residents.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Poorly thought out and inappropriate for Elvington. Traveller site would be a blight on the landscape, cause additional traffic.	
10898(iiiiii)	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Plans are unsustainable and inappropriate speed of growth in small rural villages. Projects too large with no thought of impact on communities, amenities and resources, no mention of huge traffic implications.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Concerned about expansion of industrial estate, as already inappropriate level of HGV's in Village, Bridge and on school run. Not sufficient size of village or amenities to be appropriate for travellers sites.	Rural transport- should be increasing not cutting it for old and young a like.
11149	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
11150	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
11151	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Existing traffic problems in York, proposed number of properties and developments are excessive for the need of the city. Labour are providing overspill accommodation for Leeds and other areas.	Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposed safe guard site will affect the nature of the village with the number of houses proposed. Accept need for developments taken up with the first draft plan.	
11152	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Proposals do not fit the village lifestyle.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Opposed Travellers site for the village. Unsure why permanent site when they are called travellers due to lifestyle.	
11153	Opposed	Yes	Yes		Agree	No	Yes	No		
11154	Strongly Opposed	No	No	No camp site(travellers)	Strongly Disagree	No	No	No		We do not want a campsite in Elvington.
11156	Opposed	Yes	Don't Know		Strongly Agree	Yes	Don't Know	Yes		
11158	Strongly Opposed	No	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
11159	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Don't Know	Yes		
11160	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Elvington is a small village with a small infant school and medical practice. It lacks a post office and has a small store. Bus service is limited. Police service is provided from Fulford. With these facts the council does not realise the difficulties their plans will create.	Strongly Agree	No	No	Yes	21 Acres south of airfield business park development, should take into account the increase in traffic it will create and noise it will generate.	Locally NHS
11189	Strongly Opposed	Don't Know	Don't Know		Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	Cannot see the benefit of the Traveller site. Not an appropriate location on a busy road.	
11190	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Local Plan overestimates how much housing and development is needed in York. Brownfield sites also have been over looked.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	No	Oppose the extent of development in Elvington. Will change character and make up of rural village.	

11191	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Noticed significant changes in York over 25yrs. City is growing unsustainably and does not have the infrastructure for it.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		
11192	Supportive	Yes	Yes	Agree there is a need for housing, 16,000 is too many. There are Brownfield sites in the area.	Strongly Agree	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	The present family at the Stables are an asset to the village. Proposed traveller site is totally inappropriately sited opposite a children's playground, sports field and doctors surgery.	
11194	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Will loose traditional village with more homes and travellers site. Roads will not cope, already too busy. Land in greenbelt should stay in green belt.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes		Dog fouling on pavements main street in Elvington.
11198	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Too much traffic on Elvington Road through the village. No need or want for more houses or traffic . Object to travellers in the middle of village.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Objections to plans.	
11207	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Continually extending villages boundaries eventually spoils the character of the original village. Resources and infrastructure resume overstretched and overwhelmed leading to a deterioration in both. Because planners lack the foresight to see the full implications of their actions. If greenbelt is ever to be utilised in the future, then it should be an 'isolated' plan to build a completely new suburban area in its own right.	Strongly Agree	No	Yes	Yes	Travellers neither add or contribute to the community into which they impose themselves. Should look at move affordable housing plots, so that young people can choose where to live and work in the area which they were brought up in.	
11208	Opposed	Yes	Yes	Who will live in the new houses? Will it be outsiders buying the new homes? Will they work on the new industrial sites?	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Yes	Don't Know	If all the new sites are used, this will double the size of the village. The infrastructure we have will not be able to cope. The road to Elvington from York is in a bad state already. It is used by a lot of traffic and very many large lorries.	
11210	Opposed	Yes	Yes		Strongly Agree	No	Yes	No		
11211	Strongly Opposed	Yes	Yes	Plan is too complex and documents to complicated should have been more accessible consolation	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Yes	Yes	Does not agree with extra travellers sites and should not be allocated green belt. Position opposite medical centre is not appropriate.	