

YORK

**CITY OF YORK**  
LOCAL PLAN  
Sustainability Appraisal Addendum  
Appendices A-G  
Proposed Modifications Consultation  
June 2019



## Appendix A

### SA implications from the Proposed Modifications

The following schedule sets out the screening of the Proposed Modifications for Sustainability Appraisal (SA) implications. The plan location refers to the Local Plan Publication Draft (February 2018). This schedule supersedes the schedule contained in the SA Report Addendum (April 2018) Appendix A (submitted with the Local Plan Publication Draft in May 2018). Text that is proposed to be deleted is struck through (~~example~~) and additions are shown underlined and bold text (**example**).

Modification Reference Number	Plan location	Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Is the proposed modification considered significant for the purposes of SA?												
<b>General</b>																
PM1	Whole plan where applicable	Amend references from 'proposals map to ' <u>policies map</u> '	To clarify title of accompanying maps to the plan	No. The proposed modification is presentational and has no implications for SA.												
<b>Index of Policies, Figures and Tables</b>																
PM2	6 Pages in from Title Page	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy Number</th> <th>Policy Name</th> <th>Page Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Policy SS18</td> <td>Station Yard, Wheldrake</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td><del>Policy SS19</del></td> <td><del>Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall</del></td> <td><del>63</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy SS20</td> <td>Imphal Barracks, Fulford Road</td> <td>67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Policy Number	Policy Name	Page Number	Policy SS18	Station Yard, Wheldrake	62	<del>Policy SS19</del>	<del>Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall</del>	<del>63</del>	Policy SS20	Imphal Barracks, Fulford Road	67	Reference to ST35 removed following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35.	No. The proposed modification is a consequential change to supporting text to reflect the removal of Policy SS19. There are no implications for SA. See commentary under PM13 for the
		Policy Number	Policy Name	Page Number												
		Policy SS18	Station Yard, Wheldrake	62												
		<del>Policy SS19</del>	<del>Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall</del>	<del>63</del>												
Policy SS20	Imphal Barracks, Fulford Road	67														

				proposed deletion of the policy itself.
<b>Section 2: Vision and Development Principles</b>				
PM3	Paragraph 2.5  Page 17	2.5 To ensure a continuous supply of housing opportunities throughout the plan period sustainable sites should be brought forward. By the end of the plan period sufficient sites will have been identified for viable and deliverable housing sites with good access to services and public transport to meet the housing needs of the current population and the future population linked to the city's economic growth ambitions. This will require the provision of sufficient land for <b>867 790</b> dwellings per annum and will include substantial areas of land for 'garden village' development delivering exemplar new sustainable communities at Land West of Wigginton Road, Land East of Metcalfe Lane and Land West of Elvington Lane, along with major sustainable urban extensions such as British Sugar and York Central. In addition the plan will optimise the delivery of affordable housing to meet identified need subject to not compromising viability of development sites; and address the needs of specific groups.	To align with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn	Yes. The proposed change to explanatory text includes reference to the proposed decrease in the number of new homes required over the plan period, from 867 dwellings per annum to 790 dwellings per annum in Policy SS1 following the preparation of the City of York - Housing Needs Update (2019). The full implications for SA are set out below under PM4.
<b>Section 3: Spatial Strategy</b>				
PM4	Policy SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York  Page 26	Deliver a minimum annual provision of <b>867 790</b> new dwellings over the plan period to 2032/33 and post plan period to 2037/38. This will enable the building of strong, sustainable communities through addressing the housing and community needs of York's current and future population.	To align with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn	Yes. The proposed change includes a decrease in the housing requirement over the plan period, from 867 dwellings per annum to 790 per annum.  The proposed change in the housing requirement should

				<p>be appraised. The publication plan preferred housing figure and reasonable alternatives were appraised in the SA Report (2018). The housing need evidence base for that appraisal has been superseded by the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn for the City of York Council. The appraisal should be reviewed and updated to reflect the proposed change and latest evidence.</p> <p>Additionally, policies SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York and H1: Housing Allocations (which gives effect to the housing requirement) should be re-appraised in light of the proposed change and the housing need latest evidence.</p>
PM5	Policy SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York	3.3 Technical work has been carried out by GL Hearn in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2017). This work has updated the demographic baseline for York based on the July 2016 household projections to <b>867 790</b> per annum. Following consideration of the	To align with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs	Yes. The proposed change to explanatory text includes reference to the proposed decrease in the number of new homes required over



	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Page 27</p>	<p>outcomes of this work, the Council aims to meet an objectively assessed housing need of <b>867 790</b> new dwellings per annum for the plan period to 2032/33, including any shortfall in housing provision against this need from the period 2012 to 2017, and for the post plan period to 2037/38.</p>	<p>Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn</p>	<p>the plan period, from 867 dwellings per annum to 790 dwellings per annum in Policy SS1 following the preparation of the City of York - Housing Needs Update (2019). The full implications for the SA are set out above under PM4.</p>
PM6	<p>Policy SS10: Land North of Monks Cross</p> <p>Item No. X</p> <p>Page 49</p>	<p>x. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England, as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The site will exacerbate congestion in the area, particularly at peak times given its scale and the capacity of the existing road network. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with sites ST7, ST9, <b>and</b> ST14 <b>and</b> <b>ST35</b> should be addressed.</p>	<p>Reference to ST35 removed following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35 from the plan.</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change to Policy SS10 is a consequential change following the proposed removal of site ST35. The implications for the SA due to the removal of the site should be reviewed and the SA Report updated to reflect the deletion. See commentary under PM13 for the proposed deletion of the policy itself.</p>
PM7	<p>Policy SS12: Land to the West of Wigginton Road</p> <p>Criterion vi</p> <p>Page 53</p>	<p>vi. Ensure provision of new all purpose access roads to the east/south from A1237 Outer Ring Road/<b>Wigginton Road roundabout Clifton Moor Gate</b> and off the Wigginton Road/B1363 (as shown on the proposals map). The internal layout of any future development on the site could be such that it creates discrete sectors, each with a specific access</p>	<p>To correct the roundabout name referenced.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is presentational. It corrects the name of the roundabout identified in the policy. There are no implications for SA.</p>
PM8	<p>Policy SS12: Land West of Wigginton Road</p>	<p>vii. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is</p>	<p>Reference to ST35 removed following removal of policy</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change to Policy SS12 is a consequential change</p>

	<p>Item No. VII</p> <p>Page 53</p>	<p>achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site's ST7, ST8, ST9, <b>and</b> ST15 <b>and</b> <b>ST35</b> should be addressed.</p>	<p>SS19/ Site Allocation ST35 from the plan.</p>	<p>following the proposed removal of site ST35. The implications for the SA due to the removal of the site should be reviewed and the SA Report updated to reflect the deletion. See commentary under PM13 for the proposed deletion of the policy itself.</p>
<p>PM9</p>	<p>Policy SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Criterion iv.</p> <p>Page 54</p>	<p>iv. Create new open space <b>(as shown on the proposals map)</b> within the site to maintain views of the Minster and existing woodland.</p>	<p>To clarify that the openspace is not shown on the proposals map.</p>	<p>Yes. The change provides clarity for open space proposals associated with the proposed site allocation at ST15.</p> <p>This not considered a significant change to the policy and is not considered to give rise to the need for a re-appraisal; however, there are further changes to the evidence base that also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The HRA (April 2018) concluded that there were no adverse effects on the integrity of Lower Derwent Valley SPA. The appraisal was therefore reviewed in the SA Report Addendum</p>

				<p>(April 2018). This found that the uncertainties identified for the SA of the policy on biodiversity (SA Objective 8) related to the effects on Lower Derwent Valley SPA could be removed, although a residual minor negative effect remained.</p> <p>Utilising visitor survey evidence, the updated HRA (Feb 2019) has reconfirmed the findings of earlier HRA (April 2018). However, the SA commentary should be reviewed to ensure it reflects the latest HRA (Feb 2019).</p>
PM10	<p>Policy SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Criterion vi.</p> <p>Page 54</p>	<p>vi. Follow a mitigation hierarchy to first seek to avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts or compensate unavoidable residual impacts on Heslington Tillmire SSSI and the Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar through the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>incorporation of a new nature conservation area (as shown on the proposals map <b>as allocation OS10 and included within Policy GI6</b>) including a buffer of wetland habitats, a barrier to the movement of people and domestic pets on to the SSSI and deliver further benefits for biodiversity. A buffer of at least 400m from the SSSI will be required in order to adequately mitigate impacts unless evidence demonstrates otherwise; and</li> </ul>	<p>To clarify the link to new openspace (OS10) as detailed in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (2018)</p>	<p>Yes. The changes in the wording clarify the correct cross reference for open site provision. This is not considered a significant change to the policy and is not considered to give rise to the need for a re-appraisal. However, there are further changes to the evidence base that also need to be taken into account.</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision of an detailed site wide recreation and access strategy to minimise indirect recreational disturbance resulting from development and complement the wetland habitat buffer area which will be retained and monitored in perpetuity. A full understanding of the proposed recreational routes is required at an early stage.</li> </ul>		<p>The HRA (April 2018) concluded that there were no adverse effects on the integrity of Lower Derwent Valley SPA. The appraisal was therefore reviewed in the SA Report Addendum (April 2018). This found that the uncertainties identified for the SA of the policy on biodiversity (SA Objective 8) related to the effects on Lower Derwent Valley SPA could be removed, although a residual minor negative effect remains.</p> <p>Utilising visitor survey evidence, the updated HRA (Feb 2019) has reconfirmed the findings of earlier HRA (April 2018). However, the SA commentary should be reviewed to ensure it reflects the latest HRA (Feb 2019).</p>
PM11	<p>Policy SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane</p> <p>Item No. XI</p>	<p>xi. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site's ST7, ST8, ST9, ST14, ST27, <del>ST35</del> and ST36 should be addressed.</p>	<p>Reference to ST35 removed following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35 from the plan.</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change is a consequential change following the proposed removal of site ST35. The implications for the SA should be reviewed and the SA Report updated to</p>

				reflect the deletion. See commentary under PM19 for the proposed deletion of the policy itself.
PM12	Policy SS18: Station Yard, Wheldrake  Criterion iv.  Page 62	iv. Undertake a comprehensive evidence based approach in relation to biodiversity to address potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar/SSSI. <b><u>This will require the developer to publicise and facilitate the use of other, less sensitive countryside destinations nearby (e.g. Wheldrake Woods) and provide educational material to new homeowners to promote good behaviours when visiting the European site. The former could be supported by enhancing the local footpath network and improving signage</u></b>	To clarify the mitigation required as detailed in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (2018)	Yes. This proposed addition expands criterion iv) of Policy SS18. Criterion iv) relates to the potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar/SSSI.  Whilst the proposed change in the policy draws out elements that need to be considered for the management of visitors to the designated site, it is not considered a significant change that requires re-appraisal. However, there are further changes to the evidence base that also need to be taken into account.  The HRA (April 2018) concluded that there were no adverse effects on the integrity of Lower Derwent Valley SPA. The appraisal was therefore reviewed in

				<p>the SA Report Addendum (April 2018). This found that the policy still had likely minor negative effects on biodiversity (SA Objective 8).</p> <p>Utilising visitor survey evidence, the updated HRA (Feb 2019) has reconfirmed the findings of earlier HRA (April 2018). However, the SA commentary should be reviewed to ensure it reflects the latest HRA (Feb 2019).</p>
PM13	<p>Policy SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall</p> <p>Pages 63-65</p>	<p>Remove entire policy:</p> <p><del><b>Policy SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall</b></del></p> <p><del>Following the Defence Infrastructure Organisation's disposal of the site by 2021, Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35) will deliver 500 dwellings at this rural development site. Development is anticipated to commence in 2023. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles:</del></p> <p><del>i. The mitigation hierarchy should be followed to ensure no net loss of biodiversity; where possible development should deliver biodiversity gain. Development will only be allowed where it can be</del></p>	<p>Site removed following the outcomes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (Feb 2019), which has not been able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change sees the deletion of a strategic policy due to the proposed deletion of the strategic site, following the conclusions set out in the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (Feb 2019).</p> <p>The implications for the SA due to the proposed deletion should be reviewed and the SA Report should be updated to reflect the deletion.</p>

		<p>demonstrated that it will not have an adverse impact, alone or in combination, upon the integrity of Strensall Common SAC and SSSI.</p> <p>ii. <del>Take full account of the extent and quality of ecological interest on Strensall Common through the preparation of a comprehensive evidence base to support the required Habitat Regulations Assessment and other assessments to be able to fully understand and avoid, mitigate or compensate impacts. To help deliver this, a detailed Visitor Impact Mitigation Strategy must be prepared, which will be informed by comprehensive and repeatable visitor surveys (to be repeated as necessary). The Strategy will identify effective measures which will encourage both the use of alternative sites instead of Strensall Common and less damaging visitor behaviour on the Common. This will include (but not be limited to) the following measures:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Within the site divert new users away from the SAC by:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>○ Providing natural green space within the site boundary attractive to a range of users, particularly dog walkers;</del></li> <li><del>○ The provision of a circular walk within the site;</del></li> <li><del>○ Ensuring no access throughout the life of the development either by vehicle, cycle or foot to adjoining land on the north, south and eastern site boundary, and</del></li> <li><del>○ Providing publicity, education and awareness to support these aims</del></li> </ul> </del></li> <li><del>• On Strensall Common ensure suitable behaviour by visitors by:</del></li> </ul>		<p>Implications for housing supply from deletion of site should be reviewed and the SA Report should be updated to reflect the deletion.</p> <p>The SA Report should also be updated to reflect the latest evidence in the HRA (2019) which supersedes the HRA (2017) which informed appraisal of the Local Plan Publication Draft (Regulation 19 Consultation) in the SA Report (2018) and the HRA (2018) which informed the SA Addendum (2018).</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implementing actions to manage recreational pressure at points of arrival, by type of activity and location of activity on site;</li> <li>○ Ongoing monitoring that will specifically lead to the implementation of prompt remedial measures such as the closure of access points etc if adverse effects are identified, and</li> <li>○ Publicity, education and awareness</li> </ul> <p>iii. Ensure all ecological avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures are fully operational and functioning prior to commencement of any development. Measures must be supported by a long term management plan which includes ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.</p> <p>iv. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>v. The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused.</p> <p>vi. Be of a high design standard, ensuring the development has a distinct identity from Strensall village and not be just a continuation of the existing development. The site should have its own identity and character that in its layout and spaces, reflects the site's long use as a barracks, its landscape context, and the natural site assets.</p> <p>vii. Retain all identified good quality trees, with appropriate distance to tree canopy, unless they pose an unreasonable restriction on development and their contribution to the public amenity and amenity of the development is very limited, and their loss is</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>outweighed by the benefits and mitigation provided by the development.</p> <p>viii. Undertake an archaeological evaluation consisting of geophysical survey and excavation of trenches to identify the presence and assess the significances of archaeological deposits.</p> <p>ix. Prepare a Flood Risk Assessment and full drainage strategy. The strategy should be developed in conjunction with the Council and required statutory bodies and should ensure that the development will not exacerbate any existing issues with surface water and drainage. Hydrological studies that explore surface and sub-surface characteristics of the local hydrological regime would be required to identify the impact on the wet heath communities of Strensall Common SAC/SSSI and identify mitigation measures where required. Any hydrology plan/study also needs to consider impacts on water logged archaeological deposits.</p> <p>x. Increase the area and quality of open space within any proposed development beyond that found at present in order to reduce the impact of recreational pressure on Strensall Common SSSI/SAC.</p> <p>xi. Create new local facilities as required to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development.</p> <p>xii. Deliver sufficient education provision, including a new primary school, to meet the demand arising from the development. Further detailed assessments and associated viability work will be required.</p> <p>xiii. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The</p>		
--	--	---	--	--



		<p>impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with sites ST7, ST8, ST9, ST14 and ST15 should be addressed.</p> <p><del>xiv. Give further consideration to road safety at the Strensall Road/Towthorpe Moor Lane, in addition to the use of Towthorpe Moor Lane by through traffic. If identified as necessary, mitigation to Strensall Road/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction will be required.</del></p> <p><del>xv. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well-connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods, to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling). Cycle paths will need to be provided along the site frontages connecting into the site and also focus upon the route into the village and local facilities.</del></p> <p><del>xvi. Undertake detailed noise and contamination assessments, including detailed assessment of the current and future use of the military training area adjacent to the site.</del></p>		
<p>PM14</p>	<p>Policy SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>Pages 65-67</p>	<p>Remove entire explanatory justification:</p> <p><del>3.82: ST35 covers circa 28ha with a net developable area of approximately 18ha and will deliver approximately 12ha of public open space and an estimated yield of circa 578 dwellings. There are no listed buildings or conservation areas currently designated within this site. However, as access to the area has always been restricted, no detailed assessment of the existing buildings has been carried out to determine if the buildings merit designation</del></p>		<p>Yes. The proposed change sees the deletion of strategic policy explanatory text due to the proposed deletion of the strategic site following the conclusions set out in the HRA (Feb 2019).</p>

		<p><del>3.83: To address any heritage designations that may exist on the site it is recommended that Historic England are consulted, using their pre-application assessment service. With a site of this size it is important to consider the impact it will have on the historic nature of the city. The area needs to have a distinct identity from Strensall village and not be just a continuation of the existing development there. This was an important military site which played a wider role in its linkages to other military sites in the area and in the history of York's development as a garrison town. It is important that the area shouldn't lose the story of its identity as a military site and that careful consideration should be given to the kind of area/place being created. The context of the barracks is essentially rural, therefore the presentation of the site to Strensall Road and Strensall common is sensitive and this characteristic should be retained or enhanced. Strensall Common forms part of the site's wider landscape context and it is important to maintain its sense of place adjacent to this whilst taking consideration of its biodiversity value.</del></p> <p><del>3.84: The location of this site adjacent to Strensall Common SAC means that a comprehensive evidence base to understand the potential impacts on biodiversity from further development is required. Strensall Common is designated for its heathland habitats but also has biodiversity value above its listed features in the SSSI/SAC designations that will need to be fully considered. Although the common is already under intense recreational pressure, there are birds of conservation concern amongst other species and habitats which could be harmed by the intensification of disturbance. In addition, the heathland</del></p>		<p>The implications for the SA should be reviewed. The SA Report should also be updated to reflect the latest evidence in the HRA.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>habitat is vulnerable to changes in the hydrological regime which needs to be explored in detail. The mitigation hierarchy should be used to identify the measures required to first avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts or compensate for any unavoidable residual impacts, and be implemented in the masterplanning approach. Potential access points into the planned development also need to consider impacts on Strensall Common.</p> <p><del>3.85: It will be necessary to identify the presence and assess the significances of archaeological deposits on the site. An archaeological evaluation consisting of geophysical survey and excavation of trenches will be required. This will be used to assess the significances of archaeological features and deposits and will allow decisions about the scale and form of future mitigation measures on the site. There is a reasonable potential for survival of prehistoric and Romano-British features and deposits as well as medieval and later exploitation and occupation of the site. There is a high potential for discovering water logged deposits which would be of high significance and may need to be preserved in situ — this needs to be taken into consideration through the hydrology plan/study.</del></p> <p><del>3.86: The majority of the site is in flood zone 1 except for a small area to the north in flood zone 2. Given the scale of the site, a full Flood Risk Assessment and full drainage strategy will be needed. Infiltration Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) would be compromised in this location but there is an opportunity to develop comprehensive SuDS for the potential new development. Good Surface Water SuDS can enhance development sites and increase the potential value of homes. The adoption and maintenance of any</del></p>		
--	--	--	--

		<p>SuDS features needs to be considered as the Council has no capacity to adopt these without funding.</p> <p><del>3.87: The nearest existing facilities are in Strensall, it is anticipated that a new primary school and community facilities including retail and community uses will be required within the site given the distance to existing services. This will need to be subject to further detailed viability assessment as part of the site masterplan.</del></p> <p><del>3.88: Good bus network links already exist to York City Centre and Strensall Village along Strensall road. It will be necessary to examine the potential for bus services entering the site in order that public transport access is in line with best practise and policy requirements. There are currently very limited cycle links to Strensall to/from the outer ring road. The construction of a segregated subway to facilitate the crossing of the A1237 is included within the West Yorkshire Transport Fund upgrade scheme, due for completion by 2021/22. There is potential that contributions from this site could help to deliver a cycle link between the A1237 and Strensall.</del></p> <p>Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Key Delivery Partners: City of York Council; landowners; developers; and infrastructure delivery partners.</li> <li>● Implementation: Planning applications; and developer contributions</li> </ul>		
PM15	SS20: Imphal Barracks	3.89 ST36 covers circa <del>30ha</del> <b>18ha with net developable area of approximately 19ha</b> , and will deliver	To correct the developable area and	No. The site was appraised on the basis of the revised

	Explanatory text Page 68 Para 3.89	<b>approximately 11 ha of public open space and</b> an estimated yield of 769 dwellings.	housing number referenced in the policy.	developable area. The change is presentational and has no implications for SA.						
<b>Section 4: Economy and Retail</b>										
PM16	Policy EC1: Employment Allocations  Allocation E18 and associated footnote  Page 76	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>Floorspace</th> <th>Suitable Employment uses</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>E18: Towthorpe Lines, Strensall (4ha)*</td> <td>13,200sqm</td> <td>B1c, B2 and B8 uses.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* <b>Policy SS19 points i. – ii. apply to this allocation in relation to assessing and mitigating impacts on Strensall Common SAC and Given the site’s proximity to Strensall Common SAC (see explanatory text), this site must also take account of Policy GI2.</b></p>	Site	Floorspace	Suitable Employment uses	E18: Towthorpe Lines, Strensall (4ha)*	13,200sqm	B1c, B2 and B8 uses.	Modification to associated footnote to refer to Policy GI2 (set out in CD003 - Modifications schedule to 25 <sup>th</sup> May 2018) following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35.	Yes. The proposed change in May 2018 (CD003) led to a reappraisal of Policy EC1 as set out in the Publication Draft (Regulation 19 Consultation) SA Report Addendum. The appraisal commentary was also updated to reflect the HRA (April 2018). The appraisal against SA Objective 8 (biodiversity) should be reviewed to consider the implications. The commentary should also be updated to reflect the HRA (February 2019).
Site	Floorspace	Suitable Employment uses								
E18: Towthorpe Lines, Strensall (4ha)*	13,200sqm	B1c, B2 and B8 uses.								
PM17	Policy EC1: Employment Allocations  Explanatory text  Page 77	<b><u>The location of allocation E18 adjacent to Strensall Common SAC means that a comprehensive evidence base to understand the potential impacts on biodiversity from further development is required. Strensall Common is designated for it’s heathland habitats but also has biodiversity value above its listed features in the SSSI/SAC designations that will need to be fully considered. Although the common is already under intense recreational pressure, there are birds of conservation concern amongst other species and habitats which could be harmed by the intensification</u></b>	New explanatory text to ensure that allocation E18 is considered in relation to Strensall Common SAC.	No. The explanatory text sets out the broader context for the footnote proposed above and the considerations for impacts on Strensall Common SAC which are set out in the proposed change to Policy GI2.						

		<p><b><u>of disturbance. In addition, the heathland habitat is vulnerable to changes in the hydrological regime and air quality, which needs to be explored in detail. The mitigation hierarchy should be used to identify the measures required to first avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts or compensate for any unavoidable residual impacts, and be implemented in the masterplanning approach. Potential access points into the planned development also need to consider impacts on Strensall Common.</u></b></p>												
<b>Section 5: Housing</b>														
PM18	<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations</p> <p>Allocation H59 and associated footnote</p> <p>Page 93</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allocation Reference</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Site Size (ha)</th> <th>Estimated Yield (Dwellings)</th> <th>Estimated Phasing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>H59**/***</b></td> <td><b>Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Howard Road, Strensall</b></td> <td><b>1.34</b></td> <td><b>45</b></td> <td><b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6–15)</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>*** Policy SS19 points i. – ii. apply to this allocation in relation to assessing and mitigating impacts on Strensall Common SAC and must also take account of Policy G12.</b></p>	Allocation Reference	Site Name	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Yield (Dwellings)	Estimated Phasing	<b>H59**/***</b>	<b>Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Howard Road, Strensall</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6–15)</b>	<p>Site removed following the outcomes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (Feb 2019), which has not been able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>Removal of associated footnote (set out in CD003 - Modifications schedule to 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018) following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35.</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change sees the deletion of a general housing site (H59) following the conclusions of the HRA (Feb 2019).</p> <p>The implications for the SA due to the proposed deletion should be reviewed and the SA Report should be updated to reflect the deletion.</p>
Allocation Reference	Site Name	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Yield (Dwellings)	Estimated Phasing										
<b>H59**/***</b>	<b>Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Howard Road, Strensall</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6–15)</b>										
PM19				Yes. The proposed change sees the deletion of a										



<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations</p> <p>Allocation ST35</p> <p>Page 94</p>	<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations</p> <p>Allocation ST35</p> <p>Page 94</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allocation Reference</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Site Size (ha)</th> <th>Estimated Yield (Dwellings)</th> <th>Estimated Phasing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>ST35** Queen Elizabeth</b></td> <td><b>Barracks, Strensall</b></td> <td><b>28.8</b></td> <td><b>500</b></td> <td><b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6-15)</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Allocation Reference	Site Name	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Yield (Dwellings)	Estimated Phasing	<b>ST35** Queen Elizabeth</b>	<b>Barracks, Strensall</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6-15)</b>	<p>Site removed following the outcomes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (Feb 2019), which has not been able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	<p>strategic site (ST35) following the conclusions of the HRA (Feb 2019).</p> <p>The implications for the SA due to the proposed deletion should be reviewed and the SA Report should be updated to reflect the deletion.</p>
Allocation Reference	Site Name	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Yield (Dwellings)	Estimated Phasing										
<b>ST35** Queen Elizabeth</b>	<b>Barracks, Strensall</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>Medium to Long Term (Years 6-15)</b>										
<p>PM20a to PM20d</p>	<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations Explanation</p> <p>Figure 5.1</p> <p>Page 97</p>	<p>PM20a – Update to Figure 5.1: Housing Trajectory to 2033 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa</p> <p>PM20b – Update to Figure 5.1: Housing Trajectory to 2033 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa inclusive of a 10% non-implementation discount to extant planning permissions and site allocations identified for housing development</p> <p>PM20c – Update to Figure 5.1: Housing Trajectory to 2038 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa</p> <p>PM20d – Update to Figure 5.1: Housing Trajectory to 2038 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa inclusive of a 10% non-implementation discount to extant planning permissions and site allocations identified for housing development</p>	<p>To align the housing trajectory with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 (GL Hearn)</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change reflects the proposed change to SS1. Policy H1 was appraised as having a mix of ‘minor positive/minor negative’ effects against SA Objective 1 (housing) linked to the housing requirement in Policy SS1 (and reflected in the housing trajectory).</p> <p>The proposed change to supporting text gives effect to the change in Policy SS1. It is considered material to the outcomes of the appraisal of Policy H1.</p> <p>The appraisal of the policy should be reviewed to reflect the proposed change to Policy SS1.</p>										

<p>PM21a to PM21d</p>	<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations Explanation</p> <p>Table 5.2</p> <p>Page 98</p>	<p>PM21a – Update to Table 5.2: Housing Trajectory to 2033 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa</p> <p>PM21b – Update to Table 5.2: Housing Trajectory to 2033 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa inclusive of a 10% non-implementation discount to extant planning permissions and site allocations identified for housing development</p> <p>PM21c – Update to Table 5.2: Housing Trajectory to 2038 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa</p> <p>PM21d – Update to Table 5.2: Housing Trajectory to 2038 to reflect the revised OAN of 790 dpa inclusive of a 10% non-implementation discount to extant planning permissions and site allocations identified for housing development</p>	<p>To align the housing trajectory with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 (GL Hearn)</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change reflects the proposed change to SS1. Policy H1 was appraised as having a mix of ‘minor positive/minor negative’ effects against SA Objective 1 (housing) linked to the housing requirement in Policy SS1 (and reflected in the housing trajectory).</p> <p>The proposed change to supporting text gives effect to the change in Policy SS1. It is considered material to the outcomes of the appraisal of Policy H1.</p> <p>The appraisal of the policy should be reviewed to reflect the proposed change to Policy SS1.</p>
<p>PM22</p>	<p>Policy H1: Housing Allocations Explanation</p> <p>Paragraph 5.9</p> <p>Page 98</p>	<p>5.9 Local Planning Authorities are expected to demonstrate that they have a rolling five year supply of deliverable sites, measured against the housing requirement set out in Policy SS1, with an additional 5% or 20% buffer (for five years) depending on past delivery to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Developable sites or broad locations should be identified for years 6-10 and where possible for years 11-15. To fulfil these requirements and to provide additional certainty we have chosen to allocate land</p>	<p>To align with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed change to explanatory text reflects the proposed change to the housing requirement in Policy SS1. Policy H1 was appraised as having a mix of ‘minor positive/minor negative’ effects against SA Objective 1 (housing) linked to the housing requirement set out in Policy SS1.</p>

		<p>for the full plan period, including the greenbelt period, to 2037/38 to meet the minimum housing requirement as set out in Policy SS1 of <b>867 790</b> additional dwellings per year. The Council accepts that there has been persistent under delivery of housing as defined in the NPPF and consequently has included enough land in the early years of the trajectory to ensure there is a 20% buffer in the 5 year supply. This land has been brought forward form later in the plan period. Progress on meeting delivery targets will be assessed through the authority monitoring report and the 20% buffer will be rolled forward within the 5 year supply until such time as the under delivery has been satisfactorily addressed. This does not mean that overall more land has been allocated in the plan, what it does mean is that the development trajectory (see Figure 5.1) ensures that in the early years of the plan additional land is available to address previous under delivery.</p>		<p>The proposed change to supporting text gives effect to the change in Policy SS1. It is considered material to the outcomes of the SA. The appraisal of the policy should be reviewed to reflect the proposed change to Policy SS1.</p>
<b>Section 6: Health and Wellbeing</b>				
PM23	<p>Supporting text to Policy HW1: Protecting Existing Facilities</p> <p>Explanatory text Para 6.5 Page 122</p>	<p>6.5 For the purpose of the policies within this section, community facilities should be taken to mean the buildings, facilities and services that meet the day-to-day needs of communities. This may include libraries, post offices, <b>public houses</b> and community meeting places, such as youth groups, places of worship, and parish and village halls...</p>	<p>Limited new text to add clarity and to better reflect NPPF definition.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is to supporting text. The policy was assessed as having significant positive effects on access to services (Objective 5) on the basis that it would support delivery of a range of facilities and services to support everyday needs. The proposed modification adds public houses to the</p>

				(not exhaustive) list of services. The change is not considered significant for the purposes of SA.
<b>Section 8: Placemaking, heritage, design and culture</b>				
PM24	Policy D1: Placemaking  Page 146	<p><b>v. Character and Design Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure proposals are not a pale imitation of past architectural styles.</li> <li>• ensure appropriate building materials are used.</li> <li>• meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion.</li> <li>• demonstrate the use of best practice in contemporary urban design and place making.</li> <li>• integrate car parking and servicing within the design of development so as not to dominate the street scene.</li> <li>• create active frontages to public streets, spaces and waterways.</li> <li>• create buildings and spaces that are fit for purpose but are also adaptable to respond to change.</li> <li>• create places that feel true to their intended purpose.</li> <li>• maximise sustainability potential.</li> <li>• <b><u>ensure design considers residential amenity so that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking or overshadowing</u></b></li> </ul>	To clarify that residential amenity should be considered as part of overall design standards as part of the planning process.	Yes. The proposed modification sees the inclusion of additional policy wording that seeks to ensure that residential amenity is not unduly affected by new development. The policy was appraised as having minor positive effects against health (SA Objective 2) in the SA Report (Feb 2018). The appraisal should be reviewed for any implications.
PM25	Policy D4: Conservation Areas Page 152	<b>Outline p</b> Planning applications for development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas 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.	To clarify that all planning applications should consider conservation areas, not	No. The proposed modification provides clarity that the policy requirement applies to all planning applications. The change is

			solely outline planning applications.	not considered to have implications for SA.
<b>Section 9: Green Infrastructure</b>				
PM26	Policy GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature  Page 166	In order to conserve and enhance York’s biodiversity, any development should where appropriate:  <b>i. <u>determine if they are likely to have a significant effect on an International Site in the context of the statutory protection which is afforded to the site.</u></b>  <b>ii. <u>demonstrate that proposals will not have an adverse effect on a National Site (alone or in combination). Where adverse impacts occur, development will not normally be permitted, except where the benefits of development in that location clearly outweigh both the impact on the site and any broader impacts on the wider network of National Sites.</u></b>  <b>iii. <u>demonstrate that where loss or harm to a National site cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated, as a last resort, provide compensation for the loss/harm. Development will be refused if loss or significant harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against or compensated for.</u></b>  <b>iv. avoid loss or significant harm to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs),</b> whether directly or indirectly. Where it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the development in that location and the benefit outweighs the loss or harm the impacts must be adequately mitigated against, or compensated for as a last resort;	Policy amended to include reference to internationally and nationally designated nature conservation sites and how they will be considered through the planning process following Natural England’s response to the Regulation 19 consultation.	Yes. The proposed modification incorporates three new policy criteria related to internationally and nationally designated conservation sites. The policy was scored as ‘significant positive’ against SA Objective 8 (biodiversity) in recognition of the positive effects on biodiversity.  The proposed change is not considered to affect the SA scoring as it reinforces the positive effects identified. However, the appraisal commentary should be reviewed to ensure consistency with the proposed change.

		<p><b>ii. v.</b> ensure the retention, enhancement and appropriate management of features of geological, or biological interest, and further the aims of the current Biodiversity Audit and Local Biodiversity Action Plan;</p> <p><b>iii. vi.</b> take account of the potential need for buffer zones around wildlife and biodiversity sites, to ensure the integrity of the site's interest is retained;</p> <p><b>iv. vii.</b> result in net gain to, and help to improve, biodiversity;</p> <p><b>v. viii.</b> enhance accessibility to York's biodiversity resource where this would not compromise their ecological value, affect sensitive sites or be detrimental to drainage systems;</p> <p><b>vi. ix.</b> maintain and enhance the rivers, banks, floodplains and settings of the Rivers Ouse, Derwent and Foss, and other smaller waterways for their biodiversity, cultural and historic landscapes, as well as recreational activities where this does not have a detrimental impact on the nature conservation value;</p> <p><b>vii. x.</b> maintain water quality in the River Ouse, River Foss and River Derwent to protect the aquatic environment, the interface between land and river, and continue to provide a viable route for migrating fish. New development within the catchments of these rivers will be permitted only where sufficient capacity is available at the appropriate wastewater treatment works. Where no wastewater disposal capacity exists, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



		<p>effect on the integrity of the River Derwent, Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary European Sites;</p> <p><del>viii.xi.</del> maintain and enhance the diversity of York’s Strays for wildlife; and</p> <p><del>ix.</del> <u>xii.</u> ensure there is no detrimental impact to the environmental sensitivity and significant Lower Derwent Valley and its adjacent functionally connected land which whilst not designated, are ultimately important to the function of this important site.</p>		
PM27	<p>Policy G12: Biodiversity and Access to Nature</p> <p>Explanatory text Page 167 Para 9.5</p>	<p>9.5 Although the protection of individual sites is essential, such sites do not occur in isolation as discrete, self contained habitats, but influence and are influenced by their surroundings. The surrounding area can therefore be as important to the interest of the site as the feature itself, and changes to it could affect the integrity of that interest. In order to fully protect the site or interest, there may be a requirement to establish a suitable buffer area around it. The extent of that buffer could vary depending on the site, the type and value of the habitat present and the proposed change. <b><u>In addition, whilst recognising the benefits to people provided from access to nature, where appropriate developments will be required to fully assess and mitigate for the impact of recreational disturbance on SSSIs, SACs and SPAs.</u></b></p>	<p>To clarify how the planning approach to internationally and nationally significant nature conservation sites.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is to explanatory text and clarifies the importance of understanding recreational pressures on designated conservation sites when impacts of development proposals. The proposed modification is not considered to have implications for SA.</p>

<p>PM28</p>	<p>Policy GI6: New Open Space Provision</p> <p>Page 172</p>	<p>Indicative new significant areas of open space have been identified in connection with the following strategic sites, as shown on the proposals map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OS7: Land at Minster Way at ST7</li> <li>• OS8: New Parkland to the East of ST8</li> <li>• OS9: New Recreation and Sports Provision to the south of ST9</li> <li>• OS10: New Area for Nature Conservation on land to the South of A64 in association with ST15</li> <li>• OS11: Land to the East of ST31</li> <li>• <del>OS12: Land to the East of ST35</del></li> <li>• —</li> </ul>	<p>Removal of indicative open space associated with Policy SS19 and allocations ST35/H59, which are removed following the outcomes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (Feb 2019), which has not been able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	<p>No. The proposed change is consequential to the proposed deletion of sites from the plan. There are no implications for SA.</p>
<p><b>Section 10: Managing Appropriate Development in the Green Belt</b></p>				
<p>PM29</p> <p>(See map on page 44 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – Moor Lane, Woodthorpe.</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the carriageway to the south of Moor Lane, as opposed to the north side of the road, as it is presented on the submitted policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency:</p> <p>The methodology indicates that where the metalled surfaces of roads are in proximity to urban uses they should be considered to form part of the built up area.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 – Annex 3, Inner Boundary Section 1 Boundary 2.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary and is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>

<p>PM30  (See map on page 45 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – rear of St Olaves and St Peters School.</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the existing built sports provision in preference to the current line which no longer matches physical features on the ground.</p>	<p>To represent changes since the boundary was drafted and to reflect completed planning permission.</p> <p>Although the changes to the layout of the sports provision at St Peters School are deemed appropriate uses within the Green Belt they may have an urbanising influence on the area which needs to be reflected.</p> <p>The proposed line offers a more robust boundary to the Green Belt in this location with a greater degree of permanence being offered. The line currently presented on the policies map no longer relates to any physical structures.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 3, Inner</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It reflects development that has taken on the ground and is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>
--	---	---	--	--

			Boundary Section 3 Boundary 9,	
<p>PM31  (See map on page 46 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Windy Ridge, Huntington.</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the limit of built development in preference to the historic field boundaries it currently represents on the submitted policies map..</p>	<p>To represent changes since first drafted to reflect completed planning permission.</p> <p>The layout of housing in this location does not relate to historical field boundaries but has been designed to integrate with the open space and wildlife functions in the area.</p> <p>The open areas have been designed to create a semi natural space and have been created in a way which connects the population to the countryside.</p> <p>The appropriate Green Belt boundary needs to reflect the layout of the latest planning application to be considered permanent and while protecting</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It reflects development that has taken place on the ground and is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>

			<p>areas necessary to keep open.</p> <p>See Justification set out in TP1 Addendum, Annex 3 Inner Boundary Section 5 Boundary 22.</p>	
<p>PM32</p> <p>(See map on page 47 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Jockey Lane.</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the carriageway to the east side of Jockey Lane, as opposed to the west side as it is presented on the submitted policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency:</p> <p>The methodology indicates that where the metalled surfaces of roads are in proximity to urban uses they should be considered to form part of the built up area.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 – Annex 3, Inner Boundary Section 5 Boundary 28.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>
<p>PM33</p> <p>(See map on page 48 of the Proposed Modifications this document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Land to the rear of Osbaldwick Village</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should closely follow the main urban area as represented by identifiable built structures to the North of Osbaldwick Village, as opposed to the more irregular garden, paddock and strip fields boundaries which are more difficult to identify on the ground which are presented on the submitted policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum Annex 3 – Inner Boundary Section 6 Boundary 18.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>

<p>PM34  (See map on page 49 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Land at Hull Rd, North of Grimston Bar</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should align with the limit of the urban area to the south at Grimston Bar Park and Ride rather than protrude along the road carriageway as currently presented on the policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency.  See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum Annex 3 – Inner Boundary Section 6 Boundary 23.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>
<p>PM35  (See map on page 50 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – Heslington Road and Garrow Hill</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the carriageway to the west side of University Road and the south side of Thief Lane/Heslington Road, as opposed to the east and north as it is presented on the submitted policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency.  The methodology indicates that where the metalled surfaces of roads are in proximity to urban areas they should be considered to form part of the built-up area.  See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum Annex 3 – Inner Boundary Section 7 Boundary 16.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>
<p>PM36  (See map on page 51 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – Little Hob Moor.</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the carriageway of Tadcaster Road all the way down as opposed to encompassing land known as Little Hob Moor between Tadcaster Road and the Railway within the Green Belt as presented on the policies map.</p>	<p>To correct an error.  The land identified around Little Hob Moor while open in nature provides a break in the urban landscape rather than connecting to the</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>



			<p>wider countryside around it. While it is important that this land remains open this can be achieved through other policies as it is designated open space. The line of Tadcaster Road presents a more continuous and permanent boundary</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum Annex 3 – Inner Boundary Section 8 Boundary 23</p>	
<p>PM37 (See map on page 52 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – South of Askham Bar Park and Ride</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the post and rail fence to the south of the Askham Bar Park and Ride site, in preference to the mixed boundary of fence line to edge of tarmac surface currently presented on the policies map.</p>	<p>To represent changes since first drafted to reflect the new Askham Bar Park and Ride boundary.</p> <p>While the building of the Park and Ride site is an acceptable use within the Green Belt it has been established that this has had an urbanising influence on this area. At the time of first drafting</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It reflects development that has taken places on the ground and is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>

			<p>the proposals Ordnance Survey data did not represent the final built scheme. Assessing the boundaries post development reveals the fence line to be the most continuous acceptable line which encompasses the site and its associated landscaping.</p> <p>See Justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 3 Inner Boundary Section 8 Boundary 39.</p>	
<p>PM38  (See map on page 53 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – York College, Tadcaster Road</p>	<p>Proposed detailed Green Belt site boundary modification – it is proposed that the boundary should follow the currently identifiable features of the edge of the existing sports pitch to the east, as opposed to a new theoretical line as presented on the submitted policies map.</p>	<p>Consistency.  It is proposed that the boundary of proposed expansion be linked more closely to features on the ground to provide the most permanence.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 5.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It reflects recognisable boundary features on the ground and is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>

<p>PM39</p> <p>(See map on page 54 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Strensall Village</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification of inset urban area – it is proposed that the detailed inner Green Belt boundary around the village of Strensall should follow along Ox Carr Lane, placing all the land to the south of this within the Green Belt, as opposed to encompassing the Military Barracks and associated housing within the village envelope as presented on the policies map.</p>	<p>Following the completion of further evidence in relation to recreational pressure, the revised Habitats Regulations Assessment (2019) concluded that proposed sites ST35 and H59 will have likely significant adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The officer recommendation to remove these sites from the Plan to be in conformity with the revised HRA were agreed by the Council’s Executive (7<sup>th</sup> March 2019).</p> <p>This area to the south east of Strensall around the military barracks is separated from the main village of Strensall by Ox Carr Lane, is of a much lower density and is</p>	<p>Yes. The implications of the removal of ST35 and H59 for the SA should be reviewed.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

			<p>interspersed with open space leading to a more open nature and rural feel which connects to the wider countryside. Given the low density and open nature of development it is considered that Ox Carr Lane forms the most continuous and defensible village boundary.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 4.</p>	
<p>PM40  (See map on page 55 of the Proposed Modifications document)</p>	<p>Policies Map South – Elvington Industrial Estate, Elvington</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification of inset urban area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed change to the eastern boundary to follow recognisable features on the ground before returning westwards around the dense tree copse to the northern boundary.</li> <li>2) Proposed change to the southern boundary to contiguously follow the existing dense hedgerow to the south of Jubilee Court and the Conifers before extending northwards on Wheldrake Lane and then eastwards to the rear of properties on Elvington Park.</li> </ol>	<p>To correct an error and to ensure that the boundary aligns with recognisable features on the ground that offer the greatest permanence.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 4.</p>	<p>No. The proposed modification is a minor change to the Green Belt boundary. It reflects recognisable boundary features on the ground. There are no implications for the appraisal of employment site E9. The proposed change is not considered to have implications for the SA.</p>
<p>PM41  (See map on page 56 of the</p>	<p>Policies Map North – Knapton Village</p>	<p>Proposed detailed inner Green Belt boundary modification of inset urban area – it is proposed that the village of Knapton is included within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Consistency with the methodology.</p>	<p>No. There are no implications for the proposed site allocation (H53) which is retained.</p>

<p>Proposed Modifications document)</p>			<p>It is considered that the village of Knapton is open and not densely developed. It is surrounded by areas that are identified to be of importance for the historic character and setting of York, particularly for preventing coalescence. The village is thereby considered to contribute to openness and should be included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>See justification as set out in TP1 Addendum – Annex 4.</p> <p>Policy GB2 of the Local Plan allows for infill development within settlements in the Green Belt, subject to the stated policy criteria. Allocation H53 is retained – see Section 8 / Annex 5 of TP1 Addendum.</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

Section 14: Transport												
PM42	Policy T7: Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips  Page 225	See also Policy T1, SS4, SS9 to SS13, SS15, SS17, <b>SS19</b> , SS20, SS22 and ENV1	Reference to SS19 removed following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35 from the plan.	No. This is a consequential change to reflect the deletion of Policy SS19. See commentary under PM13 for the proposed deletion of the policy itself.								
Section 15: Delivery and Monitoring												
PM43	Table 15.2: Delivery and Monitoring  Section 3: Spatial Strategy  Page 243	- SS17: Hungate - SS18: Station Yard, Wheldrake - <b>SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall</b> - SS20: Imphal Barracks, gFulford Road	Reference to SS19 removed following removal of policy SS19/ Site Allocation ST35 from the plan.	No. This is a consequential change to supporting text to reflect the deletion of Policy SS19. See commentary under PM13 for the proposed deletion of the policy itself.								
PM44	Table 15.2: Delivery and Monitoring  Section 5: Housing  Page 247	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section and Policies Targets Indicators (Local Indicators)</th> <th>unless shown otherwise)</th> <th>Which Sustainability</th> <th>Appraisal objectives</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Section 5: Housing - H1: Housing Allocations</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of a minimum of <b>867-790</b> dwellings per annum.</li> <li>• Maintaining a supply of</li> </ul> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net additional homes provided.</li> <li>• Supply of ready to develop housing sites.</li> </ul> </td> <td>1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Section and Policies Targets Indicators (Local Indicators)	unless shown otherwise)	Which Sustainability	Appraisal objectives	Section 5: Housing - H1: Housing Allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of a minimum of <b>867-790</b> dwellings per annum.</li> <li>• Maintaining a supply of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net additional homes provided.</li> <li>• Supply of ready to develop housing sites.</li> </ul>	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15	To align with the updated housing requirement evidenced through the City of York – Housing Needs Update January 2019 published by GL Hearn	No. Indicative monitoring indicators were included in the in the SA Report (Feb 2018) Appendix J. However, the changes reflect the implementation of the objectives.
Section and Policies Targets Indicators (Local Indicators)	unless shown otherwise)	Which Sustainability	Appraisal objectives									
Section 5: Housing - H1: Housing Allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of a minimum of <b>867-790</b> dwellings per annum.</li> <li>• Maintaining a supply of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net additional homes provided.</li> <li>• Supply of ready to develop housing sites.</li> </ul>	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15									

			deliverable housing sites to meet housing targets.				
PM45  PM46	Table 15.2: Delivery and Monitoring  Section 9: Green Infrastructure  Page 255	<p>New Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>No adverse increase in recreational pressure on Strensall Common SAC, Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Skipwith Common SAC.</u></b></li> </ul> <p>New indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Change in visitor numbers at and condition of Strensall Common SAC, Lower Derwent Valley SAC and Skipwith Common SAC</u></b></li> </ul>		Additional target and indicator to respond to requirements for monitoring and review of recreational pressure at European designated nature conservation sites as a result of development in the plan.	Yes. The monitoring indicators were included in the in the SA Report Appendix J. The Report should be updated to reflect the additional monitoring indicator proposed.		







## Appendix B

### Updated appraisal of the housing growth figure



SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.	Short Term	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The proposed modifications preferred housing figure reflects the economic led housing need figure in the Housing Needs Update, January 2019, prepared for City of York Council by GL Hearn. The Housing Needs Update, January 2019 (GL Hearn) is based on the 2016 subnational population projections for York, published in 2018, which are lower than the 2014 based projections (which informed the identification of the Publication Draft preferred figure of 867dpa and SHMA Update 2017 alternative of 953). The figure has been identified under transitional arrangements for implementation of the revised NPPF.</p> <p>The figure is based on an economic led need for housing based on economic growth of 650 jobs per annum. This figure is higher than the baseline demographic starting point (484 dpa) with the incorporation of a 15% uplift from the baseline for affordability (which leads to an OAN of 557 dpa).</p> <p>The proposed figure of 790 dpa would therefore meet the objectively assessed housing needs in the plan period. It has therefore been assessed as resulting in minor positive effects in the short and medium term and long term reflecting that the preferred housing figure would positively contribute to the delivery of a range of housing types and tenures in locations across the City to meet identified need in the evidence base.</p> <p>The Publication Plan figure (867dpa) has been assessed as having positive effects in the short, medium and long term. In the SA Report (2018) the preferred option was assessed as having minor positive effects in the short and medium term and negative effects in the long term. However, this was based</p>

	Medium Term					<p>on the 2017 SHMA Update evidence which suggested that the preferred figure did not meet the identified OAN at that time (953dpa). With the publication of the 2019 SHMA Update, the basis of this appraisal has been superseded. The former preferred option has therefore been re-appraised as having positive effects in the long term, reflecting that it meets (and exceeds) the OAN.</p> <p>The 953dpa reasonable alternative reflects the previous OAN figure identified by GL Hearn in the 2017 SHMA Update (867 dpa baseline with market signals adjustment). This has been assessed as resulting in minor positive effects in the short and medium term increasing to significant positive effects in the long term. The scale of housing delivery associated with this figure would meet housing demand based on the most recent population forecasts and would support the delivery of affordable housing. Analysis by GL Hearn in the 2017 SHMA Update identifies a shortfall in housing provision against previous targets. This past under delivery of housing may suggest that there is a 'backlog' of need.</p> <p>The Government's 2017 consultation methodology figure of 1,070 dpa represents a significant uplift on the preferred figure (790dpa) and the Publication Draft preferred figure (867dpa), and an increase on the reasonable alternative of 953dpa. The Government's figure derived from the proposed standard methodology for calculating need. This was based on 2014 household projections for 2016-2026 with a formula applied to reflect median house price to median income affordability ratios in York for 2016. The figure would be likely to drive significant positive effects in the medium term. The Government's consultation figure option is not directly comparable over the same time period as for the plan; however, it is assumed for this assessment that the dpa target would be carried forward in the long term. Although long term effects have been assessed as significantly positive this is to some extent uncertain due to the 10 year period of the Government's consultation housing need figure.</p> <p><b><u>Mitigation</u></b> None.</p> <p><b><u>Assumptions</u></b></p>
--	-------------	--	--	--	--	---

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>It is assumed that the delivery of housing will accord with the Spatial Strategy for York; namely to prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through the provision of a single new settlement.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b></p> <p>The assessment of likely effects depends on the monitoring of housing delivery through the plan period in line with housing need incorporated into the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is some uncertainty related to the Government’s consultation figure option over the long term due to the time period covered by the figure (2016-2026) which is less than the Plan Period covered by the proposed modifications preferred figure, the Publication Draft figure and SHMA 2017 Update alternative figure.</p>
Long Term	+	+	++	++/?	

SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
2. Improve the health and wellbeing of York’s population	Short Term	-	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Housing growth is likely to generate minor, temporary adverse effects on health in the short term during construction (e.g. as a result of emissions to air from HGV movements and plant). In the longer term, new housing could also adversely affect health due to, for example, emissions and increased traffic. Whilst effects will be dependent on the exact location of new development and its proximity to sensitive receptors, it can be assumed that new housing would be delivered within and in close proximity to existing residential areas.</p> <p>It is anticipated that all of the housing figures would involve accommodating development at greenfield sites which could result in the loss of open space. The Government’s 2017 consultation figure option is likely to generate the requirement for a larger release of greenfield land.</p> <p>However, the provision of housing could also lead to improvements in health, particularly for those residents who may be able to move from poor quality housing to newer properties. Poor housing condition is recognised as a key determinant of overall health. This may be particularly apparent with regards to older affordable housing stock and poor quality private rented accommodation. It would be expected that the higher housing figures would enable the development of higher number of affordable homes. The effects in the long term of the higher figures may therefore be potentially positive. However, the existence and extent of any positive effects is uncertain and dependent on the implementation and number of other factors.</p> <p>The preferred option and the SHMA 2017 Update reasonable alternative have both been appraised negatively over the short, medium and long term.</p>
	Medium Term	-	-	-	-	
	Long Term	-	-	-/?	-/?	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>All of the housing figures have been appraised negatively over the short, medium and long term. The SHMA 2017 Update reasonable alternative figure (953dpa) and Government’s 2017 consultation figure (1,070dpa) may have a greater effect than the lower proposed modifications preferred figure (790dpa) and Publication Plan figure (867dpa) over the long term although this is unlikely to be significant. There may be positive effects although these are uncertain.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> New housing development may provide opportunities to incorporate health facilities, open space and measures to facilitate walking and cycling. Local planning policy should be put in place to minimise impacts on health. Additionally, regulatory requirements to limit detrimental effects on health and wellbeing, beyond the remit of the local plan, will also mitigate effects.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None</p>

SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG's 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.	Short Term	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Investment in new development has the potential to stimulate increased investment in new facilities by generating demand (through the influx of new residents) and through developer contributions. Any investment in educational facilities and services would support educational attainment, which is recognised as being good within the City of York area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed modifications preferred housing growth option, Publication Plan figure and 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing figure are expected to help deliver student accommodation and a new settlement may encourage additional educational provision. The Government's consultation figure option would similarly enable this development and in the long term has the potential to have significant effects for additional investment in local education services and in helping to retain those who have developed skills in the local workforce.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed modifications preferred figure (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) and the 2017 SHMA Update alternative (953dpa) have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective. The Government's 2017 consultation figure option is assessed as having significant positive effects in the long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p>
	Medium Term	+	+	+	+	
	Long Term	+	+	+	++	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option	
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026		
					<p><b>Uncertainty</b></p> <p>There is a risk that development may increase pressure on existing educational facilities and in particular primary schools within the City.</p>	
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy	Short Term	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Housing development will generate economic benefits associated with construction e.g. direct job creation, supply chain benefits and increased spend in the local economy by contractors and construction workers. However, effects in this regard will be temporary and the extent to which the jobs that may be created will benefit the City of York’s residents will depend on the number of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.</p> <p>In the medium and longer term, new housing and associated population growth will in turn help enhance the viability and vitality of existing businesses within central York as well as other centres.</p> <p>All options could support the objectives of the York Economic Strategy 2016 – 2020 and help ensure that York would benefit from investment through the Leeds City Region, Local Enterprise Partnership, and the Northern Powerhouse programme.</p> <p>The proposed modifications preferred housing figure (790dpa) has been developed to take account of jobs growth forecasts in the SHMA 2019 Update. It has been assessed as having minor positive effects in the short, medium and long term. The Publication Plan figure (867dpa) is also considered to have similar effects.</p>	
	Medium Term	+	+	+		++
	Long Term	+	+	++		++



SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>The 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing figure (953dpa) will provide a scale of housing growth to support economic growth and as such it is considered to have significant positive effects in the long term.</p> <p>The Government’s 2017 consultation figure option would help enable significant positive effects in the medium term by driving the housing development industry in the City and supporting economic development helping to meet objectives of the York Economic Strategy. These significant effects are likely to be felt sooner than the 2017 SHMA Update alternative growth figure.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed modifications preferred housing figure (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) and SHMA 2017 Update alternative (953dpa ) have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective. The SHMA 2017 Update alternative housing figure (953dpa) figure is considered to have a significant positive effect in the long term, due to benefits derived from the quantum of development proposed. The Governments’ 2017 consultation figure has been assessed as having significant positive effects in the medium and long term as the scale of proposed housing would mean such benefits are more likely to accrue earlier.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option	
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026		
					<p><b>Uncertainty</b></p> <p>The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.</p>	
5. Help deliver equality and access to all	Short Term	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>All four options would assist in meeting, but not fully, the net affordable housing requirement of 573 dwellings per annum as identified in the 2016 SHMA (and 2019 SHMA Update).</p> <p>Residential development of the scale proposed under all the housing need figures has the potential to improve the viability and vitality of existing shops, services and facilities in the areas where growth is located. New development may also encourage and support investment in existing, and the provision of new, services and facilities in the City of York through, for example, the receipt of developer contributions. This could help enhance the accessibility of existing and prospective residents to key services and facilities, although this would be dependent on the exact location of new development and the level of investment generated. However, depending on where new development is located, there is the potential for growth to increase pressure on existing community facilities and services.</p> <p>The Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to locate development with sustainable access to facilities and service and to ensure sustainable access for transport.</p>	
	Medium Term	+	+	+		++
	Long Term	+	+	++		++

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>The preferred housing figure option has been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. The 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing growth option and the Government consultation figure option have been assessed as having minor effects in the short term and a significant positive effect in the long term. The additional housing associated with Government’s consultation figure option is also likely to generate significant effects on this objective in the medium term through additional investment in services linked to higher levels of development.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> That affordable housing policy requirements in Publication Draft Policy H10 is implemented by the City Council.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None.</p>
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable	Short Term	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified for the proposed modifications preferred figure (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) or the 2017 SHMA Update alternative (953dpa). However, a mix of minor positive and significant</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
integrated transport network	Medium Term	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p>mixed negative effects have been assessed for the Government’s 2017 consultation figure (1,070dpa).</p> <p>Focusing development in accordance with the Council’s spatial strategy would have positive effects on the objective as it would significantly encourage people to live close to the town centres where services and facilities are more accessible, reducing the need to travel and provide for sustainable developments. Housing growth could also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in new, public transport provision in the City of York area.</p> <p>The scale of a stand-alone settlement is likely to vary with each of the options with the result that the highest growth option will result in the development of a new local centre(s) and facilities which could help reduce the need for out-commuting.</p> <p>In the short term (during construction) and once development is complete there is likely to be an increase in transport movements and associated congestion.</p> <p>Overall, the levels of growth proposed under the proposed modification preferred figure (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) or the 2017 SHMA Update alternative (953dpa) have been assessed as having minor positive and negative effects on this objective.</p> <p>The Government’s consultation figure (1,070dpa) is assessed having the potential for a mix of minor positive and significant negative effects in the long</p>
	Long Term	+/-	+/-	+/-	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>term. Positive effects could arise from focusing housing growth around existing (or new) service centres and from increased transport infrastructure investment, whilst negative effects would arise from the overall higher levels of private car use and associated traffic congestion.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Measures should be put into effect to ensure consistency with the requirements of paragraph 17 of the NPPF (2012) which identifies as a core principle of planning the active management of patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None.</p>
7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.	Short Term	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified for the proposed modification preferred figure (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) or the 2017 SHMA Update alternative (953dpa). However, significant effects have been identified for the Government’s 2017 consultation figure (1,070dpa) in the long term.</p> <p>Minor negative effects are anticipated to arise from housing growth generating an increase in greenhouse gases both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV movements and plant and associated with embodied</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
Medium Term	-	-	-	-	<p>carbon in construction materials) and once development is complete (e.g. due to increased traffic generation and energy use in new dwellings). The scale of these effects will be most significant for the Government’s 2017 consultation figure option. Having said that, the occupation of more energy efficient buildings (with more efficient boilers, insulation, and possible low carbon energy generation) could mean that carbon production per occupant would be lower than for existing older housing stock. This could help mitigate some of the effects.</p> <p>As highlighted under SA Objective 6, housing growth could help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision in the area which could help to minimise greenhouse gas emissions associated with car use.</p> <p>It is recognised that Government intends to ban new petrol and diesel cars from 2040 which will have an effect on new car purchasing behaviour in advance of this date. However, through the plan period, the number of existing cars on the roads with internal combustion engines is expected to still far outweigh electric vehicles and so vehicle greenhouse gas emissions will be expected to be substantial. The scale of these effects will be most significant for the Government’s 2017 consultation figure option (1,070dpa) and most minor for the proposed modification preferred figure (790dpa).</p> <p>Overall, the growth under the proposed modification preferred option (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) and 2017 SHMA Update reasonable alternative (953dpa) have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. The Government’s</p>
Long Term	-	-	-	--	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>consultation figure option has been assessed as having minor effects in the short and medium term and significant negative effects in the long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> There may be opportunities to promote and encourage sustainable modes of transport alongside new development. Policies in the Local Plan should encourage their development.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the design and location of development at the individual site level (which is currently uncertain).</p> <p>Housing growth may present opportunities to increase investment in transport infrastructure and renewable energy.</p>
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora	Short Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified for the proposed modification preferred option (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) or 2017 SHMA Update reasonable alternative (953dpa) although significant effects are</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment	Medium Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p>considered likely in the long term for the Government’s consultation figure option.</p> <p>Within a relatively small area (272 square kilometres), the York area boasts a range of sites with habitat and conservation value at international, national, regional and local levels of importance. These sites include ancient flood meadows, species-rich grasslands, lowland heath, woodlands and wetlands, which in turn are home to a variety of European protected species including bats, great crested newts, otters and other rare species such as the Tansy Beetle.</p> <p>Housing growth could have an adverse effect on biodiversity as a result of land take/habitat loss and disturbance during construction and increased recreational pressure once development is complete.</p> <p>It is likely that the levels of growth proposed in all the options will require development on greenfield sites with consequential effects on biodiversity and nature conservation. The proposed modification preferred option (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) and 2017 SHMA Update reasonable alternative (953dpa) have been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective, whilst due to the scale of the Government consultation figure option, there is potential for this option to have a significant effect in the long term.</p> <p>However, the implementation of Local Plan policies related to biodiversity will mitigate some of the adverse effects (through avoidance and enhancement measures). In addition, the selection of sites, through the application of the</p>
	Long Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	



SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to protect environmental assets (including nature conservation).</p> <p>The presence of designated European (and international) conservation sites in the City of York area will necessitate a Habitats Regulations Assessment in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The findings of the assessment may require additional measures to be taken to avoid any adverse effects on the designated sites which will need to be reflected in Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Residential development at the level presented in all four options may provide opportunities to enhance the existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure. This could potentially have a positive or significantly positive effect on this objective by improving the quality and extent of habitats and by increasing the accessibility of both existing and prospective residents to such assets.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed modification preferred option (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) and 2017 SHMA Update reasonable alternative (953dpa) have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective. However, there is the potential for significant negative effects to arise should development result in adverse effects on designated sites, although this is currently uncertain. Due to the additional scale of growth, the Government’s consultation figure option is likely to have significant effects in the long term, although there is some uncertainty as effects will be dependent on actual development locations and proximity to sensitive conservation sites.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>Measures to retain and enhance features of biodiversity interest e.g. species rich grassland and hedgerows on development sites should be adopted. Local Plan policies should support improvements to the green infrastructure network and connecting biodiversity networks.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None of the development sites to be taken forward in the local plan will have an adverse effect on features of international importance.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> The effects of development on biodiversity which will be dependent to an extent on the location of development, the nature of detailed proposals and the outcome of site specific investigation, which at this stage are uncertain.</p>
9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.	Short Term	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified for the proposed modification preferred housing growth option (790dpa), Publication Plan figure (867dpa) or the SHMA 2017 Update alternative option (953dpa). However, significant effects have been identified in the medium and long term for the Government’s consultation figure.</p> <p>Whilst effects against this objective are largely dependent on the location of development, which at this stage is uncertain, it is expected that all of the options will necessitate the need for some development on greenfield sites. This likely requirement has therefore been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective.</p>
	Medium Term	-	-	-	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
Long Term	-	-	-	--	<p>The NPPF (2012) says that planning should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”. The Council should encourage developers to consider whether there is previously developed land available in suitable locations for new development, rather than locating development on undeveloped land.</p> <p>The Council should encourage developers to consider whether there is previously developed land available in suitable locations for new development, rather than locating development on undeveloped land.</p> <p>Overall, the housing growth proposed under the proposed modification preferred option (790dpa), Publication Plan (867dpa) and SHMA 2017 Update alternative (953dpa) are considered to have minor negative effects on this objective. However, the Government’s consultation housing need figure option is assessed as having significant negative effects in the medium and long term with the cumulative increase in housing over this period, and the consequent greater loss of greenfield land. However, this could be mitigated to some extent through the prioritisation of brownfield sites and application of higher development densities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>The Local Plan policies should encourage the re-use of previously developed and co-location of facilities and services to make the best use of development sites.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p><b>Assumptions</b> It is assumed that development sites would avoid development on best and most versatile land and encourage development on previously developed land.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	Short Term	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified for all options.</p> <p>Housing will result in increased water consumption both during construction and in the longer term once development is complete and occupied.</p> <p>The increase in local population is expected to increase the demand on water resources, which has the potential for a negative effect on water quality. Yorkshire Water’s Water Resources Management Plan 2014 has assessed the demand and supply of water for the forthcoming 25 years until 2039/40. The demand forecast model has inbuilt assumptions regarding the projected population, household formation, the projected effects of climate change, leakage, implemented water efficiency measures and assumed new homes in accordance with Requirement G2 and Regulations 36 and 37 of the Building Regulations 2010.</p> <p>York lies within the Grid SWZ zone within Yorkshire Water’s area, which identifies a deficit between supply and demand from 2018/19 is 2.67MI/d, increasing to 108.65MI/d by 2039/40. A range of solutions are proposed to ultimately meet the forecast supply demand deficit in the Grid SWZ as well as development of existing or new assets. The options selected include leakage</p>
	Medium Term	-	-	-	
	Long Term	-	-	-	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>reduction, use of an existing river abstraction licence, three groundwater schemes and customer water efficiency. As the plan period stretches out, there is less certainty with regard to the mix of measures to be used and they are also likely to be revised in the next WRMP, to be adopted in 2019. The Revised Draft WRMP 2019 (Sep 2018) identifies that the Grid SWZ is expected to be in deficit in the mid 2030s. Measures in the 2014 WMRP and 2019 WMRP covering 2020 to 2045 would be expected to help ensure that future water resource demands are met.</p> <p>Overall, the housing growth linked to the preferred figure in the proposed modifications (790dpa), the Publication Plan preferred figure (867dpa), and the SHMA 2017 Update (953dpa) reasonable alternative have been assessed as having a minor negative effect against this objective.</p> <p>The Government’s consultation housing need figure option has been assessed as having minor negative effects – although in the long term there is some uncertainty relating to the extent of these effects (which may well be greater). The extent of the negative effects is dependent on the implementation of efficiency measures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Customer water efficiency measures which could be incorporated on the development include water metering, water harvesting and the regulation of tap and shower flows. Implementation of efficiency measures has the potential to result in a reduction of per capita in water consumption, however the uptake of these measures is not yet known. The Local Plan should incorporate policies that seek standards within new development that address water efficiency.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> The extent to which the uptake of efficiency measures may lessen the negative effects in the long term.</p>
11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.	Short Term	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>Housing growth will result in resource use, particularly during the construction of new dwellings. Residential development will generate construction waste, although it is anticipated that a proportion of this waste would be reused/recycled. Occupation of the new houses will also lead to an increase in domestic waste and recycling volumes, with the scale of waste arisings proportional to the number of houses proposed.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
	Medium Term	-	-	-	<p>Overall, all housing requirement options have been assessed as having a minor negative effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> The performance of the selected housing figure will benefit from ensuring that recycling facilities are included in the design to ensure any waste created once the development is in operation is minimised.</p> <p>Local Plan policies should encourage the use of recycled and secondary materials in new developments and promote the reuse of construction and demolition wastes.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None</p>
	Long Term	-	-	-	
12. Improve Air Quality	Short Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Housing growth will result in increased emissions to air both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV movements ad plant) and once development is complete (e.g. due to increased traffic generation).</p> <p>Development in accordance with the spatial strategy is likely to see a strong emphasis upon housing delivery within and around the main urban area and close to existing public transport links and main centres, reducing the requirement to travel by private car.</p>

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
Medium Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p>The levels of growth proposed under the proposed preferred housing option, Publication Plan preferred option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative have been assessed as having a negative effect, albeit with some uncertainty concerning the magnitude and significance of the effects due to the uncertainties over development locations.</p> <p>The Government’s 2017 consultation housing growth option is also considered likely to have similar effects. However, the effects may be greater in line with the scale of housing dependent the locations chosen for development.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> The effects of the proposed housing growth under the figures outlined could be mitigated by the application of other Local Plan policies that seek to reduce congestion and support investment in public transport.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the location of development at the individual site level which is currently uncertain.</p>
Long Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	



SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	Short Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>Parts of York are identified as being at significant risk of fluvial flooding and so there is the potential for negative effects to occur associated with flood risk. However, until the quantum of development is agreed and location of new development is known, the effects are considered to be uncertain.</p> <p>It is considered that any adverse effects will be mitigated through the implementation of NPPF compliant Local Plan policies related to flood risk and sustainable drainage. The selection of sites, through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies avoiding areas of high flood risk (greenfield sites in flood zone 3a) as Criteria 3.</p> <p>Overall, the effect of all three options are considered to be negative / uncertain.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As set out above, site selection will be informed by the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology and application of Policies related to flood risk and sustainable urban drainage.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None</p>
	Medium Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	
	Long Term	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	

SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
14. Conserve or enhance York’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	Short Term	-	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The historic environment of the City of York is of international, national, regional and local significance. York’s wealth of historic assets include: York Minster; over 2000 listed buildings; 22 scheduled monuments including the City Walls, York Castle, Clifford’s Tower and St Mary’s Abbey; four Registered historic parks and gardens, which include the Museum Gardens and Rowntree Park; and a large number of designated conservation areas.</p> <p>Housing growth could have an adverse effect on cultural heritage assets as a result of the direct loss of assets during construction or due to impacts on their setting during construction and once development has been completed. There may also be opportunities for housing growth to enhance the settings of heritage assets as well as access to them.</p> <p>The levels of housing need to be accommodated in all four options are likely to have an adverse effect on local landscape and townscape character, although the magnitude of effects would be likely to be reduced through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology which identifies the need to protect environmental assess (including historic character and setting) and the implementation of other plan policies related to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.</p> <p>The level of effects associated with the proposed preferred option (790dpa) and Publication Plan preferred figure (867dpa) and 2017 SHMA Update (953dpa) alternative housing figures are likely to be similar to one another;</p>
	Medium Term	-	-	-	-	
	Long Term	-	-	-	-	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>although this will depend upon the selection of individual sites. SHMA 2017 Update The effects of the Government’s 2017 consultation figure option are also likely to be similar. However, as a basic principle, the magnitude of effect is likely to be increased commensurate with the higher scale of growth under the SHMA 2017 Update alternatives (867dpa and 953 dpa) (compared to the proposed preferred figure of 790dpa) and the even higher level of growth associated with the Government’s 2017 consultation housing need figure (1,070 dpa).</p> <p>This effect is dependent on the specific approach to meeting the identified need through polices and proposals.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Local Plan policies should ensure that historic environment is conserved and enhanced in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> It is assumed that the development sites in the Local Plan will be subject to a Heritage Impact Appraisal to assess whether the sites and policies of the Local Plan will conserve and enhance the special characteristics of the city.</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None</p>

SA Objective		Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
		Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
15. Project and enhance York’s natural and built landscape.	Short Term	-	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The landscape includes a range of features of natural, historical, and cultural significance that contribute to the special qualities of the City of York.</p> <p>Housing growth could have an adverse effect on landscape character associated with the need to direct some development (under all housing figures) onto greenfield sites. Development may also affect townscape and the visual amenity of residential and recreational receptors both in the short term during construction and once development is complete.</p> <p>Housing growth may also present opportunities to improve townscape which could have a long term positive effect on this objective.</p> <p>All of the figures have been appraised as having negative effects on this objective. The Government’s consultation figure could have greater effects than the preferred (790dpa) reasonable alternative related to the 2017 SHMA Update (867dpa and 953dpa) figures due to the higher level of growth required to meet the identified need. In a similar way to the assessment against SA Objective 14, the general principle may be applied that the greater the number of houses the greater the effect on the landscape. However, this effect is dependent on the specific approach to meeting the identified need through policies and proposals within the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>
	Medium Term	-	-	-	-	
	Long Term	-	-	-	-	

SA Objective	Housing Figure				Commentary on the effects of each option
	Preferred Housing Figure (Proposed Modifications Consultation - SHMA 2019 Update) – 790 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (Publication Draft 2018 preferred option) – 867 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (SHMA 2017 Update) – 953 dpa 2017-2033	Alternative Housing Figure (MHCLG’s 2017 consultation housing need figure for CYC) - 1,070 dpa 2016-2026	
					<p>It is considered that adverse effects should be mitigated through the application of Local Plan policies related to the protection of the landscape.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None</p> <p><b>Uncertainty</b> None</p>



## Appendix C

### Updated Appraisal of Strategic Sites

The updated appraisal of Strategic Sites utilises the same matrices and text as the SA Report (2018) Appendix I. Where changes to the SA scoring or appraisal commentary have been identified these are presented in underline for additional text or with ~~strikethrough~~ for deleted text. Where the text is not underlined or struck through it is the original appraisal text taken from the SA Report (Feb 2018) appendix and has not been changed.

Please note that for SA Objective 8, the original text is taken from the SA Report Addendum (April 2018) Appendix B. For this objective the text includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough but new amendments are in **bold**.

Please note the page numbers below refer to Appendix I of the SA Report (Feb 2018). The whole matrices are not repeated here with the exception of ST35, which is included in its entirety to reflect the proposed deletion from the draft Local Plan and its consideration as a reasonable alternative. To reflect the review of ST15 and ST33 in relation to HRA (April 2019) evidence, the appendix only shows the relevant scoring and commentary in relation to biodiversity (SA Objective 8).

#### Key

Symbol	Likely Effect on the SA Objective
++	The policy is likely to have a significant positive effect
+	The policy is likely to have a positive effect
0	No significant effect / no clear link
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine effect
-	The policy is likely to have a negative effect
--	The policy is likely to have a significant negative effect

#### Part 1 – Allocated Strategic Sites and their boundary alternatives

ST1: BRITISH SUGAR / FORMER MANOR SCHOOL 7

ST2: FORMER CIVIL SERVICE SPORTS GROUND 14

ST4: EAST OF GRIMSTON BAR 23

ST5: YORK CENTRAL	33
ST7: EAST OF METCALFE LANE	47
ST8: NORTH OF MONKS CROSS	65
ST9: LAND NORTH OF HAXBY	81
ST14: LAND TO THE WEST OF WIGGINTON ROAD	95
ST15: LAND TO THE WEST OF ELVINGTON LANE	114
ST16: FORMER TERRY'S CHOCOLATE FACTORY EXTENSION SITES	140
ST17: NESTLÉ SOUTH	152
ST19: NORTHMINSTER BUSINESS PARK	163
ST20: CASTLE GATEWAY	173
ST26: SOUTH OF AIRFIELD BUSINESS PARK, ELVINGTON	184
ST27: UNIVERSITY OF YORK EXPANSION	194
ST31: LAND AT TADCASTER ROAD, COPMANTHORPE	207
ST32: HUNGATE	217
ST33: STATION YARD, WHELDRAKE	227
<del>ST35: QUEEN ELIZABETH BARRACKS, STRENSALL</del>	<del>237</del>
ST36: IMPHAL BARRACKS, FULFORD ROAD	250
ST37: WHITEHALL GRANGE	264

**NB: SITE WITH IMPLEMENTED PLANNING PERMISSION ARE NOT REASSESSED IN THIS APPENDIX. SEE APPENDIX K (SA REPORT FEB 2018) FOR THE AUDIT TRAIL OF SITE ALLOCATIONS.**



## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
<p>8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.</p>	<p>Protect and enhance international and nationally significant priority species and habitats within SACs, SPAs, RAMSARs and SSSIs ;</p> <p>Protect and enhance locally important nature conservation sites (SINCs);</p> <p>Create new areas or site of bio-diversity / geodiversity value;</p> <p>Improve connectivity of green infrastructure and the natural environment;</p> <p>Provide opportunities for people to access</p>	<p>-- ?</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>	<p><b>This section includes the changes identified in the SA Report Addendum (April 2018). New additions/deletions are added in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Environmental Effects</b></p> <p>This site would be subject to policies within the Local Plan in relation to Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity relating to creation, preservation and enhancement.</p> <p>The site includes arable farmland interspersed with mixed woodland copses as well as a middle section of Elvington Airfield. In its entirety Elvington Airfield is identified as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) for birds and part of this will be directly lost to development. Two separate sections of the Airfield are designated as SINC for species-rich grassland. These sections are immediately adjacent to the allocation boundary and would be adversely affected by increased access. The site is within 1km of a Site of Special Scientific (SSSI): Heslington Tillmire, and a further SINC: Fulford Golf Course. It is also within 5km of the Lower Derwent Valley (LDV), which is notified as a SSSI, classified as Special Protection Area (SPA), and designated as Special Area of Conversation (SAC) and Ramsar site; parts are also designated as a National Nature Reserve (NNR). Evidence suggests that there is a functional link between the LDV and the allocation as wintering wetland birds from the SPA also utilise land within the allocation for feeding and roosting. These species will therefore be vulnerable to habitat loss from construction and ongoing disturbance from recreational activities. Potential impact from recreation would also adversely affect Heslington Tillmire SSSI.</p> <p><u>Elvington Airfield SINC</u></p> <p>The species-rich grassland SINC areas adjacent to the site boundary would be adversely affected by increased uncontrolled access and others negative impacts associated with housing proximity, and the construction and operation of a new access road to Elvington village.</p> <p>A significant area of the bird SINC will be lost and the remainder fragmented and adversely affected by increased uncontrolled access and others negative impacts associated with housing</p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
	the natural environment.							<p>proximity. Without sufficient mitigation and compensation there will be adverse effects on the existing SINC and overall biodiversity.</p> <p>Although the allocation boundary incorporates part of the airfield and therefore the SINC area designated for birds, it is aligned between the two grassland SINC. Whilst not directly including them in the development it is reasonable to assume that these sites would still experience significant negative effects as a result of development through urban edge effects and recreational pressure unless mitigation was in place to make the sites inaccessible to the public. This would also be likely for alternative 3 and 4 which share the same boundary on to the airfield. Furthermore, in comparison to alternatives 1 and 2, there would be less area that could potentially be left undisturbed to mitigate for the candidate SINC for birds. Although there would be a large area to the west and east of the allocation, a secondary access would need to be provided to Elvington Lane which may cause disturbance in areas outside of the allocation boundary. In addition, the area to the east is reduced in comparison to alternatives 1 and 2.</p> <p>Alternatives 1 and 2 extend the development along the runway taking in more of the SINC to the east. The effects of this are still likely to be significant with the direct loss of SINC habitat but there is an opportunity presented to retain the western half of the runway and the SINC in this area. This may be positive for birds associated with the SINC (and also LDV and SSSI) given the large area that would remain as an undisturbed area, subject to making this inaccessible for recreational purposes to minimise disturbance.</p> <p><u>Heslington Tillmire SSSI</u></p> <p>Heslington Tillmire SSSI is located to the west of the site. The SSSI is notified for its habitats of tall herb fen and marsh grassland as well as wading birds, including lapwing, curlew, redshank and snipe, which live and breed in the marshy grassland. The last assessment by Natural England (2011) found the Tillmire to be in favourable condition. A National Vegetation Classification (NVC) Survey undertaken on behalf of the developer/landowner in 2014 found consistent results with the former and the original SSSI designation interest species.</p> <p>Development of a new garden village within proximity to this SSSI could potentially have significant adverse effects through disturbance to the breeding birds and damage of the</p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
								<p>grassland as well as changing the hydrological levels which create this habitat. It is acknowledged that Heslington Tillmire already receives disturbance through the use of surrounding footpaths which bound the site and through its designation as Open Access Land available for the public. However, greater disturbance through the close location of a new settlement may have significant adverse effects and is a point applicable to all boundaries appraised.</p> <p>Access to the SSSI is currently available by public footpaths (including the Minster Way linked to Heslington) and via road on Long Lane. The allocation boundary and alternatives 3 and 4 also have an additional right of way extending from Long Lane/Langwith Stray southwards into the site which may be used to link more directly with the SSSI and open access land. Minimising access to Heslington Tillmire SSSI will be paramount in minimising disturbance. Should the development go ahead, access to the SSSI should be restricted without compromising the Open Access Land and Public Rights of Way (PROW) designations. Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS) incorporating new networks of attractive footpath routes should be incorporated as part of a site specific Green Infrastructure and Recreation Strategy to divert recreational disturbance pressure away from sensitive sites including the SSSI and adjacent SINC. The potential to restrict access to the Open Access land (for 28 days) on the SSSI during the bird breeding season via application to Natural England to help minimise disturbance should be explored.</p> <p>A new population in this location may also have direct consequences on predation of birds in the vicinity. The direct impact on the Tillmire is reduced through the allocation and alternative boundaries being 1km away with the exception of alternative 4 which brings development closer to the SSSI. Predation from domestic cats in particular would have a direct adverse effect on bird populations on site, particularly where they are ground nesting. Sufficient and appropriate buffering/landscaping would need to be in place to ensure that predation is minimised through locating development far enough away from any known area for breeding birds</p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
								<p>As part of alternative boundary 2, the site promoters proposed an area of enhanced habitat adjacent to Heslington Tillmire in addition to the western end of Elvington airfield, both of which would have no/limited accessibility to the public. This mitigation was based upon their evidence to understand the effects of development and the scale of mitigation necessary to avoid, mitigate and compensate these effects as a result of the development. This mitigation scheme would also be applicable to alternative 1 given the similarity in the boundary. Associated with the allocation boundary is an openspace adjacent to the SSSI which is identified solely for nature conservation associated with ST15. This extends beyond 400m from the SSSI up to the A64 to help mitigate and compensate for effects of development aligning with and extending the site promoter's proposals but excluding additional land on western section of the airfield. This airfield mitigation measure would still be relevant but its implementation is uncertain in connection with the allocation boundary. More mitigation maybe required as a result of alternative 3, given it would bring development closer to the SSSI and for alternative 4 which would increase the scale of the settlement.</p> <p>Advice from Natural England suggests a minimum 400m buffer with deterrents to minimise effects, which accords with the proposed openspace / habitat mitigation areas proposed for the allocation and alternatives 1 and 2. They also recognise the potential significant negative impacts that development in this location may have and whilst they welcome the requirement to avoid impacts on Heslington Tillmire SSSI and secure an area for mitigation, there will also need to be an appropriate site wide recreation and access strategy to minimise indirect disturbance from the development and compliment the mitigation area.</p> <p>The site promoters indicate through submissions for alternative 2, which are also relevant to alternative 1,that masterplanning would include up to 40% of the site areas for openspace and provide "A connected, multi-functional network of green spaces and corridors will be incorporated that permeates the residential areas and forms part of the movement network for pedestrians and cyclists. This network will include public open space, play areas, amenity space, playing pitches, SUDS, wildlife corridors, allotments and orchards, and green movement corridors". These</p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
								<p>proposals should help to ensure that facilities on-site are attractive for the new population and help to minimise recreational trips to the SSSI in line with Natural England’s concerns. Whilst the allocation boundary would be subject to policies in the plan regarding green infrastructure, including openspace provision, the openspace and recreational strategy is currently unknown.</p> <p>All ecological measures should be established prior to development, particularly in locations near the SSSI, SINC and highly populated bird areas in early phases to ensure that they can sufficiently establish.</p> <p><u>Lower Derwent Valley (LDV)</u></p> <p>A number of surveys and evidence has been produced on behalf of the developer/landowners to identify and understand the significance of the bird populations as well as whether this would have a consequential negative impact on the Lower Derwent Valley SPA, SSSI and Ramsar site (and Heslington Tillmire SSSI). This evidence is relevant to all site boundaries although it should be noted that there is a gap in evidence in the middle part of the allocation, which is in third party ownership; however, given the proximity and similar (if not identical land-use) it is reasonable to presume that this will support similar biodiversity interest as the adjacent SINC including wetland bird populations from the LDV. This gap in evidence is also relevant for alternatives 3 and 4. In addition, there is a significant evidence gap for alternative 4 given the boundary extends to the north and evidence gap for alternative 3 for the additional land included at Langwith Lakes.</p> <p>Although the LDV lies some distance away, the <u>Habitat Regulations Assessment</u> <u>Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report (2017)</u> has evaluated evidence that suggests there may be a functional link for wetland bird species between the LDV, the site (particularly the airfield and adjacent land) and the adjacent SSSI. <u>Initial advice received from Natural England concurs with this conclusion.</u> The HRA concluded that a likely significant effect could not be ruled out and that an Appropriate Assessment would be required. Specifically, it stated that</p>

# ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*	
									<p><i>"recent ornithological studies have suggested that the site and its environs regularly support considerable numbers of both golden plover and lapwing, both identified as components of the non-breeding bird assemblage of the SPA...with limited information available [representative to this site boundary] ensure that no mitigation can be applied, the conclusion of LSE alone remains and an appropriate assessment is required."</i> Furthermore, the HRA suggests that this site needs to be informed by ongoing ornithological surveys that evaluate the impact on wintering waders and can be used to identify bespoke mitigation measures. Initial advice received from Natural England concurs with this conclusion.</p> <p>Ongoing work on the HRA suggests that the successful delivery of this allocation and policy will require the development and implementation of a comprehensive mitigation strategy to ensure that adverse effects on the integrity of the LDV SPA and Ramsar site can be ruled out. This will have to take account of habitat loss through construction and ongoing disturbance from recreational activities, including the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space and a site-wide recreation and access strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised HRA (2018) further considered that evidence and the potential mitigation required. This states that <i>"Comprehensive requirements for mitigation are already embedded in the existing policy that anticipates the establishment of extensive areas of wet grassland and public open space. Together, these would provide enhanced areas of functionally-linked land for bird populations from the European site and provide alternative countryside recreational opportunities for new residents. Unfortunately, there are insufficient opportunities within SS13/ST15 to deliver all aspects of the built development alongside the measures to provide public open space and ecological mitigation."</i></li> <li><i>The opportunity to implement these mitigation measures is provided by Policy/Allocation OS10 which is situated immediately adjacent to the west of SS13/ST15. The purpose of OS10 is described as the provision of 'significant areas of open space ... in connection with a strategic site' designed to 'mitigate ... for ecological impacts' and, as a 'New Area for Nature Conservation on land to the South of the A64 in association with ST15'. However, there is no</i></li> </ul>

# ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
								<p><u>formal policy mechanism in SS13/ST15 that ensures both it and OS10 must be pursued together to secure sustainable development.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>To provide certainty that the embedded mitigation and open space requirements described in Policy SS13/ST15 can be delivered, it is recommended that the Plan is modified to provide a formal link in policy terms with OS10. This will enable delivery of the ecological mitigation whilst public open space can be secured within the footprint of SS13/ST15.</u></li> <li><u>This can be delivered by deleting the phrase 'as shown on the proposals map' in sub-section (iv) and amending sub-section (vi) to read as follows: 'Incorporation of a new nature conservation area (as shown on the proposals map as allocation OS10 and included within Policy G16 New Open Space Provision)...</u></li> <li><u>Should this or similar wording be added to Policy SS13/ST15 it is concluded that the Council can ascertain that Policy SS13/ST15 will have no adverse effect on the integrity of the Lower Derwent Valley European site in terms of the disturbance of bird populations. There would be no residual effects and no need for an in combination assessment."</u></li> </ul> <p><b><u>The updated HRA (Feb 2019) reconfirms these conclusions. It notes that the changes proposed by the Council in May 2018 (CD003) - which are now proposed modifications - and states: "Therefore, it can be concluded that the adoption of this modification would allow the Council to conclude that an adverse effect could be avoided."</u></b></p> <p><u>Other ecology</u></p> <p>A range of other ecological surveys have been undertaken on behalf of the landowners/developers over the last four years to identify potential constraints and opportunities for alternative site boundary 2. Where appropriate this evidence base remains valid for all sites considered where the boundaries overlap although it should be noted that there are gaps in evidence as outlined above. Surveys have included Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, National Vegetation Survey, and surveys for great crested newts, reptiles and butterflies. Great</p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979)	Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888)	Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
										<p>crested newts were found on adjacent land and notable butterfly species were found on site; no reptiles on site were identified. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure the habitats for the identified species are appropriately provided.</p> <p>The requirement for further species surveys including badgers and bats have been identified.</p> <p>All biodiversity impacts should be addressed by following the mitigation hierarchy with the overall aim to prevent harm to existing biodiversity assets, delivering no net loss for biodiversity and maximising further benefits.</p> <p>On balance, the allocation is assessed as likely to have a potentially significant negative effect on this objective. <u>This is based upon the loss of and impact on the Elvington Airfield SINC site and impacts on Heslington Tillmire SSSI. Uncertainty is also identified given site specific mitigation in relation to this site is yet to be fully established. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the HRA (2018) concluded that with mitigation ST15 will have no adverse effects on the integrity of the Lower Derwent Valley SPA. The updated HRA (Feb 2019) reconfirmed these conclusions.</u> Similarly, impacts on all of the alternative boundaries are also identified as significantly negative recognising the potential loss of and potential harm to the SINC, SSSI and potentially the Lower Derwent Valley (as their boundaries/quantums have not been subject to HRA). However it should be acknowledged that alternative 1 and 2 may have more positive impacts as a result of the mitigation proposed by the site promoters both adjacent to the SSSI and on the western end of the runway as well as an initial strategy for managing recreation. Alternatives 3 and 4, given the gaps in evidence are identified as having only significant negative effects.</p> <p>It is also noted that Appropriate Assessment is required as part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment process.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A minimum of 400m buffer to the SSSI to mitigate predation from domestic animals;</li> </ul>



## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979)	Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888)	Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Appropriate ecological enhancement of the development site to increase its biodiversity and minimise impacts to the SSSI/ LDV through increasing ecological functionality. This should be agreed alongside City of York Council and Natural England.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ecological enhancement of the site should be prioritised within the masterplanning/phasing.</i></li> <li>• <i>Phasing of development should prioritise locations away from the SSSI to minimise disturbance and allow any ecological enhancement to establish.</i></li> <li>• <i>A full Green Infrastructure and Recreational Plan for the development should be developed, incorporating open space and a biodiversity management plan. Any management plans for the site should take into consideration the requirements of the SSSI to maximise synergistic benefits from enhancement and management proposals. Any management proposals will need to be agreed with Natural England.</i></li> <li>• <i><u>Create a policy link in policy SS13/ST35 as set out in the HRA: “deleting the phrase ‘(as shown on the proposals map)’ in sub-section (iv) and amending sub-section (vi) to read as follows: ‘Incorporation of a new nature conservation area (as shown on the proposals map as allocation OS10 and included within Policy GI6 <b>New-Open Space Provision</b>). (This proposed change is set out in the proposed modifications to the Publication Draft.)</u></i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The evidence bases referred to have been prepared on behalf of the landowners/developers remain valid. This has involved discussions with CYC ecologists and Natural England. It should be noted that there is a gap in evidence for an area in the mid-west of the site that is in third party ownership.</i></li> <li>• <i>Previously suggested mitigation measures are yet to be agreed in relation to this site boundary.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

## ST15: Land to the West of Elvington Lane

(Site ref: 851)

\* The appraisal is presented here in the same manner as the SA Report (Feb 2018) allowing for comparison with site boundary alternatives considered for the site.

A Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Allocation (site 851)	Alternative 1 (site 984)	Post PPC	Alternative 2 (Site 979) Developer PPC	Alternative 3 (site 888) Developer	Alternative 4 (site 877/985)	Commentary*
		Red	Yellow	Orange	Red	Red	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The implementation timescale of mitigation measures and their effectiveness in the long term are uncertain. The scale and residual effects of development are therefore also uncertain. The mitigation measures will need to be refined through the detailed planning application stage, including ecological receptor-specific evaluation.</li> <li>There is a gap in evidence for an area in the mid-west of the allocation that is in third party ownership. There are also evidence gaps associated with alternative 3 and 4.</li> </ul>

## ST33: Station Yard, Wheldrake

(Site ref: 855)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
<p>8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.</p>	<p>Protect and enhance international and nationally significant priority species and habitats within SACs, SPAs, RAMSARs and SSSIs ;</p> <p>Protect and enhance locally important nature conservation sites (SINCs);</p> <p>Create new areas or site of bio-diversity / geodiversity value;</p> <p>Improve connectivity of green infrastructure and the natural environment;</p> <p>Provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><b>This section includes the changes identified in the SA Report Addendum (April 2018). New additions/deletions are added in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Environmental Effects</b></p> <p>The site does not include any nature conservation designations but is within 1.8km of the Lower Derwent Valley SAC, SPA, Ramsar and River Derwent SAC. <u>The Habitat Regulations Assessment states for this site: The site is within just 2km of the SPA including 'Bank Island', the most important site for breeding birds across the entire European site as well as Wheldrake Ings National Nature Reserve run by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.</u></p> <p>The Lower Derwent Valley supports diverse, fragile breeding and non-breeding bird populations throughout the year, both within the SPA and on functionally-linked land beyond which are vulnerable to disturbance and displacement. In addition, the terrestrial habitats, especially the grassland communities, are all equally vulnerable to disturbance from public pressure which could result in trampling and erosion.</p> <p>Whilst access to much of the SPA is managed and/or restricted (<u>such as to Wheldrake Ings</u>), it is not completely controlled. Furthermore, whilst the majority of functionally-linked land is found on private land, access here can also not be fully managed. Consequently, given the location of certain allocations (eg ST33) within a few kilometres of the SPA, adverse effects cannot be ruled out if recreational pressure is to increase considerably.</p> <p><u>Given that the SPA would be perhaps be one of the most obvious destinations for outdoor recreation, the impact of increased public pressure (frequently allied with dog walking) and predation pressure from cats ensured that LSE alone could not be ruled out in the HRA screening. The HRA screening concludes that given the uncertainty surrounding Policies SS18 (ST33) in particular, there is a risk that the proposals could undermine the conservation objectives for the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and that a likely significant effect cannot be ruled out (alone) and so the policy must be screened in (Category I).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>However, the HRA (2018) appropriate assessment concludeds "Policy SS18/ST33 already provides some mitigation by ensuring that any new development must accord with principle (iv) to 'undertake a comprehensive evidence based approach in relation to biodiversity to address potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar/SSSI'. However, this fails to adequately describe a desired outcome and cannot be relied on to provide adequate mitigation.</u></li> </ul>

## ST33: Station Yard, Wheldrake

(Site ref: 855)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the careful management of recreational pressure at the Lower Derwent Valley including footpaths, hides and wardening, it is considered that a modest revision to section (iv) of the Policy SS18/ST33 by incorporation of the following wording or similar would be sufficient to effectively remove the potential threat and avoid an adverse effect on the integrity of the European site alone.</li> <li><i>'This will require the developer to publicise and facilitate the use of other, less sensitive countryside destinations nearby (e.g. Wheldrake Woods) and provide educational material to new homeowners to promote good behaviours when visiting the European site. The former could be supported by enhancing the local footpath network and improving signage.'</i></li> <li><i>Consequently, if the proposed amendment is adopted it is concluded that the Council can ascertain that Policies SS18/ST33 will have no adverse effect on the integrity of the Lower Derwent Valley European site in terms of the disturbance of bird populations. There would be no residual effects and no need for an in combination assessment."</i></li> </ul> <p>The site scores as potentially significantly negative against this objective to reflect the site's proximity to the Lower Derwent Valley SPA. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the HRA (2018) conclusion stated that with mitigation there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. <b>The updated HRA (Feb 2019) reconfirms this conclusion that the implementation of mitigation within policy (as proposed in the modifications) would allow the Council to conclude that an adverse effect on the integrity of the site could be avoided.</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive evidence base is required to determine ecological issues in detail and potential mitigation strategy. <u>Revise section (iv) of policy SS18/ST33 to include the following and remove potential threat of adverse effects on the integrity of the site identified by the HRA:</u> <i>'This will require the developer to publicise and facilitate the use of other, less sensitive countryside destinations nearby (e.g. Wheldrake Woods) and provide educational material to new homeowners to promote good behaviours when visiting the European site. The former could be supported by enhancing the local footpath network and improving signage.'</i> <b>(This proposed change is set out in the proposed modifications to the Publication Draft.)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The biodiversity value of brownfield land is less than that of greenfield sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

### ST33: Station Yard, Wheldrake

(Site ref: 855)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type and location as well as mitigation measures are to be determined through masterplanning. This creates uncertainty as to the scale and significance of any effects. <u>The mitigation measures will need to be refined through the detailed planning application stage, including ecological receptor-specific evaluation.</u></li> </ul>

## Part 2 – Alternative Strategic Sites and their boundary alternatives

SITE 148 - LAND AT MOOR LANE, WOODTHORPE (FORMER ST10/SF12)	275
SITE 320 - NEW LANE, HUNTINGTON (FORMER ST11)	289
SITES 723, 872 AND 944 - LAND TO THE WEST OF MANOR HEATH, COPMANTHORPE (FORMER ST12)	300
SITE 131 - LAND AT MOOR LANE, COPMANTHORPE (FORMER ST13)	318
SITE 800 - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF THE DESIGNER OUTLET (FORMER ST25)	329
SITE 779 - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF BROUGHBRIDGE ROAD/A59 (FORMER ST29)	339
SITE: 187 - NORTH OF STOCKTON LANE (FORMER ST30)	350
SITE 170 – POND FIELD, HESLINGTON	363
SITES 297, 874 & 875 – LAND AT RIVERSIDE GARDENS / SITES OFF MAIN STREET, ELVINGTON (FORMER SF10)	375
SITE 789 – LAND TO THE WEST OF BECKSIDE, ELVINGTON	387
SITE 726 – WHEATLANDS, POPPLETON	397
SITE 840 - SOUTH OF DESIGNER OUTLET (ADJ. A19)	408
SITE 859 – NORTH OF ESCRICK	418
SITE 964 : GALTRES GARDEN VILLAGE	428
SITE 220 – WEST OF KNAPTON	443
SITE 629 /861 – THE RETREAT, HESLINGTON	453
SITE REF: 864 – LAND TO THE NORTH OF ELVINGTON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE	465
<u>SITE REF 934 - QUEEN ELIZABETH BARRACKS, STRENSALL</u>	

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
<p>1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.</p>	<p>Deliver homes to meet the needs of the population in terms of quantity, quality;</p> <p>Promote improvements to the existing and future housing stock;</p> <p>Locate sites in areas of known housing need;</p> <p>Deliver community facilities for the needs of the population;</p> <p>Deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">++</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The proposed development of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks site is forecast to provide 500 dwellings. This is a significant re-development of a former army barracks site and has the potential to provide a new community and respond to mixed needs. As the site is composed of both green and brownfield land it is expected that 20-30% of this total will be affordable units in order to comply with the proposed Affordable Housing Policy (H10) within the Local Plan, this equates to a minimum number of 100 affordable dwellings.</p> <p>Given that the development is adjacent to Strensall village in the short term the provision of facilities and services should not be an issue. However as the development grows provision of further facilities will be required for the area to ensure commensurate facilities are available for the population in the medium to long-term and undue pressure is not put on existing facilities in the village.</p> <p>Overall, this site has been assessed as having a permanent significant positive effect on this objective in the long-term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing of development should include the provision of facilities to ensure the population is provided for.</li> <li>In order to maximise the ability of the site to meet the needs of York, the housing mix and type should reflect the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>n/a</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final number of homes and housing mix developed on this site will be subject to masterplanning and an associated planning application.</li> <li>Number of facilities available in the future will be dependent upon masterplanning.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.</p>	<p>Avoid locating development where environmental circumstances could negatively impact on people's health;</p> <p>Improve access to open space / multi-functional open space;</p> <p>Promotes a healthier lifestyle through access to leisure opportunities (walking / cycling);</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ -</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The development of sites would be subject to policies within the Local Plan regarding provision of on-site open space, provision of community facilities, consideration for green infrastructure and sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>The proposed boundaries have existing open space, with sports pitches bordering Strensall Road on the eastern edge of the site. Strensall Common is adjacent to the west and there is a golf course to the north of the site.</p> <p>Strensall Common and Strensall Park, to the west and south respectively, provide opportunities for recreational walking. However, given the ecological status of Strensall Common, alternative openspace must be provided on site to ensure sufficient recreational space for new residents and to balance any effect on the designated nature conservation site.</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
	<p>Improves access to healthcare; Provides or promotes safety and security for residents; Ensure that land contamination/pollution does not pose unacceptable risks to health.</p>	<p style="background-color: #90EE90; text-align: center;">+</p> <p style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;">?</p>	<p>At present the site has limited cycle links and it is likely that the development would have to make a contribution to improving the surrounding infrastructure.</p> <p>There are is no doctors surgery within 800m of the site but further north Strensall is served by a dentist, doctors surgery and pharmacy in the village (approx 1200m). Development may have to support additional provision to ensure the new and existing population have adequate access to healthcare in the medium to long-term. Provision of this should be accommodated on site to encourage local access to services. This approach should have an overall benefit on the health and well-being of prospective residents.</p> <p>The potential continued use of the training area for army purposes – shooting and rifle ranges – pose a significant noise concern. A full assessment of this will be required with particularly consideration on the sites continued use for military training purposes. Past activities (vehicle maintenance and refuelling, firing ranges etc.) could have contributed to land contamination so an appropriate contamination assessment is required to establish appropriate mitigation. The MOD advises that the site would be investigated and any threats removed prior to the disposal of the site.</p> <p>This objective has been a both minor positive and minor negative impact due to the good local provision of open space and medical facilities but concerns around soft transport links and noise concern from continued use of the firing range.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The strategies for contamination and noise remediation should be implemented accordingly.</i></li> <li><i>Development of facilities needs to be undertaken throughout the phasing of the site to ensure adequate provision for new residents.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Preliminary investigations on the site for contamination and noise will be remediated through agreed strategies with the Council, Environment Agency and MOD.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The level and type of provision of healthcare facilities is currently unknown and will be subject to masterplanning.</i></li> <li><i>The level and type of open space will be subject to masterplanning.</i></li> </ul>
<p>3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</p>	<p>Provide good education and training opportunities for all; Support existing higher and further educational establishments for continued success; Provide good quality employment opportunities available to all.</p>	<p style="background-color: #90EE90; text-align: center;">+</p> <p style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;">?</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>It is important that the anticipated requirement arising from this site for education is estimated in advance to allow sufficient services to be in place or incorporated onto the site and avoid increased pressure on existing facilities. This would be subject to policies set out within the Local Plan requiring educational provision. There are 4 nurseries but no primary or secondary educational facilities nearby (&lt;800m). Provision for education should be planned and phased alongside the residential development to ensure facilities are accessible to new residents through the course of the development. Given the anticipated number of new households that this site would generate, it s likely to require new nurseries, primary school and may also require additional secondary school provision.</p> <p>There would be construction and associated trade jobs required on site for the duration of construction works. This would have positive impacts in the short-medium term. The level of training and skills development in associated industries would be dependent upon employment practices in the companies that construct the development. Though Strensall village is adjacent the village centre is on the far side from the proposed development site., The scale of anticipated population as a result will require a local centre/neighbourhood parade offering services and facilities, which would provide opportunities for a small numbers of local jobs and potentially also providing some local training opportunities.</p>



# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
		<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #FFFF00; margin-right: 5px;"></div> </div>	<p>Currently, the effects of this are assessed as potentially positive but with a uncertain assessment regarding the specific requirements for educational provision for which further information is required and for which once determined, provision will need to be made.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Educational capacity should be planning in advance to enable a primary school to be planned into any masterplan and phased accordingly to adequately accommodate students arising from the new development and to ensure undue pressure is not put on existing educational facilities.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Educational capacity is agreed in conjunction with the Council.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The number of students and their educational needs will only be fully determined upon the developments completion and occupation.</i></li> </ul>
<p>4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.</p>	<p>Help deliver conditions for business success and investment;                      Deliver a flexible and relevant workforce for the future;                      Deliver and promote stable economic growth;                      Enhance the city centre and its opportunities for business and leisure;                      Provide the appropriate infrastructure for economic growth;                      Support existing employment drivers;                      Promote a low carbon economy.</p>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">+</div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #FF0000; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">-</div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #FF0000; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">-</div> </div>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Though the rifle range will remain, the army barracks on site are set to be entirely vacated by 2021 and this would represent a loss of a specialist employment type within the city. The site is considered primarily for residential uses and not the redevelopment for employment uses as other locations have been identified through the Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst employment is not the key land use for this site, the scale of the development will require a local centre/neighbourhood parade offering services and facilities. These facilities, along with a likely primary school would provide opportunities for a small numbers of local jobs. Temporary jobs would also be generated through the construction of the site in the short to medium term and may generate opportunity for training in this industry.</p> <p>The development overall would support the housing of the local workforce for other employment opportunities within the city helping to support the overall economy.</p> <p>Whilst this site represents a loss of a military barracks, deemed as a specialist employment type within the city, this was not land in B use class development. On balance, this site is therefore likely to have a positive short term direct effect and long-term indirect permanent effect on this objective through the provision of housing and local jobs.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>n/a</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>n/a</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of construction and associated jobs to be provided as well as their timescales is uncertain and will be dependent upon the works on-site.</li> </ul>
5. Help deliver equality and access to all.	<p>Address existing imbalances of equality, deprivation and exclusion across the city;</p> <p>Provide accessible services and facilities for the local population;</p> <p>Provide affordable housing to meet demand;</p> <p>Help reduce homelessness;</p> <p>Promote the safety and security for people and/or property.</p>	+		<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Based upon the proposed affordable housing policy, the site would have a target to provide a minimum of 20% affordable dwellings of mixed tenure on site. This would make a significant positive contribution towards this objective in the long-term towards meeting the identified affordable housing need and work towards breaking down barriers to affordable accommodation.</p> <p>Provision of existing services and facilities in Strensall is likely to suffice initially but as the development grows new facilities may be necessary. Developing the facilities in tandem with the development would be necessary to ensure that increased pressure is not placed on the existing facilities and to ensure local access on the proposed site which are further than 800m from facilities.</p> <p>Overall this site has been assessed as having a significant positive impact on this objective in the long-term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>n/a</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of facilities within the existing area would need to be supplemented to ensure adequate provision for the existing and new populations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The facilities and services provided on the site will be subject to masterplanning and occupation following development.</li> </ul>
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.	<p>Deliver development where it is accessible by public transport, walking and cycling to minimise the use of the car;</p> <p>Deliver transport infrastructure which supports sustainable travel options;</p> <p>Promote sustainable forms of travel;</p> <p>Improve congestion.</p>	+	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The development should aim to minimise car trips and promote sustainable modes of transport. This site links to the existing bus network to York City Centre and Strensall Village along Strensall Road which provides frequent and non frequent services. However the potential for new bus services being required needs to be considered as the diversion of existing services from Strensall Road is unlikely to be supported.</p> <p>Preliminary evidence from the site promoter indicates that new and upgraded bus stops are anticipated together with financial support to incentivise bus usage by first occupants and that the viability of additional services would need to be assessed.</p> <p>At present there are limited cycle links to Strensall to/from the outer ring road. There is potential that contributions from this site could help to enhance the current access links including the construction of a segregated subway to facilitate the crossing of the A1237. Cycle paths would need to be provided along the site frontages connecting into the site and also focus upon the route into the village and local facilities. This could be a combination of segregated and on carriageway.</p> <p>A full transport assessment will need to be provided to understand the potential impacts as a result of development. Road safety at Strensall Road / Towthorpe Moor Lane is currently an issue that needs further consideration. Furthermore Towthorpe Moor Lane should be discouraged from</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
		<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #FFD700; margin-right: 5px;"></div> </div>	<p>being inappropriately used by through traffic. If identified as necessary, mitigation to Strensall Road / Towthorpe Moor Lane junction will require further consideration.</p> <p>Potential access points into the planned development also need to consider impacts on Strensall Common. Accessing the potential development via Scott Moncrieff Road to the north would involve upgrading a road which currently crosses the SSSI and SAC and linking the Queen Elizabeth Barracks to the Towthorpe Lines site would introduce increased traffic to the edge of the designations. Access to the site needs to be considered in combination with ecological considerations of the Common..</p> <p>On balance, it is likely that this site could have positive and negative impacts on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The impact from this site on the transport network needs to be established prior to development to ensure appropriate enhancements/ infrastructure can be incorporated.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The existing transport routes can be linked into the new development.</i></li> <li><i>That the existing bus services continue into the future.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The level of congestion as result of this development as a result of its occupation.</i></li> <li><i>The behaviour of future occupiers and their travel needs.</i></li> </ul>
<p>7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.</p>	<p>Reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from all sources;                      Plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change;                      Provide and develop energy from renewable, low and zero carbon technologies;                      Promote sustainable design and building materials that manage the future risks and consequences of climate change;</p>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">+</div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #FFD700; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">-</div> </div>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Emissions are likely to increase during the construction phase of the development due to trip generation to the sites, such as HGVs and construction vehicles, the use of machinery and the embedded carbon in construction materials. Post development there is also likely to be emissions associated with the occupation of dwellings/other facilities and services and trips generated by the residents.</p> <p>The number of resident trips may be reduced depending on the success and up-take of sustainable travel modes as well as the location of employment opportunities, local facilities and services and open space, the scale and location of which is currently uncertain.</p> <p>The Council aspire to be the Greenest city in the North (City Vision 2030, 2016) and sustainable design and construction applied on Strategic Sites should help to ensure that new development minimises emissions. This site could contribute as its size would enable a variety of climate change mitigation measures to be incorporated through design, layout and the incorporation of renewable energy technologies to avoid negative impacts on greenhouse gases and ultimately, climate change. The site should seek to optimise the layout of the site to make use of natural features/orientation in relation to solar gain.</p> <p>The Renewable Energy Evidence Base (2014) states that this site has high potential for incorporating solar and technologies and medium potential for ground source heat pumps. Any masterplanning of the site should therefore help to maximise the opportunities for using these renewable</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
	Adhere to the principles of the energy hierarchy.	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 15px; height: 100%; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="width: 15px; height: 100%; background-color: #FFD700; margin-right: 5px;"></div> </div>	<p>energy sources to help offset any impacts from the construction and occupation of the site in the future. This would need to be demonstrated through a Sustainability Statement and Low Carbon Energy Generation Strategy for the site. The site should be sure to comply with policy CC3 in relation to district heating as it meets the definition of sufficiently large (&gt;300 dwellings) to consider the provision of a (C)CHP network.</p> <p>Overall there is an opportunity to have a long-term positive impact by minimising the impacts of the site through the delivery of a low-carbon construction/energy generation strategy. However it is inevitable that the level of emissions from the construction and occupation of the site will have some negative impact. Ultimately the significance of the impact will depend upon masterplanning and implementation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A sustainability and low carbon strategy should be implemented across the site to help minimise and manage negative impacts towards climate change.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The residential buildings will conform to Part L of the building regulations (as updated) to ensure that dwellings are low carbon.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The impacts resulting from trip generation to services, facilities etc is currently uncertain and will be determined through the masterplanning of the site.</i></li> <li><i>The scale of effects as a consequence of residents is unknown.</i></li> </ul>
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.	<p>Protect and enhance international and nationally significant priority species and habitats within SACs, SPAs, RAMSARs and SSSIs ;</p> <p>Protect and enhance locally important nature conservation sites (SINCs);</p> <p>Create new areas or site of bio-diversity / geodiversity value;</p> <p>Improve connectivity of green infrastructure and the natural environment;</p> <p>Provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment.</p>	<p>--</p>	<p><b>This section includes the changes identified in the SA Report Addendum (April 2018). New additions/deletions are added in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Environmental Effects</b></p> <p>This site is adjacent to Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which is designated for its lowland heath. Extensive areas of both wet and dry heath occur and form a complex habitat mosaic with grassland, woodlands and ponds. Strensall Common also has biodiversity value above its listed features in the SSSI/SAC designations that will need to be fully considered e.g. ground nesting birds, invertebrates and aquatic fauna and flora.</p> <p><u>Hydrological regime</u></p> <p>The habitats on the SAC are fragile and are vulnerable to changes in the surface and sub-surface hydrological regime, impacts which can be easily prompted by large scale construction nearby. <u>The <b>previous</b> HRA (April 2018) of the Local Plan refers to a shadow HRA produced on behalf of the site promoter, which considers that mitigation should include using "Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water, use of silt fencing to trap sediment, and the adoption of best practice measures for pollution management embedded within a Construction Management Plan (CEMP)."</u> The HRA (2018) <del>went</del> goes on to acknowledge that these and a number of other mitigation measures are embedded in Policy SS19 <b>(now proposed for deletion)</b> that require hydrological and related studies to be completed and used to inform the development effective,</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<p><u>deliverable, mitigation measures prior to any consent. The HRA therefore screens out likely significant effects in relation to hydrological regime. <b>The updated HRA (Feb 2019) reconfirms this overall conclusion.</b></u></p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Its heathland communities are particularly vulnerable to elevated levels of nitrogen deposition from increased road traffic associated with new development. Current evidence shows that <u>both existing and predicted nitrogen deposition at Strensall Common exceed the minimum critical loads, the SAC already exceeds the critical load for nitrogen, prior to assessment of the plan.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst acknowledging this, the Air Quality Assessment undertaken for the plan seeks to understand impacts on nature conservation sites (Annexed to HRA (2018)), in-combination with other development using traffic and air quality modelling. This assessment shows that the nitrogen deposition at Strensall Common with development is above the criteria for ruling out insignificant impacts and is therefore screened in for further assessment. Harmful effects may therefore occur on the vegetation in closest proximity to the road. However, given the modified nature of the vegetation on the road side and that nitrogen deposition is shown to decrease with distance from kerbside, quickly returning to near-background levels, the HRA (April 2018) concludes that it is likely that the plan will slow down the rate of improvement, but not meaningfully increase nitrogen deposition, and is highly unlikely to undermine the conservation objectives of the SAC. It also concludes that there would be no residual effects and no need for an in-combination assessment. <b>Following reassessment of the evidence, the updated HRA (Feb 2019) concluded that the site will have no adverse effect on the integrity of Strensall Common European site in terms of impacts on air quality emissions. Natural England confirmed their agreement with the conclusions of the HRA (Feb 2019) in an e-mail of 4<sup>th</sup> June 2019. It stated: "Natural England concurs with the conclusions of this assessment and is satisfied that air quality emissions as a result of the plan will not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC or damage the interest features of Strensall Common SSSI."</b></u></p> <p><u>Recreational Pressure</u></p> <p>The lowland heath is also vulnerable to recreational pressure. Although the common is already well used for a range of activities, further intensification could harm the lowland heath habitat through trampling, erosion, disturbance of stock and nutrient enrichment (dog fouling). In addition there are birds of conservation concern and other wildlife which are also susceptible to any increase in disturbance. Increased disturbance as a result of recreational behaviour is likely from development adjacent to the Common and may cause significant harm. The reduction and mitigation of such impacts for example through Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS), active wardening and raising awareness amongst users needs to be given careful consideration and be informed by a comprehensive visitor survey of the Common. An appropriate mechanism to provide sustainable funding for this approach will be required, such as through a levy on the new homes.</p> <p><u>Scrub encroachment is a major threat to lowland heath and to manage this Strensall Common is managed under Environmental Stewardship using sheep and cattle grazing by an adjacent tenanted farmer. Interruption to this management regime or factors making it unviable could undermine the conservation objectives for the Common and have a potentially negative effect on the integrity of the site.</u></p> <p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment (2018) screening ( Report (2017) concludes that as no meaningful mitigation had been proposed within the policy to avoid or mitigate these adverse, that likely significant effects could not be ruled out and that an appropriate assessment would be required to evaluate the impacts from anticipated increases in recreational pressure and road traffic pollution, and construction.</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsequent changes to the policy-wording has sought to prevent easy, direct access to the Common from the proposed development and provide alternative, natural greenspace to mitigate the adverse consequences of increased recreational pressure (openspace OS12 in policy GI6). The effectiveness, or otherwise, of these proposals will be evaluated in the next iteration of the HRA. <u>The revised HRA (April 2018) states: "The screening exercise concluded that significant effects from recreational pressure on the dry and wet heathland communities at Strensall Common SPA cannot be ruled out alone.</u></li> <li>• <u>Comprehensive mitigation is already embedded within Policy SS19/ST35 which provides for extensive open space within the allocation and restricts direct access to the Common for new residents. This is expected to successfully reduce but not prevent the frequency of visits to the Common and so cannot be relied upon entirely to safeguard the European site. Furthermore, no effective measures are proposed that will address the behaviour of visitors (and their dogs) when on the Common. Policies H59 and E18 face no restrictions although their impact is considered to be of a much smaller scale.</u></li> <li>• <u>Drawing on experience from other heathlands across England facing similar threats, it is considered that this would be most effectively addressed by the establishment of a permanent, suitably-staffed wardening service that could focus on the management of people to ensure good behaviours are adopted. Whilst the specific wording is a matter for the Council, it is suggested that the addition of text which achieved the following purpose, added to sub-section (ii) of SS19/ST35, would allow this potential threat to be removed:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>'the introduction of an efficient wardening service that could supplement the work of existing landholders (including the MOD and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust) across the entire Common to present a physical presence on site and encourage good behaviours by the public.'</u></li> <li>• <u>This could be supplemented by the addition of the following text to the explanatory text:</u> <p><u>'A recreational strategy physical presence on site could promote good behaviours by visitors, encouraging use of existing paths and ensuring dogs are properly controlled. The necessary costs would best be secured by an appropriate levy or similar on each development''.</u></p> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>However, following a letter from Natural England which did not accept these conclusions regarding recreational pressures, visitor surveys of Strensall Common were conducted. The evidence in the visitor surveys informed further consideration of the LSE of the plan on designated conservation sites, and an Appropriate Assessment, as reported in the updated HRA (Feb 2019). The HRA (Feb 2019) determined that the scale of the predicted increase in visitor numbers of 24%, the uncertainty surrounding the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and the associated increase in the worrying of livestock (given the importance of the grazing regime to site management and the achievement of the conservation objectives) ensures that adverse effects on integrity of Strensall Common SAC cannot be ruled out.</u></b></p> <p><u>Other</u></p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<p>Within the site itself there are potential areas of ecological interest including protected species (bats, great crested newts, invertebrates) and potential areas of higher value habitat. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment undertaken on behalf of the landowner in March 2017 recommends further work is needed to fully assess the impacts on these biodiversity assets. <u>There is therefore a gap in detailed evidence for these assets to understand implications as a result of development.</u></p> <p>There are a good number of well established, high quality trees on site that the development should seek to preserve. At least all trees of category A and B, and any with a significant ecological value should be retained unless they pose an unreasonable restriction on development and their contribution to the public amenity and amenity of the development is very limited, and their loss is outweighed by the benefits and mitigation provided by the development.</p> <p><u>Scrub encroachment is a major threat to lowland heath and to manage this Strensall Common is managed under Environmental Stewardship using sheep and cattle grazing by an adjacent tenanted farmer. Interruption to this management regime or factors making it unviable could undermine the conservation objectives for the Common and have a potentially negative effect on the integrity of the site.</u></p> <p><del>In conclusion</del> <u>On balance</u>, this site is scored as having a significant negative impact given the adjacency to the Strensall Common and outstanding issues in relation to ecological interest including protected species, given that <b>Furthermore, the HRA (Feb 2019) concludes that adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC arising from increased recreational pressure and visior disturbance cannot be ruled out. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the site would not undermine the conservation objectives for Strensall Common SAC. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the HRA (2018) concludes that development is not likely to have adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC.</b> further evidence and Appropriate Assessment is required to fully assess the impacts on ecology both within the site boundaries and the neighbouring SAC / SSSI. <b>The impact of development of this site will be contingent on limiting the significant negative impact on Strensall Common this objective.</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>HRA states Appropriate Assessment is required</del></li> <li>Comprehensive evidence base is required to determine ecological issues <u>in relation to protected species and potential areas of higher value habitat in detail and produce a sufficient mitigation strategy.</u></li> <li><del>To satisfy the HRA, the addition of the following wording to sub-section (ii) of Policy SS19: 'the introduction of an efficient wardening service that could supplement the work of existing landholders (including the MOD and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust) across the entire Common to present a physical presence on site and encourage good behaviours by the public'.</del></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That development would follow the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts then to mitigate unavoidable impacts, and, as a last resort, to compensate for unavoidable residual impacts.</li> <li>For hydrological impacts the shadow HRA produced on behalf of the site promoter is accurate and remains relevant.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>



# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*		
			<p><del>The outcome of Appropriate Assessment</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Alternative designs which avoid impacts and mitigation measures are to be determined through masterplanning. This creates uncertainty as to the scale and significance of any effects. The mitigation measures will need to be refined through the detailed planning application stage, including ecological receptor-specific evaluation.</del></li> </ul>		
<p>9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.</p>	<p>Re-use previously developed land; Prevent pollution contaminating the land and remediate any existing contamination; Safeguard soil quality, including the best and most versatile agricultural land; Protect or enhance allotments; Safeguard mineral resources and encourage their efficient use.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #90EE90; text-align: center;">+</td> <td style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;">-</td> </tr> </table>	+	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>This site is composed of both brown and Greenfield land, currently occupied by the army barracks which are set to be vacated and cleared for development.</p> <p>Preliminary assessment has identified potential ground contamination issues so an appropriate contamination assessment would need to be undertaken to establish required mitigation. Preliminary evidence by the site promoter advises that the site would be investigated and any threats removed prior to them vacating the site.</p> <p>As this site involves redevelopment of previously developed land there is some positive effect, however the development of Greenfield land and negatives impacts on neighbouring protected land (as detailed further in objectives 8 and 10) that will arise from development mean this has been assessed as also having a negative effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any contamination of the site needs to be remediated appropriately for the proposed use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The evidence base has appropriately identified contamination issues and this will be dealt with appropriately through the remediation strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>n/a</li> </ul>
+	-				
<p>10. Improve water efficiency and quality.</p>	<p>Conserve water resources and quality; Improve the quality of rivers and groundwaters.</p>	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The site is not located within a Source Protection Zone. The increase in local population is expected to increase the demand on water resources, which has the potential for a negative effect on water quality. There is the potential for measures such as water metering, water harvesting and other efficiency measures to result in a reduction of per capita water consumption.</p> <p>An increase in population will have an inevitable negative impact on water usage and consumption. Yorkshire Water's Water Resources Management Plan 2014 has weighed up the demand and supply of water for the forthcoming 25 years until 2039/40. The demand model has inbuilt assumptions regarding the projected population and households as well as the projected effects of climate change, leakage, implemented water efficiency measures and assumed new homes in accordance with Building Regulations. York lies within the Grid SWZ zone within Yorkshire Water's area, which identifies a deficit between supply and demand from 2018/19 is 2.67MI/d, increasing to 108.65MI/d by 2039/40. A range of</p>		



# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<p>solutions are proposed to ultimately meet the forecast supply demand deficit in the Grid SWZ as well as development of existing or new assets. The options selected include leakage reduction, use of an existing river abstraction licence, three groundwater schemes and customer water efficiency. As the plan period stretches out, there is less certainty with regard to the mix of measures to be used and they are also likely to be revised in the next WRMP, to be adopted in 2019.</p> <p>The scale of the development should allow mitigation measures to be incorporated through design, layout and the incorporation of efficiency schemes such as rainwater harvesting to also mitigate impacts on this objective.</p> <p>The sustainability statement accompanying a development proposal/masterplanning should demonstrate how measures to conserve water have been incorporated to ensure that development makes a positive contribution to this objective in the long-term. A preliminary sustainability statement should outline that any development would promote rainwater harvesting and grey water systems.</p> <p>Ultimately through design and the WRMP, the increase in demand should be accommodated but given the potential impacts, this has been assessed as having a negative impact on this objective given the uncertainty related to implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into the design and layout of the site to minimise use of resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yorkshire Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)(2014) delivers measures to minimise the deficit between demand and supply through their mitigation measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• n/a</li> </ul>
<p>11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.</p>	<p>Promote reduction, re-use, recovery and recycling of waste; Promote and increase resource efficiency.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>An increase in population will have an inevitable impact on waste generation and use of materials. The site would need to be incorporated into the citywide recycling schemes to manage the arising waste and to minimise impacts on landfill.</p> <p>Waste arising from the remediation and construction of the site should be processed according to the waste hierarchy as far as possible.</p> <p>Overall the impacts of this site are likely to be negative but there is an opportunity to offset part of this through the implementation of waste management and recycling schemes.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In order to maximise the reuse of materials and minimise landfill waste, the site should be incorporated into the citywide recycling schemes and occupants be encouraged to recycle as much as possible.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It is assumed that waste is processed according to the waste hierarchy during the construction and remediation phases.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The level of waste processed during the construction and remediation phases is unknown.</i></li> </ul>
<p>12. Improve air quality.</p>	<p>Reduce all emissions to air from current activities;</p> <p>Minimise and mitigate emissions to air from new development (including reducing transport emissions through low emission technologies and fuels);</p> <p>Support the development of city wide low emission infrastructure;</p> <p>Improve air quality in AQMAs and prevent new designations;</p> <p>Avoid locating development where it could negatively impact on air quality;</p> <p>Avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality where it could result in negative impacts on the health of future occupants/users;</p> <p>Promote sustainable and integrated transport network to minimise the use of the car.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>There are no AQMAs adjacent to this site, located beyond the outer ring road the essentially rural setting of the development means air quality is unlikely to be an issue at present. However the potential for increased congestion/ traffic flows associated with both construction and operational traffic, air quality will likely deteriorate in future. There may also be short-term adverse impacts arising from construction activities relating to, for example, on-site HGV movements, dust and emissions associated with the use of machinery.</p> <p>Proposals for development of the site should adhere to policies within the Local Plan to mitigate impacts on air quality through the citywide low emissions policy with the incorporation of low emissions technologies and promotion of sustainable travel/non-car modes of travel, particularly for short journeys. Incorporating services and facilities within the site should help to ensure local provision within a short-distance. Also, the site masterplanning will need to demonstrate that pedestrian and cycle paths are incorporated to help encourage walking and cycling. The scale of effects will be related to the success and up-take of low emissions solutions on the site as well as sustainable travel behaviour of residents in the long-term.</p> <p>Overall the impact of this site could be negative subject to the implementation of mitigation and ensuring the occupants on site have sustainable travel behaviour.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Appropriate assessments undertaken to understand the traffic impact of the site to enable air quality mitigation measures to be appropriately identified.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>n/a</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>There is some uncertainty on the scale of impacts from development, which will be able to be more fully identified following masterplanning of the site.</i></li> </ul>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
<p>13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.</p>	<p>Reduce risk of flooding; Ensure development location and design does not negatively impact on flood risk; Deliver or incorporate through design sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs).</p>	<p>o ?</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1 so is at essentially no or extremely low risk of flooding, however the north-eastern corner touches Flood Zone 2. It is also known that at present parts of the land are frequently saturated with standing water.</p> <p>Surface water flooding is an identified issue within York. The scale of the development should allow for the incorporation of mitigation techniques for the management of surface water flooding such as sustainable drainage (SUDs), the details of which would need to be included in any masterplan of the site. The drainage scheme would need to consider the impact on potential hydrological change on Strensall Common.</p> <p>The effect development of this site will have on this objective has been assessed as uncertain as its effect will largely be determined through site masterplanning and subsequent mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In order to mitigate surface water issues, the site is required to adhere to policy regarding surface water management and the incorporation of SUDs.</i></li> <li><i>Mitigation schemes need to consider in-combination effects on Strensall Common SAC.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The development of the site would require mitigation for surface water and that the site remains in flood zone 1.</i></li> <li><i>Mitigation would be in line with drainage management policies set out in the Local Plan.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>n/a</i></li> </ul>
<p>14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	<p>Promote or enhance local culture; Preserve or enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting; Preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city as identified in the Heritage Topic Paper.</p>	<p>+ -</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The site does not contain any listed buildings or conservation areas at present. With the possible exception of the Officer's Mess Hall there is unlikely to be any buildings of significance on site. However, this should be fully assessed.</p> <p>The HIA identified that the area needs to have a distinct identity from Strensall village and not just be an extension of the existing development. The existing character of the area suggests that development should proceed from east to west and maintain the sparsely developed frontage that borders Strensall road to the west.</p> <p>The HIA also identified that this was an important military site which played a wider role in its linkages to other military sites in the area and in the history of York's development as a garrison town. It is important that the area shouldn't lose the story of its identity as a military site and that careful consideration should be given to the kind of area/place being created.</p> <p>The mature trees on site, patches of woodland and hedgerows should be maintained where possible to help maintain the rural setting.</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect		Commentary*
				<p>The HIA identified that it will be necessary to identify the presence and assess the significances of archaeological deposits on site. An archaeological evaluation consisting of geophysical survey and excavation of trenches will be required. This will be used to assess the significances of archaeological features and deposits and will allow decisions about the scale and form of future mitigation measures on the site. There is a reasonable potential for survival of prehistoric and Romano-British features and deposits as well as medieval and later exploitation and occupation of the site. There is high potential for discovering water logged deposits which would be of high significance and may need to be preserved in situ – this needs to be taken into consideration through the hydrology study.</p> <p>The site will need to implement high quality design within its masterplanning to ensure that there is a positive outcome for architectural design. A poorly designed settlement or quality of building/craftsmanship could have minor harm on York in general. In addition, it is considered that any development which removes visible historic grain would be detrimental to the area. There is an opportunity however, for design to provide a distinctive place that reflects York’s existing character whilst also creating an independent identity. In order to masterplan appropriately therefore, further heritage based and landscape evidence and strategies should be developed to ensure loss or minor harm is minimised.</p> <p>Impact on this objective has been assessed as both positive and negative. Effects on the historic environment should be mitigated through high quality design.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Masterplanning needs to take considerations of the views on site to ensure that they are not obstructed through development. Further analysis is required.</i></li> <li>• <i>In defining the development, military history of the site needs to be taken into consideration so that this is not lost through merging with existing development.</i></li> <li>• <i>New development should have its own identity.</i></li> <li>• <i>Heritage, archaeology and landscape assessments are required to understand significance and mitigation required. The outcomes of this should be fed into masterplanning.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>n/a</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Further analysis is required to understand the specific views into/out of the site. This will need to feed into the masterplan of the site.</i></li> </ul>
<p>15. Protect and enhance York’s natural and built landscape.</p>	<p>Preserve or enhance the landscape including areas of landscape value; Protect or enhance geologically important sites; Promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural</p>	+	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The military barracks have formed part of the wider landscape for a number of years. Development is predominantly low density development. Strensall Common forms part of the context of the site with the military training area/ rifle ranges within the Common.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) identified that the area needs to have a distinct identity from Strensall village and not just be an extension of the existing development. The existing character of the area suggests that development should proceed from east to west and maintain the sparsely developed frontage that borders Strensall road to the west. It will be important that the military history of the site be taken into</p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
	<p>landscape and in line with the "landscape and Setting" within the Heritage Topic Paper.</p>	<p style="background-color: #90EE90;"> </p> <p style="background-color: #FFD700;"> </p>	<p>consideration in the design and landscaping of the site. It also identified that development may have detrimental impact to existing mature trees and the rural character within and surrounding the site. Development of the barracks site is also identified to impact upon the biodiversity of Strensall Common which informs the context of the Barracks. Further work needed on the existing grain of the site to understanding what defines the character in this area.</p> <p>The development of the site will also bring Strensall closer to Towthorpe. However, this impact is reduced as the site is already developed as a military site.</p> <p>A views analysis is required to assess the impact on views to/from the city. Properties in Strensall are generally two-storey in height any inappropriately tall buildings could disturb the character and setting of the area. There is an opportunity to create well designed housing which could reflect some existing military character while also creating an independent identity. If correctly done, this may have a positive impact on the variety of architectural character in general.</p> <p>New built development should be sure not to adversely impact on the existing character of the surrounding landscape, village and Strensall and Towthorpe Commons. Particular regard should be paid to the relationship between the commons and the eastern/southern edges of the site that are more open in character. Proposals should seek to provide a positive settlement edge that integrates the development into the surrounding countryside through appropriate open space / structural planting and the avoid of visually intrusive built development. There are also opportunities to remove unsightly existing security fencing.</p> <p>To avoid disrupting the natural landscape existing tree cover that is of intrinsic value, of character and/ or affords amenity within the site and surrounding landscape should be retained (subject to Tree Survey in accordance with BS 5837:2012). Other landscape elements, features and characteristics (such as the parkland character of the landscape and setting of key buildings to be retained) that are of intrinsic value and form positive characteristics within the site and surrounding village should be conserved. The outdoor sports facilities should be retained subject to consultation with the council and Sport England regarding their need.</p> <p>The scheme design should form part of a wider green infrastructure network of multi-functional green space/ green corridors, which seeks to maintain, enhance and create connectivity with off-site green infrastructure (notably the Towthorpe and Strensall Common strategic assets).</p> <p>On balance there is potential for development of the site to have both positive and negative impacts on this objective as the effect it will have on the rural landscape, Strensall village and historical significance of the former barracks site will largely be determined through design.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Identification of views on the site to help inform the landscape strategy should be undertaken. This will help to maximise opportunities for informing the masterplanning process and increase design quality.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A former mixed used site can be enhanced through re-development.</i></li> <li>• <i>Preliminary evidence by the site promoter remains valid.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

# ST35: Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall

(Site ref: 934)

SA Objective	Sub-objective (Will the site...?):	Effect	Commentary*
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%; background-color: #90EE90; height: 100%;"></div> <div style="width: 45%; background-color: #FFD700; height: 100%;"></div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of effects will be determined through the masterplanning process and appropriate landscape strategy.</li> </ul>

**Summary**

Objective 8 has been assessed a significant negative effect, partly due to the fact that development may adversely impact current green infrastructure within site boundaries but mainly because of the impact that re-development will have on the neighbouring Strensall Common SSSI/SAC through both physical development and greater recreational use. **The Council cannot conclude that the site would not have adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC.** Objective 4 (jobs) has been assessed as a significant negative effect because redeveloping barracks necessitates the loss of a specialist employment site however there is a minor positive effect as the development will create/sustain a number of construction jobs in the short term and in the medium to long term the expansion of services/facilities and probable development of a primary school will also create some jobs. A significant positive effect has been identified against objective 1 (housing) due to the significant number of new dwellings being created.

Objective 5 has also been assessed a positive effect also due to the provision of social housing on site.

Objectives 10, 11 and 12 are assessed as negative effects because the development of this site for residential dwellings will almost certainly increase the density of development. Though all of these impacts can be mitigated to some extent it is unlikely that water quality, the volume of waste generated or air quality will improve during construction or later occupation.

Objectives 14 and 15 are assessed as both minor positive and minor negative effects as the development of the site has the potential to sustain and promote the historical significance of the site whilst maintaining the rural landscape, high architectural quality, and independence from Strensall village however all this will be determined through masterplanning and development could negatively impact Strensall Common. Objective 6 has been assessed as both minor positive and minor negative because whilst there are existing transport links to Strensall village the promotion of soft transport links will require expansion of cycling provisions and diversion/creation of bus routes. Road safety at Strensall Road/Towthorpe Moor Land remains an issue and a full transport assessment is needed in order to fully determine the effects. Objective 7 is both minor positive and minor negative because whilst emissions during construction and occupation can be minimised through the delivery of a low-carbon construction/energy generation strategy but the extent to which they are successfully minimised is set to be determined through masterplanning and implementation. Objective 3 is minor positive and minor negative as during construction there will be some construction and trade jobs Also once built there will likely be new services/facilities and there is some uncertainty over school capacity. Objective 2 is both minor positive and minor negative impact due to the good local provision of open space and medical facilities but concerns around soft transport links and noise concern from continued use of the firing range. Objective 9 is both minor positive and minor negative as the site involves redevelopment of previously developed land, however the development of Greenfield land and increased recreational impacts on Strensall Common is a negative.

Objective 13 (flood risk) has been assessed as uncertain at this stage because small parts of the site are in flood zone 2 and there could be issues with drainage on site, once again the effect will be determined through masterplanning.

**This site has a bespoke policy within the Local Plan guiding the principle of its development and covering the issues raised here.**

## Appendix D

### Updated Appraisal of Allocations and Alternatives – Housing

The following text and table update the appraisal of the allocations and alternatives for housing sites in the draft Local Plan. It utilises the same text and scoring as the SA Report (2018) Appendix H. Where changes to the text have been identified these are presented in underline for additional text or with ~~strike through~~ for deleted text. Where the text is not underlined or struck through it is the original text taken from the SA Report (Feb 2018) appendix and has not been changed. The Site Assessment Criteria which informed the scoring is set out in Section 2 of the SA Report Addendum.

#### Key for assessment

Symbol	Likely Effect on the SA Objective
++	The policy is likely to have a significant positive effect on the SA objective.
+	The policy is likely to have a positive effect on the SA objective.
0	No significant effect / no clear link between the policy and the SA objective.
I	Depends upon Policy Implementation (applied to GIS Assessments)
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine effect on the SA objective.
-	The policy is likely to have a negative effect on the SA objective.
--	The policy is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objective.

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
6	n/a	Land adjacent to Greystone Court, Haxby, York	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	-	--	--	0	-	-	-
11	n/a	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
13	n/a	Buffet Depot/Wheldrake Station and SE6744 ID sheet OS6247	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	-	0	I	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	-
22	SP1	The Stables Elvington	Travelling Showpeople Allocation	+	--	--	0	I	0	0	++	--	0	0	0	-
30	n/a	Land at Intake Lane Dunnington	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	--	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	--	-	--
35	ST4	Land Adj Hull Road - Grimston Bar	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	+	0	++	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-
49	n/a	Land at Brecks Lane, Strensall	General Reasonable Alternative	++	+	--	0	I	+	-	--	0	0	-	-	0
55	n/a	Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington, York	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	I	+	-	--	0	0	0	0	0
58	H8	Askham Bar Park and Ride Site	General Housing Allocation	+	+	+	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	0	0
59	H22	Heworth Lighthouse	General Housing Allocation	+	++	+	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	0	0



Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
64	H55	Land at Layerthorpe and James St	General Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	0	I	-	0	0
69	n/a	62 Mill lane Wigginton	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
72	n/a	Water Tower Land Dunnington	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	--
83	H53	Land at Main Street, Knapton	General Housing Allocation	+	+	--	0	+	0	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
95	H39	North of Church lane Elvington	General Housing Allocation	+	+	+	0	+	+	--	--	0	0	0	0	0
98	H23	Grove House EPH	General Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	I	0	-	0
99	n/a	Woolnough House EPH	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0
124	H20	Oakhaven EPH	General Housing Allocation	+	++	+	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0
125	n/a	Morrell House EPH	Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
127	H5	Lowfields former school site	General Housing Allocation	++	++	++	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	-	-
130	n/a	Land at Acomb Waterworks	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	+	+	--	++	--	I	--	-	+
131	n/a	Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
137	SH1	Land at Heworth Croft	Student Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	+/-	--	I	--	-	-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
138	n/a	York St John University playing field	Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	0	+/-	-	0	0	-	-
148	n/a	The Moor Lane 'Zero Carbon' Partnership	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	+	+	--	--	-	0	0	-	-
163	n/a	Hudson House	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	++	0	++	+	-	++	--	-	0	-	0
166	H29	Land at Moor Lane	General Housing Allocation	+	++	-	0	I	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	-
170	n/a	Pond Field	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	0	-	--	0	0	-	-
172	H7	Bootham Crescent Football Stadium	General Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	-	0
179	n/a	Whiteland Field	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	-
180	n/a	Malton Road site, york	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	++	+	0	+/-	-	0	--	-	-
182	H46	Land to North of Willow Bank and East of Haxby Road, New Earswick	General Housing Allocation	++	++	++	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	0	-	-
185	ST31	Land to the South of Tadcaster Road	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	-	0	+	+	--	--	-	0	0	-	-
187	n/a	Open Pasture Land North of Stockton Lane	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	--	0	0	-	-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
192	yes	Land RO Stockton lane off Greenfield Park Drive	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	++	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
193	n/a	West Fields Copmanthorpe	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
220	n/a	Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	--	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-
229	n/a	Land west of Beckside, elvington and land parcel SE6947 6854 & 70	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	0	-	-
247	n/a	Amalgomated sites RO Wilberforce Home/York College <sup>1</sup>	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	++	+	0	-	0	0	0	-	-
295	ST1	Amalgomated Sites at British Sugar	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	+	0	+	+	--	++	--	0	-	+/-	+/-
298	n/a	Amalgomated Sites at Connaught Court Care Home	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	++	+	--	++	0	I	--	-	-

<sup>1</sup> Please note that only the colour has been corrected for SAO1, SAO2 and SAO5/6. There are no changes to scoring.

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
307	n/a	Amalgomated sites at James Street	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	++	+	-	++	0	I	--	0	0
320	n/a	Amalgomated Sites at New Lane Huntington	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	--	0	0	-	-	0
322	n/a	Amalgomated sites South of Strensall	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	-	--	--	0	0	-	-
472	H1	Former Gas Site 24 Heworth Green	General Housing Allocation	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	0	-	-	-	0
627	n/a	Land at frederick House East of Fulford	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	++	+	0	++	0	-	0	-	0
629	n/a	The Retreat, Heslington Road	Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	0	I	0	-	-
654	n/a	Land at Mill Mount	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	-	0	-	0
656	H10	Barbican Centre	General Housing Allocation	++	+	+	0	++	+	0	++	0	-	0	-	0
677	H38	Land RO Rufforth Primary School	General Housing Allocation	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
719	ST16a	Terrys Carpark	Strategic Housing Allocation	+	++	+	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	+/-	+/-
723	n/a	Amalgomated Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
726	n/a	Wheatlands	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	++	+	-	--	--	0	0	0	-
737	n/a	Stockhill Field	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-
738	n/a	Land on South side of Intake Lane, Dunnington	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	--	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	--	-	-
742	E16	Upper Poppleton Garden Centre	Employment Allocation	+	+	-	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	0	0
744	n/a	Bull Balks	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-
748	n/a	Adjacent Stamford Bridge Road Dunnington	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	-	-
757	n/a	Haxby Hall EPH	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	-
758	n/a	Broad Highway Wheldrake	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
779	n/a	South of Boroughbridge Road	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	+	0	++	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
789	n/a	Land to the West of Beckside Elvington	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	+	+	-	+/-	0	0	0	-	-
791	n/a	East and West of Askham lane Acomb	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	0	-	-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
800	n/a	Safeguarded Land SF7 Land South of Designer Outlet	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	--	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	--	-	--
823	ST9	North of Haxby	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
824	n/a	Terry's Chocolate Factory	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	--	0	0	-	-
827	n/a	Water Tower, Dunnington	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
828	H56	Land at Hull Road	General Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	-	0
832	H6	RO the square Tadcaster Road	General Housing Allocation	0	+	+	0	++	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	-
840	n/a	South of the Designer Outlet, West of the A19	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	--	0	+	+	-	--	--	0	--	-	-
848	ST14	Land to the West of Wigginton Road	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	-	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-/--
849	ST8	Revised north of Monks Cross	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	-	0	++	+	0	--	--	0	0	0/-	0/-
850	ST7	Amalgamated east of Metcalfe lane	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	-	0	+	+	0	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	-/--
851	ST15	Land to the west of Elvington lane	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	--	--	0	I	+	-	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	-/--

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
853	H3	Revised Burnholme School	General Housing Allocation	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
854	n/a	Revised Lowfields School	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
855	ST33	Amalgamated sites at Wheldrake	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	-	0	I	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0/-	0/-
859	n/a	FSC Proposed Housing Allocation North of Escrick	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	-	--	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
861	n/a	The Retreat South	Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	I	0	-	-
862	n/a	The Retreat North	Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	0	I	0	--	-
867	n/a	The Derwent Arms Osbalwick	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	+/-	--	0	--	-	--
872	n/a	ST12 alternative boundary	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	-
874	n/a	Riverside Gardens Elvington	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	+	+	--	+/-	--	0	--	-	-
877	n/a	ST15 alternative	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	--	-	0	I	+	-	+/-	--	0	--	-	--
878	n/a	Land at Victoria Farm Close Ruffoth	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0-2 <sup>2</sup>	0	0

<sup>2</sup> Please note - the incorrect symbol was included in this cell in the SA Report (2018). There is no change in scoring but the correct 'neutral' symbol '0' is now included.

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
879	n/a	Land off Maythorpe Ruffoth	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	I	+	-	--	-	0	0-1 <sup>3</sup>	0	0
885	n/a	Minster Equine Veterinary Clinic	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0
886	n/a	South of Wyevale garden Centre	General Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	++	+	-	--	0	0	0	0	-
888	n/a	Land North of Langwith Lakes	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	--	--	0	I	+	-	+/-	--	0	--	-	-
899	n/a	York Road Dunnington Reduced Boundary	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	-	-
901	n/a	Land between The Village and the railway line Strensall	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	-	+/-	--	0	0	-	--
903	n/a	North Lane Skelton	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	-	++	0	0	0	0	0
905	n/a	ST8 Alternative boundary	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	++	+	-	--	--	0	0	-	-
906	ST5	York Central	Strategic Housing/ Employment Allocation	++	++	++	0	++	+	--	++	--	--	--	-/?	+/-
908	n/a	Extended Land to the Rear of Rufforth Primary	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0

<sup>3</sup> Please note - the incorrect symbol was included in this cell in the SA Report (2018). There is no change in scoring but the correct 'neutral' symbol '0' is now included.



Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
910	ST2	Civil Service Sports Ground	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	+	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
913	n/a	ST8 Alt with nature reserve to east and sports to west	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	++	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	--
914	n/a	ST8 Alt with Land to North and nature Reserve to east	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	++	+	-	--	--	0	0	-	--
915	n/a	ST14 Alt Option 1 1350 Homes	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	0	0	-
923	n/a	Phase 1 Land East of Station Road South of Railway Poppleton	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	++	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	-	--
926	n/a	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	0	--
927	ST16b	Land to the South of Terrys	Strategic Housing Allocation	+	++	+	0	+	+	-	++	-	0	0	+/-	+/-
929	ST32	Hungate	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	+	0	++	+	-	++	-	I	--	--/?	--/?
930	H31	Revised Eastfield Lane Dunnington	General Housing Allocation	+	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	0	0
931	ST17a	Former Almond and Cream blocks ST17a	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	++	0	++	+	0	++	-	0	0	+/-	+/-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
932	ST17b	Nestle South ST17b	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	I	0	+/-	+/-
934	ST35 n/a	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 1	<del>Strategic Housing Allocation</del> Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	+	+	--	+/-	--	0	-	+/-	+/-
935	n/a	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 2	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	+	--	+/-	0	0	-	0	-
936	H59 n/a	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall – Howard Road, Strensall	<del>General Housing Allocation</del> General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	I	+	--	+/-	0	0	-	0	-
937	n/a	Main Imphal Barracks 1	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	++	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	--	0	-	--
938	H58	Clifton Without Primary School	General Housing Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	-	0
939	n/a	Imphal Red Line Yellow fill 2	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	-	0	-	-
944	n/a	ST12 alternative boundary	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
946	H52	Willow House EPH, Long Close Lane	General Housing Allocation	+	+	-	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	-	0	-	0
947	n/a	Land at Cherry Lane	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	0	0	-	-

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
949	n/a	Land West of Wigginton Road Post PSC Officer Proposal	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
951	ST36	Main Imphal Barracks Officer Discussion	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	+	+	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	--	0	--/?	--/?
953	n/a	Poppleton Garden Centre Expanded	General Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	0	0
955	ST20	Castle Gateway	Strategic Allocation	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	--	--	--	-/?	+/-
956	n/a	Milstone Avenue Rufforth	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	+/-	0	0	0	0/-	0/-
959	n/a	Land at Kettlestring Way	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0
964	n/a	Galtres Garden Village	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	+	+	-	--	--	0	0	-	--
965	n/a	Land South of Rufforth Airfield	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	+	+	0	+/-	0	0	0	0/-	0
967	n/a	Land to the North of North Lane Wheldrake	General Reasonable Alternative	++	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-/--
968	n/a	Land to the North of Avon Drive	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	n/a	-	--
971	n/a	Land to the South of Southfields Road Strensall	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	-	+/-	0	0	0	-	--

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
974	n/a	Alt PPC ST14 Option 1725 Homes	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	I	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-/--
975	n/a	Alt PPC ST14 Option 2200 Homes	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-/--
976	n/a	Site to the West of H39	General Reasonable Alternative	+	++	+	0	+	+	-	--	0	0	0	-	0
979	n/a	ST15 Langwith PPC Submission	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	--	--	0	I	+	-	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	-/--
980	n/a	North of Haxby excluding Cemetery expansion land	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	--	0	0	-	-
981	n/a	ST7 PPC Alternative Boundary for 1225 Homes	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	+	+	0	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	--
984	n/a	ST15 Post PPD consultation alternative	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	--	--	0	I	+	-	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	-/--
986	n/a	ST7 Post PPC Officer Recommendation	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	+	-	0	+	+	0	+/-	--	0	--	-/--	-/--
987	n/a	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission	Strategic Reasonable Alternative	++	++	++	0	++	+	--	++	--	--	--	-/?	+/-
988	n/a	H2a potential allocation	General Reasonable Alternative	+	+	-	0	++	+	-	+/-	0	0	n/a	-/--	-/--

Call for Sites Ref	Local Plan Ref	SITE NAME	Status at Publication Draft	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5 / SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14	SAO15
989	n/a	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission 2	Strategic Housing Allocation	++	++	++	0	++	+	--	+/-	--	--	--	-/?	+/-
990	n/a	<u>Limetrees Peppermill House</u>	<u>General Reasonable Alternative</u>	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	--	0/-	0
992	n/a	<u>Limetrees Cherrytree House</u>	<u>General Reasonable Alternative</u>	+	++	+	0	++	+	-	++	0	0	0	0/-	0
993	n/a	<u>New Site Wetherby Road</u>	<u>General Reasonable Alternative</u>	+	+	-	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	0	0/-	0/-
997	n/a	<u>Amended Site at Common Road Dunnington</u>	<u>General Reasonable Alternative</u>	+	++	+	0	+	+	0	--	0	0	--	-	-



## Appendix E:

### Updated Site Audit Trail

The following text and table updates the Site Audit Trail for general housing sites. It utilises the same text as the SA Report (2018) Appendix K (Table K.3.1). Where changes to the text have been identified these are presented in underline for additional text or with ~~strikethrough~~ for deleted text. Where the text is not underlined or struck through it is the original text taken from the SA Report (Feb 2018) appendix and has not been changed.

All of the sites which passed criteria 1 to 4 in the site selection process were considered reasonable but some were not chosen as allocations. Between Pre-Publication consultation 2017 and Publication 2018 the list of reasonable sites has been subject to further technical officer analysis which included updates to availability and deliverability, analysis of further evidence in relation to show stoppers and technical officer comments. Additional sites submitted to the Council at the Publication stage, that are considered reasonable alternatives, have also been added to the table. The following table summarises this information.

#### General Housing Alternatives passing Criteria 1 to 4

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
6	Land adjacent to Greystone Court, Haxby, York	3.486	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H37		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee in July 2017 or Jan 2018.
8	Land North of Church Lane	1.744	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 903 - Previous allocation H34		N/A
11	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	3.145	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
13	Buffet Depot/Wheldrake Station and SE6744 ID sheet OS6247	4.786	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H49 now reasonable alt to ST33	ST33	Rejected – The Site was rejected due to an alternative boundary being selected – See Appendix K Part 2
22	The Stables Elvington	1.58	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As SP1	SP1	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the Gypsy and Traveller use.
25	Sessions of York	0.466	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
30	Land at Intake Lane Dunnington	0.749	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected at technical officer comments as it is an isolated site separated from Dunningtons main urban area.
35	Land Adj Hull Road - Grimston Bar	7.54	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST4	ST4	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for. See Appendix k Part 2.
37	Ford Garage Jockey Lane	1.665	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for Retail only		N/A
45	Grain Stores	7.727	No	Unreasonable - Under Construction	ST3	See aneex K Part 2
49	Land at Brecks Lane, Strensall	3.94	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H27		Rejected - The site was rejected due to impacts on landscape.
55	Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington, York	4.055	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H26		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and cultural heritage impacts.
58	Askham Bar Park and Ride Site	1.574	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H8	H8	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and is a brownfield site in a sustainable location for housing development.



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
59	Heworth Lighthouse	0.29	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H22 - with Permission	H22	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing in a sustainable location.
64	Land at Layerthorpe and James St	0.228	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation E4 - Housing Allocation H55	H55	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a brownfield for housing site in a sustainable location.
69	62 Mill lane Wigginton	0.393	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - Site was rejected as under threshold
72	Water Tower Land Dunnington	4.585	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H33		Rejected – The Site was rejected due to impacts on the landscape and cultural heritage.
74	York Road, Dunnington	6	No	Unreasonable –Isolated from Village		N/A
76	Duncombe Farm, Strensall	34.35	No	Unreasonable - to protect the regional green corridor any development would be separated from the main urban area by over 250m		N/A
80	Land north of Woodland Chase, York	0.367	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
83	Land at Main Street, Knapton	0.329	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H53	H53	Selected - The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for housing in Knapton.
95	North of Church lane Elvinton	0.917	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H39	H39	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing as a natural extension to the village and in a sustainable location close to local facilities.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
98	Grove House EPH	0.246	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H23	H23	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site in a sustainable location.
99	Woolnough House EPH	0.293	Yes	Reasonable - Previously allocated As H21		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.
120	Beckfield Lane former HWS	0.487	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
121	Burnholme School	2.476	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 853 - Alternative boundary to H3		N/A
124	Oakhaven EPH	0.333	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H20	H20	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site in a sustainable location
125	Morrell House EPH	0.232	No	Reasonable - Previously allocated As H51		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.
127	Lowfields former school site	3.64	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H5	H5	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing with Brownfield redevelopment opportunities in a sustainable location.
130	Land at Acomb Waterworks	1.076	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected due to unsuitable adjacent uses and flood risk concerns
131	Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	5.498	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST13		Rejected - The site was rejected due to adverse impacts of achieving suitable access to the site. See appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
132	Land at Cherry Lane	0.902	No	Unreasonable - to protect nature conservation the issues the remaining developable area is covered by site 947 - Alt boundary to Previous allocation H2b		N/A
137	Land at Heworth Croft	1.69	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation SH1	SH1	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for specialist housing.
138	York St John University playing field	4.75	Yes	Unreasonable - Alternative boundary to H56		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
148	The Moor Lane 'Zero Carbon' Partnership	16.865	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST10 –		Rejected - land pending further investigations into impacts on Askham Bogg SSSI – See Appendix K Part 2
163	Hudson House	0.676	Yes	Reasonable - With Permission		Rejected – Preferred Used would have been employment – however site now has planning permission for office to residential conversion
166	Land at Moor Lane	2.648	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H29	H29	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for housing.
170	Pond Field	5.706	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected primarily due to the landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K part 2
171	Lime tree Farm	0.755	No	Unreasonable - to protect openspace the only remaining developable area contains existing structures		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
172	Bootham Crescent Football Stadium	1.721	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H7	H7	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for redevelopment for housing.
179	Whiteland Field	1.386	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H54		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns around deliverability in light of electricity lines crossing the site buffer required to railway line.
180	Malton Road site, york	1.938	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H50		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts.
181	Land East of Grimston Bar	5.7	No	Unreasonable - remaining area same as 847 – Alternative boundary to ST6		See Appendix K Part 2
182	Old School Playing Field	2.74	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H46	H46	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a well contained site in the landscape in a sustainable location.
183	Land to the North of Escrick	9.66	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 859		See appendix K part 2
185	Land to the South of Tadcaster Road	7.578	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST31	ST31	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See appendix K part 2
187	Open Pasture Land North of Stockton Lane	5.91	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST30		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts See appendix K Part 2
189	Monks Cross North	18.821	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by		N/A
191	Land North of Avon Drive		No	Unreasonable – Superseded by site 968		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
192	Land RO Stockton lane off Greenfield Park Drive	0.767	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H12		Rejected – Site was rejected due to access concerns however site now has planning consent.
193	West Fields Copmanthorpe	0.82	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H40		Rejected – Site was rejected due to concerns regarding the impact on the greenbelt and ability to establish robust boundaries
194	Manor Farm Yard	0.254	No	Unreasonable - No Willing Landowner - Previous allocation H43		N/A
197	Bristows Garage	0.217	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for Retail only		N/A
200	Severus Hill	1.126	No	Unreasonable- Sinc in the middle of the site does not allow logical parcel for development.		N/A
202	St Joseph's Monastery	2.615	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
220	Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton	9.535	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to not having sustainable access to services or public transport and development would compromise setting of York and Knapton village – See appendix K part 2
226	Site A Land off Main Street Nether Poppleton	3.147	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 350m away from the urban edge		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
227	Site B - land off Ouse Moor Lane Nether Poppleton	0.701	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historical character and setting of York the remaining land would be a thin 20m wide undevelopable strip separated from the urban edge by over 250m		N/A
229	Land west of Beckside, Elvington and land parcel SE6947 6854 & 70	4.439	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as failed technical officer comments, overlaps with site 789 and has the same landscape and visual impact concerns
247	Land at Wilberforce Home	2.052	Yes	Reasonable – Alternative boundary to H6		Rejected – Site was rejected as alternative boundary was selected to protect the amenity and views of residents of the existing care adjacent care facility
271	Land alongside A64	0.592	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 786		N/A
293	York Central	67.955	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 989 - Alternative Boundary to ST5		See Appendix K Part 2
295	Amalgomated Sites at British Sugar	40.697	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST1	ST1	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
297	Amalgomated Sites off main Street Elvington	8.21	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 874 and 875		See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
298	Amalgomated Sites at Connaught Court Care Home	2.174	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H47 - With Permission		Rejected – Site rejected as now has planning consent
300	Amalgomated sites Eastfield Lane, Dunnington	2.512	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 930 - Alternative Boundary to H31		N/A
303	Amalgomated sites off Stockton Lane	2.384	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 250m away from the urban edge		N/A
305	Amalgomated sites South of Haxby	3.486	No	Unreasonable - Developable area covered by site 6?Alternative Boundary previous allocation H37		N/A
307	Amalgomated sites at James Street	0.225	Yes	Reasonable - Previously allocated E5 – Part with Permission	E5	Rejected - Site rejected as part of site now has consent for 102 student units and remainder is under threshold.
308	Amalgomated sites RO Wilberforce Home/York College	2.052	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is considered entirely by Ste 247 - Alternative Boundary to H6		N/A
317	Amalgomated Sites North of Moor Lane Woodthorpe	1.35	No	Unreasonable – remaining developable area covered by site 791 - Part previous allocation H9		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
318	Amalgomated Sites at Layerthorpe	0.638	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
320	Amalgomated Sites at New Lane Huntington	13.757	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST11		Rejected - The site was rejected due to impacts on landscape and cultural heritage - See Appendix K part 2
321	Amalgomated sites at Millfield lane/A59	11	No	Unreasonable – part built out - Superseded by Site 910 – Alternative boundary to ST2		See Appendix K Part 2
322	Amalgomated sites South of Strensall	2.532	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H30		Rejected - The site was rejected due to access concerns.
327	Amalgomated sites between Knapton and Westfield	0.324	No	Unreasonable - remaining area same as site 779		N/A
329	Amalgomated sites North of Monks Cross	70.682	No	Unreasonable - Amalgomated Boudnary - no willing landowner for whole site - Alternative Boundary to ST8		See Appendix K Part 2
456	Hungate	2.43	No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by site 829 – Alternative boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
470	Terrys Chocolate Factory	9.454	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 824 - Alternative Boundary to ST16		See Appendix K part 2



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
472	Former Gas Site 24 Heworth Green	3.536	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H1	H1	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site for housing with good access to services and facilities.
485	Nestle South	7.129	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by 931 and 932 - Alternative Boundary to ST17		See Appendix K part 2
560	Brecks Lane, Huntington	5.25	No	Unreasonable – Development Completed. Previously Allocated as ST28		See Appendix K part 2
579	Land adj. 131 Long Ridge Lane	0.202	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H45		N/A
580	Land at Blairgowerie House, Main Street	1.499	No	Unreasonable - superseded by Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan		N/A
587	Land at York RI Rugby Ground	0.412	No	Unreasonable - remaining land is the club house servicing the adjacent openspace		N/A
596	Land adj. 26 & 38 Church lane	0.547	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H41		N/A
597	Builders Yard, Church Lane	0.335	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H42		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
598	South of Moor Lane	2.671	No	Unreasonable - remaining land consists of an operational garden nurse and a thin strip of land. Historic site - no longer a willing landowner		N/A
618	Land RO Surgery & 2a/2b Petercroft Lane	0.233	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner - Previous Allocation H44		N/A
623	Land Adjacent to Grimston Bar and A1079	13.293	No	Unreasonable		N/A
624	MOD Land Fulford	0.221	No	Unreasonable - Not Currently available		N/A
626	Land at Breary Close	0.323	No	Unreasonable - Historical Site - No willing Landowner		N/A
627	Land at Frederick House East of Fulford	0.777	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H11		Rejected - the site was rejected due to heritage and access concerns.
629	The Retreat, Heslington Road	6.098	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - the site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
631	Burnholme WMC, Burnholme Drive	0.432	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
642	Elm Tree Garage Car Park	0.316	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
645	Land west of Haxby Road	1.223	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
649	Car park, High Newbiggin Street	0.605	No	Unreasonable - historical Site - no willing landowner		N/A
651	Heworth Green North (Forum Site)	0.209	No	Unreasonable - Part with permission and access. Remaining land under threshold		N/A
654	Land at Mill Mount	0.363	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H19		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the access and design concerns.
656	Barbican Centre	0.963	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocations H10	H10	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use for housing. The site is Brownfield in a sustainable location.
657	Peel St/ Margret St	0.408	No	Unreasonable - Historic Site - No willing landowner		N/A
660	Land at Marygate	0.506	No	Unreasonable - Development Completed		N/A
677	Land RO Rufforth Primary School	0.988	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H38	H38	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a well contained site in a sustainable location.
685	End of Great North Way, York Business park	2.978	No	Unreasonable - Under Construction		N/A
688	Land to the West of Knapton	5.6	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 780 and 796		N/A
690	Amalagamated North of Haxby	24.906	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 823 and 846 - Alternative Boundary to ST9		See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
692	Amalgamated sites at New Lane Huntington	18.991	No	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST11		See Appendix K Part 2
696	Amalgamated sites off Tadcaster Road	3.486	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 947 and 988 - Alternative Boundary to Previous Site H2		N/A
697	Amalgamated Sites off Common Lane Dunnington	2.588	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated Site no willing landowner for combined site – site split by primary constraints leaving isolated parcels of land.		N/A
698	Amalgomated Sites at Clifton Moor		No	Unreasonable – Superceded by further evidence and later submissions. See Site 948. Alternative boundary to ST14		See Appendix K part 2
699	Amalgomated Development Sites East of metcalf Lane	96.858	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated site without willing landowner for whole areas - Alternative Boundary to ST7		See Appendix K part 2
700	Amalgamated Site Monks Cross Shopping Park	0.649	No	Unreasonable - willing landowner for retail only		N/A
719	Terrys Carpark	0.862	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST16	ST16a	Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for redevelopment in a sustainable location if sensitively designed. See Appendix K Part 2
723	Amalgamated Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe	29.137	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside – See appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
724	Amalgamated sites North Monks Cross Inc Cement Works	20.563	No	Unreasonable - superceeded by ST8 submissions – Previously allocated as ST18		See Appendix K part 2
725	Castle Piccadilly	0.491	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by Site 955 - Alternative Boundary to ST20		See Appendix K part 2
726	Wheatlands	6.785	Yes	Reasonable		Reacted – The sites was rejected due to impact on landscape, cultural heritage and access constraints – See Appendix K Part 2
727	South of A64		No	Unreasonable – Superceeded by further evidence and later submissions. See site 851. Alternative boundary to ST15		See Appendix K part 2
737	Stockhill Field	1.857	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
738	Land on South side of Intake Lane, Dunnington	0.829	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
742	Upper Poppleton Garden Centre	2.759	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As E16 (Former H57)		Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for employment redevelopment in a sustainable location
744	Bull Balks	1.593	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to heritage/landscape and sustainable transport concerns
748	Adjacent Stamford Bridge Road Dunnington	0.926	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to heritage/landscape and sustainable transport concerns

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
749	North of Riverside Gardens	1.472	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 874		N/A
757	Haxby Hall EPH	0.423	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H48		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over availability.
758	Broad Highway Wheldrake	0.668	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – The site was rejected due to potential impact on the greenbelt boundary
763	Land West of Upper Poppleton	10.631	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 200m away from the urban edge		N/A
764	Poppleton South	117.039	No	Unreasonable – mostly covered by land submitted for Northminster business park		N/A
773	Land North of Skelton Village	31.057	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable are would be over 350m away from the urban edge		N/A
775	East of Station Road, Poppleton	0.232	No	Unreasonable - remaining area is the same as assessed through Site 923 - duplicate		N/A
779	South of Boroughbridge Road	5.75	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST29		Rejected - The site was rejected due to concerns over landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
786	London Bridge Site 1B	6.796	No	Unreasonable - Inaccessible for housing		N/A
789	Land to the West of Becksid Elvington	5.754	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and visual impacts – See Appendix K Part 2
791	East and West of Askham lane Acomb	1.355	Yes	Reasonable - Part previous allocation H9		Rejected - Site was rejected due to defendable boundary and greenbelt concerns
792	Land off Askham Lane	1.29	No	Unreasonable – Remaining developable area completely covered by site 791 - Part previous allocation H9		N/A
799	Designer Outlet	18.32	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for retail only		N/A
800	Safeguarded Land SF7 Land South of Designer Outlet	14.501	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation ST25		Rejected – The site was rejected due to concerns regarding the potential impact on the greenbelt – See Appendix K Part 2
802	Land at Elvington Village	4.037	No	Unreasonable – Superceded by Site 874		See Appendix K part 2
804	Water Lane Caravan Park, Clifton, York	2.011	No	Unreasonable - Existing traveller site		N/A
806	Osbalwick Caravan Site, Outgang Lane, Osbalwick	0.641	No	Unreasonable - Existing traveller site		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
809	Wilberforce Home	0.521	No	Unreasonable - Landowner willing for openspace and landscaping only		N/A
810	East of Earswick	97.24	No	Unreasonable - No Longer a Willing Landowner site withdrawn		N/A
811	Dunnington Extention	5.141	No	Unreasonable – Officer defined boundary - No willing landowner		N/A
814	North of Haxby	30.28	No	Unreasonable – Officer defined boundary - No willing landowner		N/A
819	Acres Farm, Naburn	3.838	No	Unreasonable – Developable area covered entirely by site 800		N/A
820	Between Poppleton and A1237	0.258	No	Unreasonable - remaining area is the same as assessed through Site 923 - duplicate		N/A
821	Whinthorpe New Settlement	327.8	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by Further Evidence - Alternative boundary to ST15		N/A
822	North of Clifton Moor	135.378	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by Further Evidence - Alternative Boundary to ST14		N/A
823	North of Haxby	35.158	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST9	ST9	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – Appendix K Part 2



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
824	Terrys Chocolate Factory	9.443	Yes	Reasonable - Mostly developed out but part remaining relates to planning application - Allocated as ST16	ST16	Selected – The site passes CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated – This boundary has been chosen to depict the allocation on the proposals map but see also sites 719 and 927 for and b parcels. See appendix K Part 2
826	Companthorpe (safeguarded)	22.216	No	Unreasonable – without the development of site 131 (former ST13) this site would be isolated from the urban development of Copmanthorpe		N/A
827	Water Tower, Dunnington	1.658	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H33		Rejected - Due to impacts on the landscape and cultural heritage.
828	Land at Hull Road	3.985	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As H56	H56	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable for housing in a sustainable location with Brownfield redevelopment opportunities.
829	Hungate	3.094	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 929 - Previously allocated as E1 and MU1 now Alternative Boundary to ST32		See Appendix K Part 2
832	RO the square Tadcaster Road	1.52	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H6	H6	Selected- The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable and sustainable site for specialised housing.
835	Harewood Whin (for Solar)	99.957	No	Unreasonable - Unreasonable - built out for alternative purposes		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
840	South of the Designer Outlet, West of the A19	87.471	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as failed technical officer comments – See appendix K Part 2
842	Land North of Monks Cross	0.442	No	Unreasonable - Entirely considered within 849 - Alternative Boundary to ST8		N/A
845	Land to the South of Graystone Court	3.488	No	Unreasonable - to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining developable area is the same as for site 6 - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation H37		N/A
846	North of Haxby PO submitted boundary (amending 690)	26.094	No	Unreasonable - Developable area already covered by site 823 - Alternative Boundary to ST9		See Appendix K Part 2
847	Safeguarded Land North of Grimston Bar SF13 Officer agreed boundary (amending 181)	5.536	No	Unreasonable - Updated evidence shows access to site is a showstopper - Previous allocation ST6		See Appendix K Part 2
848	Land to the West of Wigginton Road	55.57	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST14	ST14	The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K part 2
849	Revised north of Monks Cross	39.307	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST8	ST8	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
850	Amalgamated east of Metcalfe lane	34.475	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST7	ST7	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K Part 2
851	Land to the west of Elvington lane	159.159	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated as ST15	ST15	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K Part 2
853	Revised Burnholme School	4.021	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H3	H3	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for housing in a sustainable location.
854	Revised Lowfields School	2.232	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to H5		Rejected - The site was rejected in preference of the larger site boundary
855	Amalagamated sites at Wheldrake	5.813	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST33	ST33	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for - See Appendix K Part 2
856	Amalgamated sites south of Tadcaster Road	8.154	No	Unreasonable - Amalgamated site - no response from landowner on area to the south - therefore superceeded by site 185 - Alternative Boundary to ST31		See Appendix K part 2
859	FSC Proposed Housing Allocation North of Escrick	6.08	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - suggested as an allocation for the post plan period (2033-2038) to reflect the current uncertainty around the position of the emerging Plan Selby however was not taken forward for allocation by Members in July 2017.

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
861	The Retreat South	3.323	Yes	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining area is covered by site 629		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
862	The Retreat North	2.613	Yes	Unreasonable – to protect the historic character and setting of York the remaining area is covered by site 629		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the significant constraints of the site and the importance of the whole site to the character setting of the City. It is considered that any future development of the site needs to be assessed through Planning application processes - See Appendix K Part 2
867	The Derwent Arms Osbaldwick	0.994	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to cultural heritage impacts and ecological and landscape concerns.
872	ST12 alternative boundary	14.693	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside
874	Riverside Gardens Elvington	4.23	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward as an allocation following Executive in July 2017 or Jan 2018 - See Appendix K part 2
875	Land beyond Riverside Gardens	11.471	No	Unreasonable – Separated from the urban area – reliant on 874 being developed before could be considered		N/A
877	ST15 alternative	186.297	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
878	Land at Victoria Farm Close Ruffoth	0.953	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward as an allocation following Executive in July 2017.
879	Land off Maythorpe Ruffoth	0.666	Yes	Reasonable		
880	ST10 Alternative Boundary	16.839	No	Unreasonable - remaining boundary same as Site 148 - duplicate		N/A
881	Land to the North of Escrick with additional Biodiversity Area	11.421	No	Unreasonable – remaining developable area entirely considered under site 859		N/A
885	Minster Equine Veterinary Clinic	0.385	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The rejected for housing and considered as employment reasonable alternative.
886	South of Wyevale garden Centre	4.422	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts and distance from services and facilities.
887	Land East of Northfield Lane	12.113	No	Unreasonable – Remaining developable area is considered entirely within site 779		N/A
888	Land North of Langwith Lakes	118.355	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		
890	Luigis	0.207	No	Unreasonable – Considered under wider boundary of 953		N/A
891	Galtres Garden Village	31.485	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 922		See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
899	York Road Dunnington Reduced Boundary	0.743	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape impacts.
901	Land between The Village and the railway line Strensall	1.655	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previously allocated site H30		Rejected – Failed Technical Officer Comments
903	North Lane Skelton	1.655	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to Previous Allocation H34		Rejected – Due to heritage and access concerns
905	ST8 Alternative boundary	49.674	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
906	York Central PSC Boundary	72.464	Yes	Rreasonable - Superseded by Site 989 - Alternative Boundary to ST5		Rejected – The site was rejected in preference for an alternative boundary - See Appendix K Part 2
908	Extended Land to the Rear of Rufforth Primary	2.412	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to H38		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
910	Civil Service Sports Ground	10.433	Yes	Reasonable - Allocated As ST2	ST2	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
911	ST7 Alternative	49.649	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 986 – Alternative boundary to ST7		N/A
913	ST8 Alt with nature reserve to east and sports to west	59.471	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
914	ST8 Alt with Land to North and nature Reserve to east	71.888	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST8		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
915	ST14 Alt Option 1 1350 Homes	66.89	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
916	ST14 Alt Option 2 1725 Homes	74.935	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 974 - Alternative Boundary to ST14		N/A
918	Graham Newcombe Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Area 2	0.291	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by later boundary submission from MOD		N/A
919	Graham Newcombe Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Area 3	0.338	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by later boundary submission from MOD		N/A
922	Extended Galtres Village	76.017	No	Unreasonable – Superseded by 964		See Appendix K part 2
923	Phase 1 Land East of Station Road South of Railway Poppleton	0.515	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected - The site was rejected due to landscape and cultural heritage concerns.
924	ST15 Langwith and Elvington Airfield PSC Submission	133.282	No	Unreasonable - Superceeded by 979 - Alternative Boundary to ST15		N/A

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
926	Land to north of North Lane, Wheldrake	2.675	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previously allocated site H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee in Jan 2018
927	Land to the South of Terrys	1.183	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST16	ST16b	Selected - The site represents a Brownfield opportunity for employment redevelopment in a sustainable location See Appendix K Part 2
929	Revised Hungate Boundary	2.58	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST32	ST32	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K Part 2
930	Revised Eastfield Lane Dunnington	2.365	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H31	H31	Selected - The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for.
931	Former Almond and Cream blocks ST17a	2.352	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST17a	ST17a	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K part 2
932	Nestle SOuth ST17b	4.744	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST17b	ST17b	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location - See Appendix K part 2
933	ST7 Alt boundary	93.912	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 986 - Alternative Boundary to ST7		N/A



Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
934	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 1	29.911	Yes	Reasonable – Allocated As ST35	ST35	Selected – The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for allocation as a strategic housing site. The site offers partial Brownfield – See Appendix K Part 2 <u>Rejected – The HRA (Feb 2019) concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC cannot be avoided. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the site would not undermine the conservation objectives for Strensall Common SAC.</u>
935	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 2	0.755	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Failed Technical Officer comments given site is dominated by existing church structure
936	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall Red Line 3	0.206	Yes	Reasonable – Housing Allocation H59	H59	Selected – The Site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for. <u>Rejected – The HRA (Feb 2019) concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC cannot be avoided. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the site would not undermine the conservation objectives for Strensall Common SAC.</u>
937	Main Imphal Barracks 1	19.887	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST36		Rejected - Rejected Alternative boundary taken forward
938	Clifton Without Primary School	0.712	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H58	H58	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable Brownfield site for housing in a sustainable location.
939	Imphal Red Line Yellow fill 2	0.591	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
944	ST12 alternative boundary	17.612	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to previous allocation ST12		Rejected - The site was rejected due to the impacts on landscape and intrusion into the countryside
945	Willow House EPH PSC boundary	0.209	No	Unreasonable - Superseded by 946 - Alternative Boundary to H52		N/A
946	Willow House EPH Post PSC	0.303	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation H52	H52	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable partly Brownfield site for housing.
947	H2b Land at Cherry Lane	0.441	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H2b		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee July 2017 or Jan 2018
949	Land West of Wigginton Road Post PSC Officer Proposal	68.261	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
950	Land West of Elvington Lane Post PSC Officer Proposal	211.997	No	Unreasonable - Superceded by boundary 924 which excludes land needed by air museum		N/A
951	Main Imphal Barracks Officer Discussion	17.952	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST36	ST36	The passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a suitable site for the use allocated for – See Appendix K Part 2
953	Poppleton Garden Centre Expanded	3.326	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to E16 (Previous H57)		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee July 2017 or Jan 2018
955	Castle Gateway	21.477	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST20	ST20	Selected - This site was selected as it passes CYC site selection criteria and represents an area of opportunity for masterplanning a new gateway to the city - See Appendix K part 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
956	Milstone Avenue Rufforth	0.39	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected as was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
959	Land at Kettlestring Way	3.248	Yes	Reasonable		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
964	Galtres Garden Village	82.47	Yes	Reasonable		site was not taken forward by Members at Executive January 2018 – See appendix K Part 2
965	Land South of Rufforth Airfield	1.585	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected as failed technical officer comments
967	Land to the North of North Lane Wheldrake	3.067	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H28		Site was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018
968	Land to the North of Avon Drive	2.763	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site rejected at technical officer comments - Landscape/setting concerns regarding the impact on openness and bringing development directly adjacent to the A1237.
969	Land East of Northfield Lane South of Wyevale	1.83	No	Unreasonable – Site considered as part of wider site 726		See appendix K part 2
971	Land to the South of Southfields Road Strensall	0.309	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to Previous allocation H30		Rejected – Site was rejected as fails technical officer comments
974	Alt PPC ST14 Option 1725 Homes	79.582	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
975	Alt PPC ST14 Option 2200 Homes	93.361	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST14		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
976	Site to the West of H39	1.693	Yes	Reasonable		Rejected – Site was rejected as fails technical officer comments
978	Queen Elizabeth Barracks Strensall	28.926	No	Unreasonable - Site considered under ref 934 - Alternative boundary to ST35		N/A
979	ST15 Langwith PPC Submission	214.119	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative Boundary to ST15		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
980	North of Haxby excluding Cemetery expansion land	29.656	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST9		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
981	ST7 PPC Alternative Boundary for 1225 Homes	55.658	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST7		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
984	ST15 Post PPD consultation alternative	193.025	Yes	Reasonable - Post Pub Draft Alt		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
985	ST15 Alternative PPC submission	163.402	No	Unreasonable - Area already covered by site 877 - no new developable area		N/A
986	ST7 Post PPC Officer Recommendation	47.637	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST7		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
987	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission	45.498	Yes	Reasonable - Alternative boundary to ST5		Rejected – Alternative boundary taken forward
988	H2a potential allocation	2.289	Yes	Reasonable - Previous allocation H2a		Site as was not taken forward by members at executive committee or Jan 2018

Site Ref	Site Name	Developable Area size	Reasonable Alternative	Reasonable Alternative reason	Current Allocation Ref	Reasoning for allocation/rejection
989	ST5 York Central Team 2017 Submission 2	82.833	Yes	Reasonable - Housing Allocation ST5	ST5	Selected - The site passed the CYC site selection criteria and represents a strategic opportunity to develop a Brownfield site in a sustainable location – See Appendix K Part 2
990	<u>Limetrees Peppermill House</u>	<u>0.67</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Reasonable</u>		<u>Rejected – Site submitted during the Regulation 19 consultation at which stage the allocations required for development had been identified. Alternatives will now be considered during the examination, if required.</u>
992	<u>Cherrytree House</u>	<u>0.37</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Reasonable</u>		<u>Rejected – Site submitted during the Regulation 19 consultation at which stage the allocations required for development had been identified. Alternatives will now be considered during the examination, if required.</u>
993	<u>New Site Wetherby Road</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Reasonable</u>		<u>Rejected – Site submitted during the Regulation 19 consultation at which stage the allocations required for development had been identified. Alternatives will now be considered during the examination, if required.</u>
997	<u>Amended Site at Common Road Dunnington</u>	<u>0.86</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Reasonable</u>		<u>Rejected – Site submitted during the Regulation 19 consultation at which stage the allocations required for development had been identified. Alternatives will now be considered during the examination, if required.</u>



## Appendix F

### Updated appraisal of Spatial Strategy Policies

The policy re-appraisal utilises the same matrices and text as the SA Report (2018) Appendix F. Where changes to the SA scoring or appraisal commentary have been identified these are presented in underline for additional text or with ~~strikethrough~~ for deleted text. Where the text is not underlined or struck through it is the original appraisal text taken from the SA Report (Feb 2018) appendix and has not been changed.

Please note that for SA Objective 8, the original text is taken from the SA Report Addendum (April 2018) Appendix C. For this objective the text includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough but new amendments are in **bold**.

#### Key for assessment

Symbol	Likely Effect on the SA Objective
++	The policy is likely to have a significant positive effect
+	The policy is likely to have a positive effect
0	No significant effect / no clear link
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine effect
-	The policy is likely to have a negative effect
--	The policy is likely to have a significant negative effect

**Table F.1 Effects of Spatial Strategy (SS1-24) Policies**

\*Consideration of the likely significant effects includes short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, as appropriate.

SA Objective	Spatial Strategy												Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on effects of each policy*
	SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York	SS2: The Role of York's Green Belt	SS3: York City Centre	SS4: York Central	SS5: Castle Gateway	SS6: British Sugar/Manor School	SS7: Civil Service Sports Ground	SS8: Land adjacent to Hull Road	SS9: Land East of Metcalfe Lane	SS10: Land North of Monks Cross	SS11: Land North of Haxby	SS12: Land West of Wigginton Road		
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The effects of the majority of the policies on this Objective is predicted to be positive or significantly positive given their role in helping to meet the housing needs for the City. The scale of provision, cumulatively and associated with the strategic sites (SS3-4 and SS6 - SS12), means that a range of housing (including affordable and self/custom build) can be provided to meet specific needs of the City identified in the SHMA.</p> <p>SS1 is considered to have mixed positive and negative effects. SS1 sets out the housing requirement to deliver <u>the assessed economic led housing need of 790 dwellings per annum based on the City of York Housing Need Update 2019 prepared for the City of York Council by GL Hearn. The scale of development in SS1 is higher than an OAN plus a 15% uplift for market signals (557dpa), the baseline housing growth (a minimum of 867 dwellings per annum) over the plan period (2017/18 – 2032/33) and beyond (2032/33 to 2037/38) based on the latest (2016) CLG sub-national household growth projections; as set out in the technical work prepared by GL Hearn for the Council in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment update (2017). The scale of development meets the projected baseline growth in the City over the plan period and is considered to be the objectively assessed housing</u></p>



															<p>need for York in the explanatory text to Policy SS1. However, it does not reflect fully the upward adjustment made in the SHMA for market signals such as land prices, affordability etc (the SHMA technical work included a 10% upward adjustment is added to make a housing figure of 953dpa).</p> <p>Although minor positive effects related to the policy in relation to achieving this objective have therefore been found, minor negative effects have also been assessed in the longer term as the does not meet housing figure in the SHMA, when adjusted for market signals in line with the Planning Practice Guidance. However, the extent to which negative effects are realised is dependent on delivery of housing above the minimum provision identified in SS1 during the lifetime of the plan. Careful monitoring is required to measure the delivery of housing during the plan period.</p> <p>The scale of proposed development at the strategic sites also means that opportunities for a high degree of self-containment in basic service provision can be secured. Delivery of the policies is a long term aspiration which will cover the plan period and beyond. The cumulative effects of policy implementation will require close monitoring.</p> <p>SS5 has been assessed as having a positive effect as the redevelopment and enhancements to Castle Gateway envisaged will provide environmental and cultural benefits and greater connectivity, helping to support the sustainability of residential areas and attractiveness of the City as a place to live and work.</p> <p>Cumulatively, the policies are therefore considered to have mixed significant positive and minor negative effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As set out in the policies on strategic sites, criteria specifying how the baseline housing need as expressed in the SHMA should be met.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That housing need across the City will be met through a combination of strategic and local sites, and the proportion of affordable housing reflects local requirements.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The rate of housing delivery on strategic sites and the early provision of basic services. Additionally, the delivery above the minimum housing requirement in SS1 which may lessen potential for negative effects in the long term.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.</p>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the complexity of seeking to improve health and well-being, these policies should assist with providing the context for this to happen, through the provision of new high quality housing and mixed use development (SS1 and SS3, SS4 and SS6 - SS12), policies to promote sustainable transport and preventing unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution, including air quality (SS1) and policies for the protection and enhancement of access to open space (formal and informal) at a City-wide scale (through SS2) and in relation to strategic sites (SS3-12) where open space and service provision will accompany housing and other development.</p> <p>Policies SS3, SS4 and SS5 will also contribute positively to the enhancement and revitalisation of the city centre and Castle Gateway, including the public realm and open space improvements.</p> <p>Realisation of provision will be across the Plan period and beyond and cumulatively, the policies should result in significant positive effects if the stated mitigation criteria are adhered to.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As per criteria set out in strategic site policies SS3-12 along with monitoring of cumulative impacts.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That new and existing provision will be co-ordinated for the benefit of existing and new residents.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The consistency of implementation in respect of service provision, particularly for large strategic sites which are relatively remote from existing provision.</p>
<p>3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</p>	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The construction of new homes ((SS1 and SS3-12) could create jobs and potentially training opportunities for local people in the construction industry and raise skill levels in this sector. However, any positive effects would depend upon the approach taken by house builders as to whether training opportunities and skills development benefited local people and therefore had any positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>The scale of proposed development is such that there are significant opportunities to secure mixed use development across a number of sites, thereby offering employment opportunities and depending on the new businesses, training opportunities for existing and new residents. The extent and likely character of employment provision will vary significantly by site, with proposals for York City</p>	

														<p>Centre (SS3) and York Central (SS4) for example offering significant mixed use development opportunities for residents in the vicinity and further afield.</p> <p>Policies SS6, SS, SS10 and SS12 explicitly require onsite education provision. They have been assessed as having a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As set out in criteria associated with strategic site policies.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging employment growth and skills development.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which existing residents will benefit from the provision of employment and training opportunities, particularly in the more remote strategic sites.</p>
<p>4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Policy SS1 makes provision for the housing requirement of <u>790 dwelling per annum (equivalent to 12,640 dwellings in the sixteen years between 2017/18 and 2032/33) over 17,340 dwellings (867dpa) and 13,000 jobs (650 per annum) in the plan period between 2012/13 and 2032/2033. It and is considered to have a significant effect on creating and sustaining employment in York and in contributing to the Leeds City Region and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP Area and delivery of the York Economic Strategy (2016).</u></p> <p>The scale of proposed development, particularly at the strategic sites covered by policies SS3, SS4 and SS6-SS12, offers potential for the development of significant renewable energy-related jobs, both in construction and operation. The construction of housing will itself support significant numbers of jobs through the plan period whilst the requirement for enabling self/custom build plots (under H5) will ensure that the sites will support a diverse range of employers.</p> <p>There will also be significant employment opportunities as part of the mixed development within the existing built-up area, within the City Centre (SS3) and York Central (SS4). Policy SS6 will also provide significant employment opportunities to realise the enhancements envisaged.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

															<p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging climate change adaptation and mitigation through a switch to low-carbon energy sources.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Market-led delivery and the scale of job creation.</p>
<p>5. Help deliver equality and access to all.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p>++</p> <p>++</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The effects of these policies on this Objective is predicted to be positive or significantly positive given their role in helping to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the City.</p> <p>SS1 seeks to conserve and enhance (inter alia) areas with an important recreation function, ensure accessibility to a range of services, and maintain the city centre for main town centre uses. This will help to promote access and equality for all communities within York. SS5 promotes the revitalisation of the Castle Gateway and seeks public realm and accessibility improvements in this key location.</p> <p>The scale of provision, cumulatively and associated with the strategic mixed and housing sites (SS3, SS4 and SS6-SS12) and the proposed broad distribution means that a range of housing and community facilities can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet specific needs. The scale of proposed development also means that opportunities for a high degree of self-containment in basic service provision can be secured. Delivery of the policies is a long term aspiration which will cover the plan period and beyond. The cumulative effects of policy implementation will require close monitoring.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As set out in the policies on strategic sites, criteria specifying how housing need and demand as expressed in the SHMA should be met.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That housing need across the City will be met through a combination of strategic and local sites, and the proportion of affordable housing reflects local requirements.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The rate of housing delivery on strategic sites and the early provision of basic services.</p>	

<p>6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>++/-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Growth across the City and through the strategic sites in particular offers opportunities to develop a better integrated transport system for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors. Policy SS1 includes ensuring accessibility to sustainable transport modes as a key spatial principle, which in conjunction with other policies in the plan (notably T1) would help to reduce the need to travel. However, the provision of some <u>790 homes (equivalent to 12,640 dwellings in the sixteen years between 2017/18 and 2032/33)</u> <u>17,600 homes between 2012/13 and 2032/33</u> for an increase of approximately <u>24,000 (between 2012 and 2037)</u> <u>40,000</u> in the population will lead to an increase the number of private cars within the City. There is the potential for the increase in vehicles to lead to an increase vehicle movements, although whether that will be within the City or the strategic road network that is affected is uncertain.</p> <p>The proposed strategic sites are in some cases set apart from key areas of higher order service provision and as such are likely to generate significant car-base trips, although some degree of self-containment will be secured on the larger sites.</p> <p>By contrast, the redevelopment proposals associated with York City Centre (SS3) and York Central (SS4) offer significant opportunities to provide for the co-location of living, working, shopping and other recreation whilst Castle Gateway (SS6) will (inter alia) deliver cycle and pedestrian improvements.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As stated in Policies SS3-12.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>As part of strategic site delivery, significant improvements in sustainable transport provision can occur.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which City-wide growth, particularly associated with the strategic sites, will lead to greater or less self-containment or further spread unsustainable commuting, for example.</p>
<p>7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/ -</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The likely effects of these policies are mixed, reflecting increased emissions associated with development but also opportunities for limiting carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures, renewable energy generation and facilitating sustainable travel. Experience in the City (Derwenthorpe) and around the country suggests that whilst considerable progress is possible, there remains a significant gap to be bridged in to approach carbon neutrality. The full effects of the</p>

<p>response to its effects.</p>															<p>policies will only be measurable over the longer term and as part of an assessment of the cumulative effects of development as a whole.</p> <p>In a similar way to Objective 5 the effects of SS3-SS5 are considered to be positive, due to the location and mix of development proposed in policies SS3 and SS4, and the sustainable travel enhancements envisaged in SS6.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As outlined in Policies SS6-13, but could potentially be more radical.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The extent to which potential sustainability measures (e.g. renewable power generation) are realised, particularly on the larger strategic sites.</p>
<p>8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding greenfield land-take associated with new development (and hence potential loss or displacement of assets), there is a significant opportunity to realise improvements to the City's green infrastructure network (including open space, biodiversity and geodiversity) through new provision, making links between existing resources and enhancing the management of resources, as well access enhancement generally. Under the guidance of a comprehensive approach to green infrastructure there is potential to enhance assets and access for the benefit of existing and future residents. Long term management of resources will be critical to ensure that improvements are sustainable.</p> <p>Policy SS4 seeks to maximise connectivity in the green infrastructure network. SS6 seeks the maximisation of links to the existing green infrastructure network and delivery of new green infrastructure as part of the Acomb/River Ouse corridor. SS10 seeks an increase in biodiversity and conn3ctivity within the natural environment.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) preliminary screening screened out the policies in this section for their likely significant effects alone or in combination.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Management of green infrastructure resources to enhance quality and accessibility.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> Protection of statutory and non-statutory biodiversity sites.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

														<p>The extent to which connectivity of green infrastructure assets can be secured and over what timescale, using new development to assist this.</p>
<p>9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.</p>	<p>+/- -</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>SS1 seeks the redevelopment of brownfield land to be phased first, where viable and deliverable. However, a significant proportion of new development on strategic housing sites (Policies SS6-SS12) will be located on greenfield land, and as such will result in the irreversible loss of this resource. A number of strategic sites e.g. ST14: Land to the West of Wigginton Road and ST4 includes land identified as Grade1-3 Agricultural land.</p> <p>However, the scale of these developments offers significant opportunities for comprehensive masterplanning which would enhance green infrastructure resources. The loss of greenfield land is to some degree balanced by the continued protection of the Green Belt (SS2) through the plan period and beyond and brownfield regeneration of sites within the existing urban area. The net effect of the policies is therefore judged to have both positive and negative effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Masterplanning of strategic development sites to include significant elements of new and enhanced green infrastructure which help to compensate for greenfield land-take.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>

<p>10. Improve water efficiency and quality.</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>An increase in population anticipated by SS1 will have an inevitable negative impact on overall water usage and consumption across the City. This is reflected in Yorkshire Water's Water Resource Management Plan <u>2014</u>, which identifies a deficit between supply and demand from 2.67MI/d in 2018/19 increasing to 108.65MI/d in 2039/40 for the water resource zone in which York is located. <u>However, the 2019 revised draft WRMP does not expect a deficit until the mid-2030s due to revised approach to climate change modelling.</u> Please note however that the water resource zone encompasses Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield and Hull.</p> <p>However, the scale of proposed development, particularly at the strategic sites covered by policies SS3, SS4 and SS6-SS12, offers potential for the development of significant sustainable water management initiatives through rainwater recycling, SUDS and water-efficient housing. In addition, Yorkshire Water's Water Resources Management Plan (<u>both the 2014 and draft 2019 versions</u>) proposes a range of solutions to ultimately meet the forecast supply demand deficit. The options selected include leakage reduction, use of an existing river abstraction licence and a three groundwater schemes.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging sustainable construction and operation.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which such measures will contribute to the overall sustainability of the housing stock.</p>
<p>11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The construction and use of the proposed development would inevitably result in an increase in waste generation which could have adverse effects in relation to this objective. However, the scale of proposed development, particularly at the strategic sites covered by policies SS5-10, offers potential for the development of significant sustainable waste management initiatives through re-use and recycling initiatives. As exemplars, practices could be spread across the City over time. In addition, the strategic policies will operate in conjunction with others in the plan, such as policy WM1 which will require the integration of facilities for waste prevention, re-use, recycling, composting, and recovery in association with the planning, construction and occupation of new developments. This requirement would help reduce waste</p>



														<p>consumption associated with new housing development and to increase levels of reuse and recycling.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging sustainable lifestyles.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The extent to which such measures will contribute to the overall sustainability of the lifestyles in the City.</p>
12. Improve air quality.	+/ -	0	+	+	+	+/ -	+/ -	+/ -	+/ -	+/ -	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The likely effects of these policies are mixed, reflecting increased emissions associated with development but also opportunities for instituting wide-ranging sustainable travel measures.</p> <p>New development covered by the policies in this chapter could have an adverse impact on air quality in York. This could occur during construction of any new development and could be related to dust and particulate matter although such effects will be very localised. In addition as they are subject to a variety of policies in the plan, notably, ENV1 which states that 'development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and reduce further exposure to poor air quality', it is likely that such effects, if they do occur, will be acceptable. Impacts may also be felt on designated conservation sites, especially from roads in close proximity to these sites. <u>However, Natural England have confirmed their agreement with the air quality assessment set out in the HRA (2018 and reconfirmed in 2019) that there are no adverse effects on integrity of Strensall Common SAC.</u></p> <p>The promotion of walking and cycling suggests that considerable progress is possible, although car use remains relatively high throughout the City. The full effects of the policies will only be measurable over the longer term and as part of an assessment of the cumulative effects of development as a whole.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As outlined in Policies SS6-13, but could potentially be more radical.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

														The extent to which potential sustainable travel measures are realised, particularly on the larger strategic sites.	
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	+/?	0	0	0	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Development principles within policy SS1 pay particular attention to flood risk and as such no negative effects are anticipated. However, whilst immediate risk can be reduced, extreme events will occur which place existing and new residents at risk. The extent to which additional development increases this risk is uncertain. Policy SS5 seeks consideration of flood improvement work for Castle Piccadilly and Foss Basin and the Ouse Riverside which may provide minor positive effects against this objective. However, this is uncertain at this stage, dependent on scheme design at application stage.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As per masterplanning proposals for strategic sites, utilising SUDS etc.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Up to date modelling of flood risk is maintained and influences decision making.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Changes in future flood risk from current modelling.</p>	
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	+	+	+	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Significant levels of new development will inevitably bring change to the character of the City, particularly where this is associated with strategic sites which envisage substantial tracts of new housing, in addition to the required release of Green Belt land. The re-definition of the City's Green Belt through policy SS2 (notwithstanding removal of land for development) will help to re-affirm the role of this policy instrument in helping to protect the overall spatial form of the City and concentration of development in the urban area, with attendant sustainability benefits. SS1 will also help to manage change and protect the historic environment. This has been assessed as having a significant positive effect on this objective.</p>

														<p>However, such change can be positive where the creation of new communities helps to address social inclusion and bring service provision and economic prosperity. Effects on the setting of the City can also be managed through land release which does not have a significant visual impact.</p> <p>The HIA identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of development at various strategic site locations (notably ST5, ST1, ST2, ST4, ST7, ST8, ST9, ST15, ST14, ST20) but these are addressed through the corresponding strategic policies SS4 to SS13. Policies SS4 to SS12 have therefore been assessed as having positive or negative effects. The implementation of other policies in the plan (placemaking, heritage, design and culture), archaeological mitigation strategies and masterplanning will help mitigation of any negative effects. The presence and extent of negative effects of these policies are to some extent uncertain at this stage.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As proposed under policies SS4-13 which emphasise the need to respect and where possible enhance local context.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Masterplanning ensures that new development respects, enhances and creates local character, in particular the City's Green Infrastructure network. Particular attention needs to be paid to the approach taken on sites within or near the City Centre.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Potential cumulative impacts of development over the longer term.</p>
<p>15. Protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The diversity in scale, type and timing, of development proposals across the City means that there will be significant opportunities to secure new patterns of development which do not detract from and enhance the character of the natural and built landscape of the City. This will demand different approaches according to location. The HIA notes that some change is inevitable from the implementation of these policies although mitigation measures will ensure that to some extent these are managed. For SS8 the HIA notes that the relationship between the southern edge of the built up area of York and the countryside will be changed. Negative effects have therefore been assessed for this policy. The full effects of the policies on this Objective can only be properly judged over the long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Detailed masterplanning to ensure sensitive integration of new development with existing natural and built landscape.</p>

													<p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The cumulative impacts of development on the character of the City.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Spatial Strategy														
SA Objective	SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane	SS14: Terry's Extension Sites 1 and 2	SS15: Nestle South	SS16: Land at Tadcaster Road	SS17: Hungate	SS18: Station Yard, Wheldrake	SS19: Queen Elizabeth Barracks	SS20: Imohal Barracks	SS21: Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park	SS22: University of York	SS23: Land at Northminster	SS24: Whitehall Granae	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on effects of each policy*
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The effects of policies SS13-SS20 on this Objective is predicted to be significantly positive given their role in helping to meet the housing requirements set out in</p>

<p>population in a sustainable way.</p>														<p>SS1. The scale of provision, cumulatively and associated with the strategic sites means that a range of housing can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet specific needs of the City identified in the SHMA.</p> <p>The scale of proposed development at the strategic sites also means that opportunities for a high degree of self-containment in basic service provision can be secured. Delivery of the policies is a long term aspiration which will cover the plan period and beyond. The cumulative effects of policy implementation will require close monitoring.</p> <p>Policies SS21, SS22, SS23 and SS24 provide for significant employment land development. Given the mix of employment uses, the existing conditions for growth in the city and the aims of the York Economic Strategy (2016) these strategic policies are likely to contribute to an increase in prosperity. This could both increase demand for new homes and increase people's chances of owning their own home or advancing on the property ladder. The policies have therefore been assessed as having minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As set out in the policies on strategic sites, criteria specifying how the baseline housing need as expressed in the SHMA should be met.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That housing need across the City will be met through a combination of strategic and local sites, and the proportion of affordable housing reflects local requirements.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The rate of housing delivery on strategic sites and the early provision of basic services.</p>
<p>2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.</p>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the complexity of seeking to improve health and well-being, these policies should assist with providing the context for this to happen, through the provision of new high quality housing (SS12 – 24). Additionally, the policies promote sustainable transport, and open space provision. Realisation of provision will be across the Plan period and beyond and cumulatively, the policies should result in positive effects if the stated mitigation criteria are adhered to.</p> <p>Implementation of SS21-SS24 would help to increase the amount of employment land across York and create significant employment opportunities, thereby providing the conditions for sustained economic growth across York. There is a strong evidence base showing that work is generally good for physical and mental health and well-being. Worklessness is associated with poorer physical</p>	

													<p>and mental health and well-being. Full time work generally provides adequate income, essential for material well-being and full participation in today's society; it is also an important provider of social interaction. Policies that increase employment opportunities are therefore appraised as having a minor positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As per criteria set out in strategic site policies SS13-24 along with monitoring of cumulative impacts.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> That new and existing provision will be co-ordinated for the benefit of existing and new residents.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The consistency of implementation in respect of service provision, particularly for large strategic sites which are relatively remote from existing provision.</p>
<p>3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</p>	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The construction of new homes (SS13 – SS20) could create jobs and potentially training opportunities for local people in the construction industry and raise skill levels in this sector. However, any positive effects would depend upon the approach taken by house builders as to whether training opportunities and skills development benefited local people and therefore had any positive effects on this objective. Policies SS13, SS19 and SS20 explicitly require onsite education provision. They have been assessed as having a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of SS21, SS23 and SS24 would help to increase the amount of employment land across York and create significant employment opportunities across a number of employment uses. Whilst it will be dependent on the individual employment practices of any businesses that seek to locate at these sites, the policy creates the opportunity for a positive contribution to this objective. SS22 would support the expansion of (inter alia) research led science park and other higher education uses. The policy is therefore assessed as having a significant positive effect.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As set out in criteria associated with strategic site policies.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

													<p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging employment growth and skills development.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which existing residents will benefit from the provision of employment and training opportunities, particularly in the more remote strategic sites.</p>
<p>4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.</p>	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The jobs required during the construction of the houses under policies SS13-SS20 will bring short, medium and long term benefits to the economy. Following the approach of Policy H4, Policies SS13-120 will also be required to make provision for custom/self-builder plots. In conjunction with H4, these policies look to ensure that local employment opportunities are created.</p> <p>The implementation of Policies SS21 – SS24 will see the delivery of a significant amount of employment land. The implementation of the policies will therefore make an important contribution to the delivery of the York Economic Strategy. The range of sites identified in these policies will help sustain and support economic growth in the City of York over the plan period.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging climate change adaptation and mitigation through a switch to low-carbon energy sources.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Market-led delivery and the scale of job creation.</p>

<p>5. Help deliver equality and access to all.</p>	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The effects of these policies on this Objective is predicted to be significantly positive given their role in helping to meet the housing requirement set out in SS1. The scale of provision, cumulatively and associated with the strategic housing sites (SS13-24) and the proposed broad distribution means that a range of housing and community facilities can be provided (particularly affordable housing) to meet specific needs. The scale of proposed development also means that opportunities for a high degree of self-containment in basic service provision can be secured. Delivery of the policies is a long term aspiration which will cover the plan period and beyond. The cumulative effects of policy implementation will require close monitoring.</p> <p>The amount, range and type of employment land provision set out in SS21-SS4 would help to increase job opportunities across York and therefore help to deliver quality and access in respect of job opportunities and have a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As set out in the policies on strategic sites, criteria specifying how housing need and demand as expressed in the SHMA should be met.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That housing need across the City will be met through a combination of strategic and local sites, and the proportion of affordable housing reflects local requirements.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The rate of housing delivery on strategic sites and the early provision of basic services.</p>
<p>6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Growth across the City and through the strategic sites in particular offers opportunities to develop a better integrated transport system for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors. A number policies (SS13, SS16, SS17, SS22) specifically seek sustainable transport measures, including pedestrian and cycling links and public transport services, to be integrated into schemes. However, there is the potential for the increase in vehicles to lead to an increase vehicle movements, although whether it is within the City or the strategic road network that is affected is uncertain. The scale of employment development to be delivered through implementation of SS21-SS24 has the potential to support improvements to transport but trips are likely to increase.</p>



																							<p>The proposed strategic sites are in some cases set apart from key areas of higher order service provision and as such are likely to generate significant car-base trips, although some degree of self-containment will be secured on the larger sites (notably Land West of Elvington Lane (SS13)).</p> <p>Minor positive and negative effects on this objective have therefore been found.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As stated in Policies SS13-24.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> As part of strategic site delivery, significant improvements in sustainable transport provision can occur.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The extent to which City-wide growth, particularly associated with the strategic sites, will lead to greater or less self-containment or further spread unsustainable commuting, for example.</p>
<p>7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>In a similar way the consideration of the policies against Objective 6, the likely effects of these policies are mixed, reflecting increased emissions associated with development but also opportunities for limiting carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures, renewable energy generation and facilitating sustainable travel. Experience in the City (Derwenthorpe) and around the country suggests that whilst considerable progress is possible, there remains a significant gap to be bridged to approach carbon neutrality. The full effects of the policies will only be measurable over the longer term and as part of an assessment of the cumulative effects of development as a whole.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> As outlined in Policies SS13-24, but could potentially be more radical.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The extent to which potential sustainability measures (e.g. renewable power generation) are realised, particularly on the larger strategic sites.</p>

<p>8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.</p>	-/?	+	+	+	+	+	?	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-/?	<p><b>Please note the text here replaces the text in the SA Addendum (April 2018) Appendix C. It therefore includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough. New amendments are in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding greenfield land-take associated with new development (and hence potential loss or displacement of assets), there is a significant opportunity to realise improvements to the City's green infrastructure network (including open space, biodiversity and geodiversity) through new provision, making links between existing resources and enhancing the management of resources, as well as access enhancement generally. Under the guidance of a Green Infrastructure Strategy there is potential to enhance assets and access for the benefit of existing and future residents. Long term management of resources will be critical to ensure that improvements are sustainable.</p> <p><u>Within the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (April 2018) likely significant effects (LSE) could not be ruled out from SS13 because of anticipated increases in recreational pressure and impacts on the bird communities of the Lower Derwent Valley that also utilised land beyond the European site boundary. <del>For SS18 LSE could not be ruled out because of anticipated increases in recreational pressure on the Lower Derwent Valley nearby.</del> For SS19 LSE could not be ruled out in terms of the impact of recreational pressure on the adjacent Strensall Common.</u></p> <p><u>Following Appropriate Assessment, the adoption of mitigation measures including the provision and promotion of information on alternative recreational areas and wardening services, delivered by changes to policy wording was found to lead to the conclusion of adverse effects on the integrity of the site.</u></p> <p><b><u>The HRA (February 2019) confirms that proposed changes to Policy SS13 and Policy SS18 and Policy SS18 (appraised in the SA Addendum (April 2018)) are adequate to remove the threat of adverse effects on breeding and non-breeding birds from recreational pressures (SS13 and SS18) and on mobile species (SS13).</u></b></p> <p>Within the preliminary Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Policy SS19 was found to cause a likely significant effect (LSE) alone across a range of factors on the adjacent Strensall Common. LSEs from recreational pressure cannot be ruled out. In addition, LSEs arising from possible hydrological effects and increased nitrogen disposition within the SAC arising from vehicle movements cannot be ruled out. Similarly, because of anticipated increases in recreational pressure, Policy SS18 was found to cause a LSE alone on the Lower Derwent Valley. Finally,</p>
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	---	---	---	---	-------	---

													<p>even though situated several kilometres from the Lower Derwent Valley, Policy SS13 was found to cause a LSE on its wintering bird populations that also use land beyond the European site boundary.</p> <p>The adoption of appropriate mitigation could remove the potential for likely significant effects in relation to SS18. However, at this stage of the assessment, it was not found possible to mitigate policies SS13 or SS19 and these must be subject to an appropriate assessment. The HRA is iterative. Policy SS19 does set out the requirement for a visitor mitigation strategy to address recreational demands which, as far as it can at present, provides suitable mitigation in line with ongoing HRA work. In light of the outcome of the ongoing assessment in HRA, and because of these outstanding issues, the Plan must await the outcome of this further scrutiny in the HRA. However, in light of the residual effects on Heslington Tillmire SSSI, minor negative effects have been identified for Policy SS13. <b><u>A mix of minor positive and negative effects have been assessed for SS19 in light of the broader beneficial aspects in relation to increasing access but that there are negative impacts. However, it is considered that policy wording helps to ensure that to some extent, these negative effects can be mitigated.</u></b></p> <p>Whilst the full effects can only be considered at the detailed planning application stage, the HRA of the housing policies and strategic sites indicates that they are unlikely to have significant adverse effects upon biodiversity sites of international importance.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Management of green infrastructure resources to enhance quality and accessibility.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Protection of statutory and non-statutory biodiversity sites. Application of the appropriate assessment for the relevant policies.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which connectivity of green infrastructure assets can be secured and over what timescale, using new development to assist this.</p>
<p>9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.</p>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>A significant proportion of new development will be located on greenfield land, and as such will result in the irreversible loss of this resource. A number of strategic sites e.g. ST4 (Grimston Bar), ST13 (Moor Lane), ST22 (Germany Beck), ST19 (land around Northminster Business Park) and ST7 (Metcalfe Lane) include land identified as Grade 2 Agricultural land.</p>

													<p>However, the scale of these developments offers significant opportunities for comprehensive masterplanning which would enhance green infrastructure resources. The loss of greenfield land is to some degree balanced by the continued protection of the Green Belt (SS2) through the plan period and beyond and brownfield regeneration of sites within the existing urban area. The net effect of the policies is therefore judged to have both positive and negative effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Masterplanning of strategic development sites to include significant elements of new and enhanced green infrastructure which help to compensate for greenfield land-take.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>An increase in population anticipated by SS1 will have an inevitable negative impact on overall water usage and consumption across the City. This is reflected in Yorkshire Water's Water Resource Management Plan <u>2014</u>, which identifies a deficit between supply and demand from 2.67MI/d in 2018/19 increasing to 108.65MI/d in 2039/40 for the water resource zone in which York is located. <u>However, the 2019 draft WMRP does not expect a deficit until the mid-2030s due to revised approach to climate change modelling.</u> Please note however that the water resource zone encompasses Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield and Hull.</p> <p>However, the scale of proposed development, particularly at the strategic sites covered by policies, offers potential for the development of significant sustainable water management initiatives through rainwater recycling, SUDS and water-efficient housing. In addition, Yorkshire Water's Water Resources Management Plan (<u>both the 2014 and draft 2019 versions</u>) proposes a range of solutions to ultimately meet the forecast supply demand deficit. The options selected include leakage reduction, use of an existing river abstraction licence and a three groundwater schemes.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

																						<p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging sustainable construction and operation.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which such measures will contribute to the overall sustainability of the housing stock.</p>
<p>11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.</p>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The construction and use of the proposed development would inevitably result in an increase in waste generation which could have adverse effects in relation to this objective. However, the scale of proposed development, at the strategic sites covered by policies SS13-24, offers potential for the development of significant sustainable waste management initiatives through re-use and recycling initiatives. As exemplars, practices could be spread across the City over time. Policies SS13 and SS22 explicitly identify a key principle for development of Land West of Elvington Lane and University of York expansion that synergies between these sites for servicing, including (inter alia) dealing with waste, are exploited. In addition, the strategic policies will operate in conjunction with others in the plan, such as policy WM1 which will require the integration of facilities for waste prevention, re-use, recycling, composting, and recovery in association with the planning, construction and occupation of new developments. This requirement would help reduce waste consumption associated with new housing and employment development and to increase levels of reuse and recycling.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>That implementation of policy will be consistent with other policies on encouraging sustainable lifestyles.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which such measures will contribute to the overall sustainability of the lifestyles in the City.</p>

<p>12. Improve air quality.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The likely effects of these policies are mixed, reflecting increased emissions associated with development but also opportunities for instituting wide-ranging sustainable travel measures.</p> <p>New development covered by the strategic policies in this section could have an adverse impact on air quality in York. This could occur during construction of any new development and could be related to dust and particulate matter although such effects will be very localised. In addition as they are subject to a variety of policies in the plan, notably, ENV1 which states that 'development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and prevent further exposure to poor air quality', it is likely that such effects, if they do occur, will be acceptable. Furthermore, all development proposals will be required to be supported with an Emissions Statement.</p> <p>Additionally, SS16 specifically requires detailed air quality assessment to be undertaken whilst SS21 requires air quality issues to be explored.</p> <p>The promotion of sustainable transport measures, including walking and cycling, suggests that considerable progress is possible, although car use remains relatively high throughout the City. The full effects of the policies will only be measurable over the longer term and as part of an assessment of the cumulative effects of development as a whole.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As outlined in Policies SS13-24.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which potential sustainable travel measures are realised, particularly on the larger strategic sites.</p>
<p>13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.</p>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The City of York has a significant extent of areas at risk of flooding. The York Local Flood Risk Management Plan (2015) helps to co-ordinate the approach to managing flood risk and development proposals should accord with its aims. The SS13-24 incorporate. Policy SS19 recognises that a specific flood risk assessment will be required. Implementation of the policy, based on latest flood risk</p>

														<p>assessment, will ensure that flood risk can be mitigated. Overall, the policies are considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As per masterplanning proposals for strategic sites, utilising SUDS etc.</p> <p><b>Assumption</b></p> <p>Implementation of policies will be based on up-to-date flood risk modelling to inform consideration of development proposals at application stage.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Changes in future flood risk from current modelling.</p>
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	+/-	++	+/-	0	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Significant levels of new development will inevitably bring change to the character of the City, particularly where this is associated with strategic sites which envisage substantial tracts of new housing or employment, in addition to the required release of Green Belt land.</p> <p>However, such change can be positive where the creation of new communities helps to address social inclusion and bring service provision and economic prosperity. Effects on the setting of the City can also be managed through land release which does not have a significant visual impact. SS21 specifically requires the retention and enhancement of historic field boundaries. SS22 requires the delivery of a landscaped buffer to mitigate heritage impacts.</p> <p>The HIA identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of development at various strategic site locations but these are addressed through the corresponding strategic policies.</p> <p>Policies SS13, SS15, SS17, SS19, SS20, SS22 and SS24 could have positive or negative effects. The implementation of other policies in the plan (placemaking, heritage, design and culture), archaeological mitigation strategies and masterplanning will help mitigation of any negative effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>As proposed under policies SS13-24 which emphasise the need to respect and where possible enhance local context.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Masterplanning ensures that new development respects, enhances and creates local character, in particular the City's Green Infrastructure network. Particular attention needs to be paid to the approach taken on sites within or near the City Centre.</p>

														<b>Uncertainties</b> Potential cumulative impacts of development over the longer term.	
15. Protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape.	0	0	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	+/-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The diversity in scale, type and timing, of development proposals across the City means that there will be significant opportunities to secure new patterns of development which do not detract from and enhance the character of the natural and built landscape of the City</p> <p>The HIA notes a number of negative effects for a number of these policies. However, the implementation of other policies in the plan and mitigation measures (including landscaping and screening) will to some extent limit these effects for the majority of these policies although some change is inevitable. However, for SS24 significant harm to the landscape has been identified. The site (ST27) contributes to the openness associated both with views of the Minster and Bootham stry. The proposed development would result in a significant change to the openness of the landscape in this location, undermining its future role as green belt and significantly impacting on landscape and setting.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Detailed masterplanning to ensure sensitive integration of new development with existing natural and built landscape.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The cumulative impacts of development on the character of the City.</p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Whilst growth of the City on the scale envisaged inevitably brings negative effects (such as greenfield land-take and increased traffic) the suite of policies seeks to ameliorate these impacts through sustainability measures which encourage self-sufficiency and innovation in energy use and generation and sustainable travel initiatives, for example. The scale of the strategic sites makes such ambitions achievable in principle, although how these are compromised by unsustainable commuting patterns, for example, would require analysis over the longer term. In light of this assessment, the spatial strategy policies have been appraised has having positive and negative affects against Objectives 6, 7, 9 and 12 to reflect the inevitable increase in vehicles and vehicle movements associated with the built development proposed for York. The extent of the cumulative impacts of this scale of development on the character of the City is again uncertain, although the provisions for the sensitive masterplanning of City Centre sites in particular should in principle off-set adverse impacts and positively enhance character where regeneration is required.</p> <p>Some negative effects relating to the loss of greenfield land (hence often land currently classified as Green Belt) where identified, although the opportunity to enhance landscape character and positively contribute to green infrastructure are also present and help to off-set such impacts.</p>															



Key uncertainties relate to the longer term and cumulative effects of development on City character and specific issues such as flood risk, although retrospective analysis would be required to determine their precise scale and effects.



## Appendix G

### Updated appraisal of Thematic Local Plan Polices

The policy re-appraisal utilises the same matrices and text as the SA Report (2018) Appendix J. Where changes to the SA scoring or appraisal commentary have been identified these are presented in underline for additional text or with ~~strikethrough~~ for deleted text. Where the text is not underlined or struck through it is the original appraisal text taken from the relevant SA Report (Feb 2018) appendix and has not been changed.

Please note that for the Economy and Retail policies and Housing policies, the original text for SA Objective 8 is taken from the SA Report Addendum (April 2018) Appendix C. For this objective the text includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough but new amendments are in **bold**.

#### Key for assessment

Symbol	Likely Effect on the SA Objective
++	The policy is likely to have a significant positive effect
+	The policy is likely to have a positive effect
0	No significant effect / no clear link
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine effect
-	The policy is likely to have a negative effect
--	The policy is likely to have a significant negative effect

**Effects of Economy and Retail Policies EC1-EC5 and R1-R4**

\*Consideration of the likely significant effects includes short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, as appropriate.

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of policies EC1, EC4 and EC5 aims to create significant employment opportunities and support sustained economic growth in York. Given the mix of uses anticipated in the employment land provision of EC1, the existing conditions for growth in the city and the aims of the York Economic Strategy (2016) the economic policies within the Local Plan are likely to contribute to an increase in prosperity. This could both increase demand for new homes and increase people’s chances of owning their own home or advancing on the property ladder. Assuming the provision of a diversity of accommodation, anticipated in policies H3 and H4 is phased in a complementary manner to the demand fostered by these policies; overall the economic policies should have a positive effect upon this objective. Policy R3 has been appraised as having a positive effect due to its reference to Castle Gateway as an area of opportunity which will be</p>	

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>promoted for high quality mixed use development which will include residential uses.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> Phasing of delivery of a mixed types of housing is aligned with the increase in employment opportunities created by the provision of employment land.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of Policy EC1 would help to increase the amount of employment land across York and create significant employment opportunities and help to provide the conditions for sustained economic growth across York. Policies EC4 and EC5 would help to increase economic growth and jobs. There is a strong evidence base showing that work is generally good for physical and mental health and well-being. Worklessness is associated with poorer physical and mental health and well-being. Full time work generally provides adequate income, essential for material well-being and full participation in today's society; it is also an important provider of social interaction. Policies that increase</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>employment opportunities are therefore appraised as having a minor positive effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is not considered that there is any direct link between policy EC2 and improving the health and well-being of York's population and so impacts from this policy are considered to be neutral.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of Policy EC1 would help to increase the amount of employment land across York and create significant employment opportunities across a number of uses. Whilst it will be dependent on the individual employment practices of any businesses that seek to locate at these sites, the policy creates the opportunity for a positive contribution to this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of policies EC4 and EC5 would increase growth of the tourism sector and the rural economy. Increases in the growth of these</p>	

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>sectors of York's economy would help to generate employment opportunities and could also create training opportunities in these areas and improve skill levels. This would have positive effects upon this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.	++	++	0	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Policy EC1 provides a mix of employment land uses aiming to create significant employment opportunities and support sustained economic growth in York. The range of sites proposed have been identified to meet (and exceed) the projected workforce increase between 2017 and 2038. Updated Oxford Economic Forecasting suggests that the workforce would grow by some 13,000 over this timescale (around 650 jobs per annum) with particularly strong growth in professional and technical services, accommodation and food services, and wholesale and retail sectors in line with the York Economic Strategy.</p>

Economy and Retail											
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
											<p>Implementation of Policy EC2 would help to ensure that any development proposals would not lead to the loss of employment sites that that are necessary to meet employment needs during the plan. This will ensure that the forecast growth can be sustained and delivered and the measures in this policy would help to have significant positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>Policy EC3 has no clear relationship with this objective since it is concerned with controlling the effects of business and industrial uses in residential areas.</p> <p>Implementation of policy EC4 would help to ensure that tourism contributes to a diverse economy. This would help to create jobs and in turn deliver growth in the tourism sector of the economy and have significant positive effects on this objective. The measures in policy EC5 would help to sustain and diversify the rural economy and help to contribute to a sustainable and inclusive economy. This can be particularly important for rural communities which can sometimes be left behind in terms of economic growth.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy R1 would help to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of City Centre, District Centres, Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades. This would help to deliver economic growth in the retail sector of York’s economy. Together with efforts in Policy R2 to have regard for the viability of District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades when considering development proposals for</p>



Economy and Retail										
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
										<p><b>Commentary on the effects of each policy*</b></p> <p>town centre uses, there would be significant positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>Policy R3 seeks to support the vitality and viability of the city centre supporting the Castle Gateway are of opportunity and supporting the reuse and reconfiguration of existing units to adapt to social and economic trends.</p> <p>Implementation Policy R4 would help to ensure that out of centre retailing is only permitted in specific circumstances and where it would not adversely impact on planned investment or vitality and viability in York City Centre/other centres. Such measures would help to safeguard investment in York and existing jobs in existing centres, all of which would have significant positive effects upon this objective.</p> <p>Overall the majority of these policies would have significant positive effects upon this objective in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
5. Help deliver equality and access to all.	++	0	0	0	++	++	++	+	0	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The amount of, and locations of, employment land set out in Policy EC1 would help to increase job opportunities across York and therefore help to deliver quality and access in respect of job opportunities and have a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p>The measures in policy EC5 would help to sustain and diversify the rural economy and ensure that those living in rural communities benefit from access to new jobs and economic growth and ensure that there is not inequality in the growth of the economy of York.</p> <p>The retail hierarchy set out in Policy R1 would help to deliver equality and access for all through ensuring that services and facilities are located in existing centres, many of which will already be easily accessible to the population of York. The requirements in Policy R2 that regard would be had for enhancing the function, vitality and viability of the District and Local Centres and the viability and vitality of Neighbourhood Parades would help to ensure that there is even greater access to services for local communities in York which would also help to have significant positive effects on this objective. Measures included within Policy R3 which involve the improvements to the public realm provide the opportunity to enhance accessibility around the city centre.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>	

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.	+	-	0	0	++	0	++	++	++	++	++	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Implementation of Policy EC1 would lead to the creation of employment opportunities on employment sites of varying size and distribution across York. Consideration was given to sustainable location as part of the site selection process. The scale of change proposed within York up to 2032/33 will inevitably generate an increase in vehicles and vehicle movements above the existing baseline. In considering these policies, and in particular EC1, alongside the requirements of other policies in the plan, notably SS1 and T1, the effects upon this objective are considered to have the potential for positive and negative effects.  Policy EC4 supports the development of tourism in York as parts of efforts to contribute to a diverse economy. This policy support for new and improved business, conference and events facilities and the requirement that any new visitor locations are in locations easily accessible by a variety of transport modes would help to ensure any growth in transport demand can be accommodated within an integrated transport system.

Economy and Retail											
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
											<p>The retail hierarchy set out in Policy R1 would also help to reduce the need to travel through ensuring that services and facilities are located in existing locations, some of which are already well served by public transport. Through Policy R2 there is support for enhancing existing District and Local Centres and supporting the vitality of Neighbourhood Parades, this would help to strengthen the role of these centres and reduce the need for new areas of retail and services which may not be in accessible locations. The specific circumstances set out in Policy R4 would help to reduce the amount of new out of centre retail developments, thus reducing the need to travel to new locations which may not be in sustainable locations. Policy R3 is explicit in defining the City Centre as the primary retail destination, a role which will be supported by managing the provision of parking and public transport.</p> <p>Overall implementation of the majority of these policies, together with measures in other policies, for example Policy T2, would have significant positive effects on this objective. There would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*			
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas		EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail					
													None identified.		
7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.	+	-	0	+	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Inevitably with the development of new employment uses there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, associated with the construction activity (combining the effects from the embodied carbon in the construction materials as well as the emissions from construction traffic to and from the site). There could also be an increase in emissions associated with the energy consumption from the occupation of the new employment premises. Any new development facilitated by these policies will also need to be consistent with policy CC2 'Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development'. This requires all new development (through design, construction and subsequent use) to make carbon savings which will be consistent with this objective.</p> <p>Inevitably with economic growth and new jobs there would be an increase in vehicle use associated with this growth, although this effect would be mitigated by the commitments on sustainable location, transport statements and Travel Plans. Any increase in vehicle movements and/or congestion could have adverse effects in relation to local air quality and the emission of greenhouse gases from vehicle emissions.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>In consequence, whilst the direct effects of emissions from the new development will be considered to be minimal/ positive in regard to climate change, the indirect effects of any road travel associated with new development are considered to have a minor negative effect (in the case of EC1, EC3 and EC4).</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> The implementation of other policies in the plan (notably CC2) will ensure that any adverse effects against this objective are minimised.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and	<u>20</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>20</u>	<p><b>Please note the text here replaces the text in the SA Addendum (April 2018) Appendix C. It therefore includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough. New amendments are in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p>

Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail		
connected natural environment.											<p>The development of the new employment land outlined in Policy EC1 could have adverse impacts on green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna without appropriate safeguards or mitigation plans. Similarly new tourism or retail development outlined in some of the other policies could also have adverse effects on local biodiversity depending on its location and proximity to conservation sites. The site assessments undertaken of the employment site allocations found that many of the sites are not within close proximity of any sensitive ecological designations. However two of the proposed general employment allocation sites (E10: Chessingham Park, Dunnington and E18: Towthorpe Lines) are within 250m of sensitive designations. E18 is within 250 of Stransall Common SAC and SSSI and E10 is within 250m of Hasscarr LNR. One of the strategic employment allocations is within 250m of Clifton Ings and Rawcliffe Meadows SSSI (ST5: York Central).</p> <p>The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening assessment has determined that E18 will require appropriate assessment as there are likely significant effects (LSE) on Stransall Common SAC in relation to air pollution, the aquatic environment and recreational pressure. E10 and ST5 have been screened out for LSEs. There is uncertainty at this stage regarding E1 until appropriate assessment is undertaken and for the other</p>

Economy and Retail												
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land		EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
												<p>policies there is uncertainty until development proposals are known, although other policies in the plan will mitigate any negative effects.</p> <p><u>The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (April 2018) could not rule out likely significant effects (LSE) with regards to site E18 in terms of the impact of recreational pressure on the adjacent Strensall Common SAC. However, following Appropriate Assessment, the adoption of mitigation measures was considered to lead to an assessment that there were no adverse effects on the in the integrity of the site. <b>This conclusion was reconfirmed in the update HRA (Feb 2019) following visitor surveys.</b></u></p> <p>On this basis, overall effects from the implementation of the policies on this objective are considered to be <u>neutral uncertain, notwithstanding in light of</u> the requirements of other policies in the plan and the potential for mitigation / enhancements at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified – any adverse effects can be mitigated by other policies in the plan or at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Appropriate Assessment is to be undertaken.</p>



SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land		EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail		
												<b>Uncertainties</b> There is some degree of uncertainty around the exact impacts that new economic development may have on ecology, as it would depend upon the ecological value of the areas of land identified in Policy EC1. There could be opportunities for ecological enhancements required as part of mitigation for new economic development. However, the details of any such enhancements would only be known at the planning application stage.
9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.	0		+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The provision of employment land set out in Policy EC1 includes expansion of some existing employment locations, which would help to reduce the amount of greenfield land from new sites that is required. Overall, half of the general employment sites allocated are on brownfield whilst half of the strategic sites are either situated on a mix of brownfield/greenfield or on brownfield land. Overall, therefore, neutral effects have therefore been assessed for this objective. Economic growth in the health and social care sectors would be met through a variety of sources including expansion of existing sites and new sites which may be required in conjunction with strategic sites. This would help to reduce the amount of greenfield land from new sites that is

Economy and Retail											
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
											<p>required for health and social care facilities and thereby help to use land efficiently.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy EC2 would help to safeguard existing employment land from being lost to other uses. This would help to ensure that land allocated is used efficiently and would have positive effects upon this objective.</p> <p>The support through Policy EC5 for the diversification of York’s rural economy would help to ensure that land resources in rural areas are used in an efficient way, which would have positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of policies R1, R2 and R3 would help to strengthen then role of existing centres in York, in particular the City Centre, and therefore reduce the amount of new land required for new retail developments and new centres for services. This would help to use land efficiently and have positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p>Implementation of policy R4 would help to limit the amount of out of centre retail developments and thereby help to focus retail in existing locations. This would help to limit the amount of new land required for retail development, and thereby use land more efficiently. This would have a minor positive effect on this objective for the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land		EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail		
												<p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New employment development under EC1 could increase the demand for water resources overall (although it would depend on the nature of the employment use and whether for example new employment accommodation replaces old inefficient accommodation). However, such effects would be mitigated through use of policies such as CC2 'Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development'.</p> <p>In addition to the policies in this Plan, Yorkshire Water have produced a Water Resources Management Plan. This sets out how they will ensure supply meets demand for the 25 years from 2015/16 to 2039/40. It incorporates future pressures on water supply and demand due to predicted changes to the climate. It also looks at future changes in population, housing, water use and metering trends in Yorkshire.</p> <p>Overall and in consideration of implementation of these policies alongside CC2 and wider measures including the Water Resources Plan highlighted above, and the fact that (as noted below) any improvements to water efficiency / quality can only be fully determined at the detailed planning</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>application stage, overall effects on this objective are considered to be neutral.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> There could be opportunities to improve water efficiency as part of new economic developments, for example with the development of SUDS. However, any such improvements could only be determined at the detailed planning application stage, and so it is uncertain at this stage what positive effects there may be.</p>
11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Implementation of policies EC1 – EC5 would help to generate economic growth in York and help to create new jobs. Ultimately this would lead to an increase in waste generation (both during the construction of the new developments and in their subsequent use) which would be inconsistent with this objective. However, other policies in the plan such as Policy WM1 would help to mitigate the generation of waste and ensure no overall effects on this objective.</p>	

Economy and Retail												
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land		EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
												<p>Furthermore, York have developed a Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy with North Yorkshire County Council and the District Councils within North Yorkshire for dealing with the area's rubbish for the next 20 to 25 years which would help to manage waste generation from new economic development. This strategy notes that with regards to municipal waste that the way that municipal waste is dealt with over the medium and long term will be determined by the letting of a long term integrated waste management contract and that targets under the landfill directive would be hard to meet. This further highlights the importance of the measures in Policy WM1.</p> <p>Implementation of the retail policies R1, R2 and R3 would help to consolidate the role and function of existing centres. This would help to reduce the need for new retail developments and waste generation associated with this. On this basis it is considered that Policies R1 and 2 would have positive effects on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
12. Improve air quality.	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	0	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New economic development could have an adverse impact on air quality in York. This could occur during construction of any new development, could be related to dust and particulate matter although such effects will be very localised. Depending on the nature of the business, there could be operational effects on local air quality, although any such emissions to air will be controlled by relevant environmental legislation enforced either by the Council or the Environment Agency. There could also be effects arising from an increase in vehicle use associated with the growth in employment and the associated vehicle emissions, although these effects would be mitigated to some extent by the commitments on sustainable location, transport statements and Travel Plans contained with the transport policies T2 and T8.</p> <p>In consequence, the indirect effects of any road travel associated with new development are considered to have a minor negative effect (in the case of EC1, EC3 and EC4).</p> <p>In addition it will be important to ensure that any new economic development does not exacerbate any problems in respect of York's current Air Quality Management Areas. These areas are around the inner ring road in York City Centre and separately at Fulford. Mitigation of policies in this plan, notably ENV1 amongst others would be required for any development in these areas to ensure that nitrogen dioxide concentrations are reduced. Only one employment site (ST5: York Central)</p>	

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>was appraised negatively against this objective by virtue of its location within the Salisbury Terrace AQMA. The Inner Ring Road AQMA includes access to/location of the city centre bus interchange locations. Therefore, whilst the City Centre remains accessible by a range of transport means, proposals which increase its role as a primary retail destination has the potential to maintain or exacerbate existing air quality problems.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> The implementation of other policies in the plan (notable CC2, T2 and T7) will ensure that any adverse effects against this objective are minimised</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> New economic development could have an adverse impact on flood risk and increase risks of flooding to people and property if inappropriately sited or if no mitigation in place. The site appraisals undertaken of the economic development sites allocated found that the majority of the sites were not in flood risk zones 2 or 3. Only one site (ST5: York Central) was found to be in an area at significant risk of flooding and so have been highlighted as having some constraints to development across the site.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												<p>Furthermore it is considered that the commitments in Policy ENV4 and the fact that the majority of economic development sites are not in areas at risk of flooding should give confidence that the new development will not be subject to an increase in the risk of flooding or be the cause of any increased risk in flooding for existing development. However, whether there would be any effects in terms reducing the impact of flood risk would depend upon details determined at the planning application stage for any new sites.</p> <p>For the above reason it is considered that the implementation of these policies would have no overall significant effects upon this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> It is assumed that new economic development would be directed to areas at lowest risk of flooding, or would only be allowed in accordance with policies elsewhere in the plan dealing with flood risk including FR1.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural	?	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> New economic development in inappropriate locations could have adverse effects on York's historic environment and culture. The site appraisals</p>	



SA Objective	Economy and Retail								Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*		
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land		EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail		
heritage, character and setting.												<p>undertaken of the sites allocated for economic development highlighted that a number of the sites would have no overall effects on this objective. However, several of the sites have been identified as having negative effects against this objective.</p> <p>There would be mitigation from other policies in the plan for any adverse effects, in particular through the design policies. However, until detailed design proposals for sites come forward the exact effects on this objective are uncertain from the implementation of policies EC1, EC3 and EC4. Although EC4 specifically seeks development that showcases York's built heritage which could have positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) undertaken states that the impacts of Policy EC5 would come from the scale and location of any development proposed and the implementation of policy as opposed to direct impacts from the policy. For EC3 negative effects against HIA criteria 1-4 although mitigation in other plan policies would ensure that heritage assets were considered through the planning application process. EC4 was considered to have positive or neutral effects by promoting quality attractions building on York's heritage. To some extent this is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>The HIA noted that for R1, R2, R3 and R4 effects are largely neutral or positive on this objective. By focussing growth in the city centre and existing centres they have potential to promote and retain the urban fabric and identity of urban villages. Overall effects of these retail policies are considered to be neutral given that the role of existing centres will be</p>

Economy and Retail										
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
Commentary on the effects of each policy*										
										<p>strengthened and that new out of centre retail will be limited unless in very specific circumstances. These measures will help to limit the amount of new retail development and limit opportunities for any such development to have adverse effects on this objective, notwithstanding requirements of other policies in the plan. However, as identified within the HIA, concentrating town centre uses within the city centre will help to maintain the city’s dense urban fabric.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b>                      Consideration could be given to referencing other policies in the plan (for example the placemaking and design policies) to help ensure that new economic and retail development does not adversely impact on the historic environment of York. Additionally, new development proposals should be accompanied by heritage statements, where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b>                      None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b>                      There may be opportunities for enhancements to York’s historic environment as part of new economic, tourism or retail related development. However, this could only be fully determined at the detailed</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail			
												planning application stage and so it is uncertain what if any positive effects there would be on this objective at this stage.
15. Protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape.	?	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Economic growth and new tourism and retail developments could have adverse effects on York's natural and built environment without appropriate safeguards in place. The site appraisals undertaken of the sites allocated for economic development highlighted that whilst a significant number of the sites would have no overall effects on this objective, a few sites have been identified as having negative effects and a few potentially having significant negative effects on this objective.</p> <p>There would be mitigation from other policies in the plan for any adverse effects, in particular through the design policies. However, until detailed design proposals for sites come forward the exact effects on this objective are uncertain from the implementation of policies EC1 and EC4. Although EC4 specifically seeks tourism development that enhances the built environment and the public realm.</p> <p>Overall effects of the retail policies are considered to be neutral given that the role of existing centres will be strengthened and that new out of centre retail will be limited unless in very specific circumstances. These measures will help to limit the amount of new retail development and limit opportunities for any such development to have adverse effects on this objective, notwithstanding requirements of other policies in the plan.</p>

Economy and Retail										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
SA Objective	EC1 – Provision of Employment Land	EC2 – Loss of Employment Land	EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	EC4 - Tourism	EC5 – Rural Economy	R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds	R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	R3 – York City Centre Retail	R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail		
											<p>The HIA noted neutral effects on landscape for the majority of these policies although R4 was considered to have the potential for harm to the open countryside. However, the effects are considered uncertain due to the exact effects of development not known at this stage.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> There may be opportunities for enhancements to York’s natural and built landscape as part of new economic, tourism or retail related development. However, this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage and so it is uncertain what if any positive effects there would be on this objective at this stage.</p>

SA Objective	Economy and Retail	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Implementation of a number of the policies would have significant positive effects on a number of the objectives. In particular there would be significant positive effects on SA objectives 4, 5 and 6. These policies would help to deliver economic growth and create new jobs. This will in turn raise levels of wealth which would help people to have an increased chance of owning their own home and would also have associated significant positive effects on the health of York’s population.</p> <p>Implementation of several of these policies would have positive effects in relation to using land efficiently. These policies will help to ensure that economic growth is met in part by existing locations for example expansion at York university campus and other existing employment locations, for growth in the health and social care sectors, and through strengthening the role of existing retail centres, all of which would help to reduce the amount of new land required for development. Implementation of policies R1 and R2 would help to consolidate the role and function of existing centres. This would help to reduce the need for new retail developments and waste generation associated with this and have positive effects in relation to SA objective 11.</p> <p>It is considered that there will be no overall effects on objectives 10 and 13. Additionally the overall effects of the economic policies on objective 11 are considered to be neutral. Uncertain effects have been identified on objectives 8, 14 and 15 due to the fact that the site appraisals have identified some sites as being in close proximity to sensitive ecological designations and other sites being flagged as having adverse effects in relation to objectives 14 and 15. Until detailed site development proposals come forward the exact effects of the implementation of these policies on this objective are uncertain, notwithstanding the requirements of other policies in the plan.</p> <p>It is recommended for policy EC4 that consideration could be given to referencing other policies in the plan (for example the placemaking and design policies) in this policy to help ensure that new tourism related development does not adversely impact on the historic environment of York.</p> <p>Negative and positive effects were identified on the climate change and air quality objectives due to the fact the reality of economic growth is an increase in vehicle use and so the indirect effects of any increases in road use and vehicle emissions associated with this growth is negative, however positive effects were also recorded through the adoption of mitigation measures including the preparation of travel plans and promoting new development to sustainable and accessible locations.</p>	<p>EC1 – Provision of Employment Land</p> <p>EC2 – Loss of Employment Land</p> <p>EC3 – Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas</p> <p>EC4 - Tourism</p> <p>EC5 – Rural Economy</p> <p>R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Thresholds</p> <p>R2 – District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades</p> <p>R3 – York City Centre Retail</p> <p>R4 – Out of Town Centre Retail</p>		

**Effects of Housing Policies H1-H10**

SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
<p>1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.</p>	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of these policies would have significant positive effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. Although minor negative effects have also been assessed.</p> <p>Policy H1 would help to meet the housing requirement set out in Policy SS1 and complement the minor positive effects in the short, and medium and long term that the provision of 790867 dwellings per annum up to 2032/33 will make. <u>The policy would see the development of a number of housing allocations at strategic and local site level that would contribute to delivery of the housing need identified for the City.</u> However, the policy would also contribute to minor negative effects in the long term as the delivery in H1 would meet the CLG baseline population and household growth projections but not fully meet the PPG compliant approach to the calculation of housing need in the City of York area as it does not include an upward adjustment of the baseline for housing market signals (as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017 update) technical work prepared for the Council by GL Hearn). Even with the shortfall for 2012–2017 annualised over the period (56dpa), the ‘annual target’ is below that identified within the SHMA which in any event would require the shortfall to be applied.</p>

Housing												
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
												<p>However, the presence and extent of the negative effects is dependent on delivery on the ground in the plan period above the housing figure. Careful monitoring is therefore required. The phasing will ensure even delivery across the plan period.</p> <p>Implementation of Policies H2, H3 and H4 will help to ensure that there is a good balance and mix of housing provided as part of new housing developments, which would be particularly important in meeting the diverse housing needs of York. The evidence base identifies an increasingly complex housing market spatially and sectorally which demands policy which can respond positively and flexibly to evolving needs. For example, the York SMHA prepared by GL Hearn (2016), identified the need for 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings across the City, reflecting the demand for family housing and the demand from older persons wishing to downsize but still retain flexible accommodation.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy H4 would support the development of self and custom build homes on all strategic sites and would further help to meet the diverse housing needs of the population. The scale of the provision involved (5% of plots on the strategic sites) mean that this policy, would make an important contribution to the diversity of choice in relation to self and custom build opportunities and have a significant effect on this objective.</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		<p>Policies H5 and H6 would help to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller, roma and travelling showpeople communities which are an often marginalised group of society and have significant positive effects on this objective. The evidence base shows that there is a shortfall of accommodation for these groups with a need over the duration of the Plan for 47 gypsy and traveller pitches and 3 plots for showpeople. In specifying accommodation provision requirements over the Local Plan period and including policy to guide provision, the approach would help meet this need, in accordance with the Government's 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (2015). H6 also includes an allocation for Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy H7 would help to meet the housing needs of students where there is a proven need. Implementation of Policy H8 would help to control the numbers of houses in multiple occupation in order to control issues of overcrowding.</p> <p>Implementation of policy H9 will support the provision of older persons specialist accommodation. Development proposals will be supported where (inter alia) they meet an identified need. Additionally, provision is should be included on the strategic sites. This will ensure that development in City of York area meets these accommodation needs.</p>



SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing			
													<p>Implementation of policy H10 would help to improve affordability across the housing market in York. Increasing affordability of housing would have significant positive effects in helping to meet the diverse housing needs of York's population and would also have significant positive effects on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified</p>
2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of the proposed policies would help to provide good quality housing of a range of types and help towards meeting the diverse housing needs of the population. Living in the right type and quality of housing would have associated positive health benefits. In particular implementation of Policy H8 would help to control overcrowding, which could otherwise have adverse health impacts.</p> <p>Implementation of policies H5 and H6 would help to improve the health and well-being of the gypsy, traveller, roma and travelling</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		<p>showpeople community by providing dedicated sites for what is often a marginalised section of society. Both policies seek to avoid adverse environmental impacts from development and the incorporation of recreation space and utility services. H6 also specifically seeks to avoid impacts on the amenity of existing residents and future occupiers.</p> <p>In addition, the siting of the new housing sites, seek to ensure that they are sustainable located with options other than private transport available to occupiers and in close proximity to areas of open green space for recreation. Increasing the opportunities to walk and cycle is also associated with improved health benefits.</p> <p>Implementation of policy H10 will help to make housing more affordable and will increase people’s chances of living in a home of their choice. Additionally, H9 will provide accommodation tailored to meet the needs of the ageing population. This would also have associated positive health effects by providing the community with access to a range of good quality housing and would therefore have a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing			
													<b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Implementation of Policies H1 Housing Allocations, H2 Density, H3 Balancing Housing Market, H4 Self Build and H10 Affordable Housing would help to deliver a significant amount of new housing in York which could help to create jobs and potentially training opportunities for local people in the construction industry and raise skill levels in this sector. However, any positive effects would depend upon the approach taken by house builders as to whether training opportunities and skills development benefited local people and therefore had any positive effects on this objective. <b>Mitigation</b> None identified. <b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> There is uncertainty around the extent of any training opportunities that there may be for local people associated with construction jobs for new housing. The extent of any positive effects would depend upon the approach taken by house builders and construction

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												companies towards the development of training opportunities and skills development.
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of Policies H1, H2, H3, H4, H9 and H10 would help to deliver a significant amount of new housing in York. This would help to create construction jobs associated with building new housing which would have positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>Policy H1 in particular, as it makes provision for the housing requirement of 867 dwellings per annum up to 2032/33, is considered to have a positive effect on creating and sustaining employment in York, particular for those working or looking to work in the house building and construction sector (which is around 5% of the total employment across the city).</p> <p>Policy H4, makes provision for the construction of new houses by self- builders and custom house builders in line with requirements of the NPPF. This is expected to support skills in the local workforce.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												<p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>There is uncertainty around the extent that new job creation associated with the development of new housing would have positive effects on this objective. It would depend upon the skills of local people as to whether they could be employed on construction projects for new housing and also the approach taken by house builders in using local workforce.</p>
5. Help deliver equality and access to all.	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	0	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of policies H1-H4 and H7 (Student Housing) would help to deliver a significant amount of new housing across York, which would help people to have greater access to housing and therefore have positive impacts on this objective, with H1 making provision for delivering the housing requirement of a minimum of 867 dwellings per annum (as set out in SS1). The majority of allocations included in H1 scored positively or significantly positively for this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of Policies H5 and H6 would have significant positive effects on this objective since they would to enable delivery of dedicated sites for what is often a marginalised group of society and therefore help to deliver equality for the Gypsy, Traveller, Roma and Showpeople Community.</p>

SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing			
													<p>Policy H10 would also have significant positive effects upon this objective as it would help to improve access to affordable housing across York by ensuring provision (in perpetuity) and therefore reduce a cause of inequality to the community. H9, meanwhile will support the delivery specialist accommodation to meet specific housing needs over the lifetime of the development. These policies would therefore have significant positive effects in relation to this objective in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Depending upon the locations of new housing there could be an increase in traffic generation associated with this housing if such locations are not accessible by sustainable modes of transport, which could have negative effects on this objective. The scale of change proposed within York up to 2032/33 will inevitably generate an increase in the number of vehicles in the city above the existing</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations		Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	<p>baseline. There is the potential for the increase in vehicles to lead to an increase in vehicle movements although whether it will be within the City or on the strategic road network is uncertain. In considering these policies, and in particular H1, alongside the requirements of other policies in the plan, notably SS1 and T1 it is the effects upon this objective are considered to have the potential for positive and negative effects. Policy SS1 includes ensuring accessibility to sustainable transport modes is a key guiding principle, whereas Policy T1 would help to reduce the need to travel. In consequence, the policies when considered in conjunction with others in the local plan would have positive effects on this objective. Furthermore, the majority of proposed allocations included in H1 scored positively or significantly positively for this objective.</p> <p>Policy H2 sets out the net densities that housing developments will be expected to achieve and this includes the highest density for the city centre, a requirement for 50 units/ha within the York urban area and that support would be given for higher density development within 400m of a high frequency public transport corridor or transport hubs where in compliance with other plan objectives. These requirements, particular for higher density development in urban areas (where there will be existing good public transport links) would help to ensure that new housing can be accessed by sustainable modes of transport and have a positive effect on this objective.</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*	
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations		Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		<p>Implementation of Policy H4 would support the development of new self and custom build houses on the strategic sites. These strategic sites would need to be developed in accordance with other policies in the plan, including the requirement for travel plans and would therefore need to be accessible by sustainable modes of transport. On this basis development of new build homes on these sites would have positive effects upon this objective. Policy H9 supports specialist accommodation on strategic sites and in accessible locations, thereby supporting achievement of this objective.</p> <p>Policies H5 and H6 include the potential for development of additional gypsy and traveller sites where proposals ensure accessibility to public transport and services and so are considered compatible with this objective.</p> <p>In particular Policy H7 supports the development of new student housing where it is accessible by sustainable transport modes, which would have positive effects on this objective.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that implementation of policies H2-H10 alongside the transport policies would have positive effects upon this objective in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>



SA Objective	Housing													Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*		
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing							
																It is assumed that there would be a requirement for the provision of access to sustainable modes of transport as part of new large scale housing developments to help deliver a sustainable transport network.	
																<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>	
7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.	+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Inevitably with the development of new housing there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, associated with the construction activity (combining the effects from the embodied carbon in the construction materials as well as the emissions from construction traffic to and from the site). There could also be an increase in emissions associated with the energy consumption from the occupation of the new houses. However, Policy CC1 supports renewable and low carbon sources of energy and energy efficiency. Policy CC2 requires that all new development will be expected to consider the principles of sustainable design and construction and to make carbon savings through reducing energy demand, using energy and other resources efficiently. Policy CC2 also requires that dwellings achieve 19% reduction in carbon emissions compared to the Target Emissions Rate. The requirements of these policies would help to ensure that new housing developments are sustainably built,</p>

Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												<p>minimise greenhouse gas emissions and to help manage the response to climate change.</p> <p>The construction of the new homes will also lead to some indirect greenhouse gas emissions associated with vehicle movements. Any increase in vehicle movements and/or congestion could have adverse effects in relation to local air quality and the emission of greenhouse gases from vehicle emissions. However, this effect would be mitigated by the commitments on sustainable location, transport statements and Travel Plans.</p> <p>In consequence, whilst the direct effects of emissions from the new development will be considered to be minimal in regard to climate change, the indirect effects of any road travel associated with new development are considered to have a negative effect.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that there would therefore be neutral and negative effects from the implementation of this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing			
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Please note the text here replaces the text in the SA Addendum (April 2018) Appendix C. It therefore includes the changes to the SA Report (2018) in underline and strikethrough. New amendments are in bold.</b></p> <p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New housing developments could have adverse effects in relation to conserving or enhancing green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment if sited in inappropriate locations or without appropriate mitigation. However, other policies in the plan, notably SS1, DP1, DP2, GI1, GI2, GI3 and GI6 would help to ensure that the location of any proposed development will seek to conserve and enhance York’s natural environment including internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites and green corridors.</p> <p><del>Two</del><u>One</u> of the proposed general housing allocation sites and <del>three</del><u>four</u> strategic allocation sites have been identified as being within</p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
											<p>Commentary on the effects of each policy*</p> <p>250m of Statutory designated nature sites e.g. SPA/SAC/SSSI/LNR and as such have been appraised as having a significant adverse effect. A number of the other sites allocated have been identified as being either within 500m of these statutory sites and/or in some cases within 250m of other sensitive (but not statutory) ecological designations including SINC and Areas of Local Nature Conservation. Whilst the full effects can only be considered at the detailed planning application stage, the HRA (<b>February 2019</b>) of the housing policies (at this stage) indicates that it is unlikely to have significant adverse effects upon biodiversity sites of international importance. <del>The HRA (April 2018) could not rule out likely significant effects from site H59 in terms of the recreational pressures on Strensall Common SAC. However, with mitigation identified through Appropriate Assessment (as detailed in the policy) there were found to be no adverse effects on the integrity of the site.</del></p> <p>It is important that development proposals are brought forward in accordance with the Green Infrastructure policies, in particular GI2 to avoid any adverse effects upon feature of biodiversity interest. <u>At the planning application stage enhancements may also lead to</u></p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
											<p><u>positive effects on achieving this objective, although overall the effects of the policy are considered to be neutral.</u></p> <p>Policies H5 and H6 seek to safeguard the existing supply of sites for Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Showpeople and H6 allocates a new site at the Stables, Elvington to meet need. Assuming that this policy is implemented in accordance with other policies in the plan, there would be no adverse effects on this objective.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that effects from the implementation of these policies is neutral.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>There could be enhancements to green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna as part of new housing developments. However any such benefits could only be determined at the detailed</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*					
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing							
9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	0	+	-	0	+	-	<p>planning application and so it is uncertain at this stage the extent of any positive effects that there may be.</p> <p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>It has been identified through the detailed site appraisals that approximately 29% of proposed housing sites are on brownfield land. This would help to re-use existing land and therefore mean that approximately one third of the 16,000+ new homes over the plan period will be on brownfield sites. However, a significant amount of greenfield land (approximately 57% of all housing sites) is required for new housing which would score negatively against this objective of using land resources efficiently. The effects of policies H1 Allocations, H3 Balancing Market and H4 self and custom build are considered likely to have both positive and negative effects upon this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy H2 would help to achieve good density for residential developments. This would help to ensure efficient use of land for housing and reduce the amount of new land required for housing. This would therefore have a positive effect upon this objective.</p> <p>Implementation of Policy H5 would help to safeguard the existing supply of Gypsy and Traveller Sites, which would help to ensure efficient use is made of the existing land used for this purpose. The allocation of a new Travelling Showpeople site would help meet the</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												<p>identified need and provide a dedicated site to help avoid unauthorised sites arising elsewhere and help to avoid unnecessary use of other land. There would therefore be positive effects on this objective from this policy.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New housing development would increase demand for water resources overall. However, such effects will be mitigated through use of policies such as CC2 'Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development'.</p> <p>In addition to policies in this Plan Yorkshire Water have produced a Water Resources Management Plan. This sets out how they will ensure supply meets demand for the 25 years from 2015/16 to 2039/40. It incorporates future pressures on water supply and demand due to predicted changes to the climate. It also looks at future changes in population, housing, water use and metering</p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
											<p>Commentary on the effects of each policy*</p> <p>trends in Yorkshire. York is identified as being within the Grid SWZ Water Resource Zone. Yorkshire Water has identified that (taking into account multiple factors including population growth) the Grid SWZ is forecast to be in deficit from 2018/19 onwards. The forecast deficit in 2018/19 is 2.67Ml/d increasing to 108.65Ml/d by 2039/40. Within their WRMP, Yorkshire Water has identified as series of demand management and options to increase supply to meet this forecast deficit.</p> <p>Overall and in consideration of implementation of these policies alongside CC2 and wider measures including the Water Resources Plan highlighted above, and the fact that (as noted below) any improvements to water efficiency / quality can only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage, overall effects on this objective are considered to be neutral.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> There could be opportunities to improve water efficiency as part of new housing developments, for example with the development of SUDS. However, any such improvements could only be determined</p>



SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing			
													at the detailed planning application stage, and so it is uncertain at this stage what positive effects there may be.
11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The development of new housing would inevitably result in an increase in waste generation which would have adverse effects in relation to this objective. However, policy WM1 requires the integration of facilities for waste prevention, re-use, recycling, composting, and recovery in association with the planning, construction and occupation of new development for housing. This requirement would help reduce waste consumption associated with new housing development and to increase levels of reuse and recycling.</p> <p>For these reasons it is considered that there would be positive and negative effects on this objective associated with the level of growth proposed for York in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												None identified.
12. Improve air quality.	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New housing development covered by the policies in this chapter could have an adverse impact on air quality in York. Two strategic allocations (ST5 and ST36) are within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and have been assessed significantly negative against this objective. Impacts from these policies could occur during construction of any new development and could be related to dust and particulate matter although such effects will be very localised. In addition as they are subject to a variety of policies in the plan, notably, ENV1 which states that ‘development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and prevent further exposure to poor air quality’, it is likely that such effects, if they do occur, will be acceptable.</p> <p>There could also be effects arising from an increase in vehicle use associated with the growth in housing and the associated vehicle emissions, although these effects would be mitigated to some extent by the commitments on sustainable location, transport statements</p>

SA Objective	Housing										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing		
												<p>and Travel Plans contained with the transport policies T2 and T8 and also through the requirements of Policy ENV1 on Air Quality.</p> <p>In consequence, the indirect effects of any road travel associated with new housing development are considered to have a minor negative effect (in the case of policies H1, H2, H4, H5, H6, H7 and H9).</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>New housing development could have adverse effects in relation to flood risk and reducing impacts of flooding to people and property if sited in inappropriate locations or without appropriate mitigation. The following strategic sites – ST5 (York Central PSC boundary), , ST7 (Amalgamate sites to east of Metcalfe Lane), ST 15 (Land to the west of Elvington Lane) and ST32 (Hungate) have all been appraised as having a significant negative effect due to the sites including land identified as Flood Zone 3. However, when considered alongside</p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
											<p><b>Commentary on the effects of each policy*</b></p> <p>other policies in the plan, notably Policy ENV4 it is not considered that there would be any overall adverse effects in relation to this objective from this policy.</p> <p>As part of the detailed site appraisal for housing allocations any sites identified in areas of significant risk of flooding (flood zones 2 and 3) have been flagged up as having significant constraints for future development. It will be for the developer to demonstrate to York City Council and the Environment Agency that any flood risk associated with a development proposal will not be at risk from flood events or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>On this basis it is considered that there would be no overall significant effects from the implementation of these policies on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> It is assumed that new housing will be located in areas at lowest risk of flooding, or that housing developments would need to accord with policies elsewhere in the plan, notably ENV4, in order to mitigate any adverse effects on flooding.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing			
													None identified.
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of these policies would see the development of a significant amount of new housing across York. New housing development in inappropriate locations or poorly designed could have adverse effects on York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting. However, when considered alongside other policies in the plan including D2, D4, D5, D7 and D10 the development of new housing in accord with these policies would help to conserve York's historic environment through ensuring good design of new housing developments and thereby avoiding adverse effects.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) noted that for H1 there is potential for positive effects on the historic environment although effects are uncertain. The proposed allocations had a mix of scores against this objective.</p> <p>For policy H2 the HIA noted that there is potential for positive effects from supporting higher densities but the effects are largely neutral and dependent on the implementation of the policy. For H3 the HIA noted that as this policy is about provision of different types of housing, the influence on characteristics will therefore depend on design proposals that come forward. Currently, it is considered that</p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
	Commentary on the effects of each policy*										
											<p>the likely impacts are predominantly neutral, however, there is potential for positive effects or harm subject to design.</p> <p>Policies H5 and H6 safeguards the existing supply of Gypsy, Roma, Travellers and Showpeople sites and allocates one new sites to meet need. Provided that these sites are implemented in accordance with the design policies then there should be no adverse effects on York’s historic environment. Furthermore, the policy would only allow other new Gypsy and Traveller sites where proposals do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhance York’s historic environment and that this includes the city’s character and setting. This requirement would help to conserve York’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting and have positive effects upon this objective. The HIA assessed neutral effects for these policies.</p> <p>For policy H7 the HIA identified that potential harm has been identified for characteristics 3 and 6, Landmark Monuments and Landscape and Setting respectively due to housing development at/near York university campus. The type and scale of these impacts would be dependent upon the type and location of any development. Implementation of other policies in the plan including design/placemaking and green infrastructure would be required to mitigate this.</p>

Housing											
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies
											<p><b>Commentary on the effects of each policy*</b></p> <p>For policy H7 on student housing the HIA noted that the policy has a neutral impact on strong urban form by preventing any current impacts from getting worse. The policy has a positive impact on the architectural character of the city as it is conserving existing stock and limiting pressures of new development.</p> <p>The production of heritage statements as part of new housing development would further help to understand the potential effects of new housing development on York’s historic environment and ensure that is at the very least conserved and also enhanced where possible.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above and considered alongside other policies in the plan, in particular implementation of these policies alongside the design policies, it is considered that there would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified – provided that policies are implemented in accordance with policies on placemaking and design then no other mitigation required to ensure no adverse effects on York’s historic environment.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Housing											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*	
	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy 10 – Affordable Housing				
														<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>There could be enhancements to York’s historic environment as part of new housing developments. However any such benefits could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application and so it is uncertain at this stage the extent of any positive effects that there may be.</p>
15. Protect and enhance York’s natural and built landscape.	+	+	0	0	?	?	?	+	0	+	+	?	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of these policies would see the development of a significant amount of new housing across York. New housing development in inappropriate locations could have adverse effects on York’s natural and built environment. However in considering these policies alongside others in the plan, notably the requirements of Policies D1 and D2, then the development of new housing across York would help to protect and enhance York’s natural and built environment.</p> <p>Policies H5 and H6 set out that new Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites (other than those already in use) would only be allowed where they would not conflict with the objective of conserving York’s historic and natural and including the City’s character and setting.</p> <p>The HIA notes for H5, H6 and H7 there may be negative effects on the landscape but any effect is dependent on implementation.</p>	



Housing												
SA Objective	Policy H1 – Housing Allocations	Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development	Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market	Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building	Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers	Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople	Policy H7 – Student Housing	Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing	Policy H10 – Affordable Housing	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
												<p>On this basis it is considered that there would be positive effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. However, there is uncertainty relating to implementation of the policies on the ground.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> The exact extent and specific details of any enhancements to York's natural environment can only be considered at the detailed planning application stage.</p>

SA Objective  Housing  Policy H1 – Housing Allocations  Policy H2 – Density of Residential Development  Policy H3 – Balancing the Housing Market  Policy H4 – Promoting Self and Custom House Building  Policy H5 – Gypsy and Travellers  Policy H6 – Travelling Showpeople  Policy H7 – Student Housing  Policy H8 – Houses in Multiple Occupation  Policy H9 – Older Persons Specialist Housing  Policy H10 – Affordable Housing  Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Implementation of these policies would have significant positive effects on objectives 1, 2 and 5. These policies would help to deliver a significant amount of new housing over the plan period and would ensure that there is a good mix of different types of housing developed, that such housing is affordable and meets need. Existing supply of sites for Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Showpeople would be safeguarded and new sites allocated to meet need. All of the various measures in this policy would help to meet the diverse housing needs of York’s population and have significant positive effects on objective. By providing the housing to meet need there is associated significant positive effects on health and well-being and also for access and equality.</p> <p>Positive effects have been identified on objectives 4, 9, 11, 14 and 15.</p> <p>Effects on objective 8 are considered to be neutral although there are a number of the allocated housing sites within 500m and in some cases 250m of sensitive ecological designations. Whilst the full effects can only be considered at the detailed planning application stage, the HRA of the housing policies and strategic sites indicates that they are unlikely to have significant adverse effects upon biodiversity sites of international importance. It is important that development proposals are brought forward in accordance with the Green Infrastructure policies, in particular GI2 to avoid any adverse effects upon feature of biodiversity interest. Notwithstanding the requirements of other policies in the plan, effects on this objective can only be fully considered at the detailed planning application stage for new housing sites.</p> <p>One minor negative effect has been identified and this relates to air quality and emission of greenhouse gases. The Local Plan proposes a scale of change within York up to 2030 which will inevitably generate an increase in vehicles and vehicle movements above the existing baseline. Whilst other policies in the plan will help to mitigate effects on air quality from the construction of new houses, the indirect negative effects of an overall increase in vehicle use associated with new housing would have negative effects on objectives 7 and 12.</p> <p>No overall effects have been identified on objectives 3, 10 and 13.</p>	

**Effects of Health and Wellbeing (HW1-7) Policies**

No changes have been identified to the appraisal of these policies.

**Effects of Education (ED1 – 8) Policies**

No changes have been identified to the appraisal of these policies.

**Effects of Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture Policies (D1-D10)**

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the proposed policies have no relationship with this objective. However, implementation of Policy D1 would help to ensure that new housing development is well designed and that appropriate building materials are used, and also the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion are considered. These requirements would all help to have positive effects on the provision of housing of a suitable quality to meet the housing needs of York in a sustainable way.</p> <p>There would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, Policy D1 includes a requirement for development proposals to adhere to a number of design points including promoting ease of pedestrian and cycle movement and that spaces and routes must be safe. These measures would help to encourage walking and cycling and ensure the safety of the population of York</p>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<p>and therefore make a minor positive contribution towards this objective. <u>Additionally, the policy includes criterion that will ensure that new development does not unduly affect residential amenity through noise, disturbance, overlooking or overshadowing. This will help to protect the wellbeing of communities.</u></p> <p>Policy D3 will support the provision of cultural facilities and services, which are recognised as being important for the general wellbeing of a community.</p> <p>There would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Some of these policies have no clear relation with this objective and implementation of the other policies would not directly have any effects on this objective. However, they would have indirect positive effects in respect of educating people about the landscape and historic environment of York but would not help in respect of skills development or training and so it is considered that there would be no overall effects on this objective</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The historic environment York clearly plays a very important role in respect of tourism and also therefore the economy of York. Measures to protect the historic environment through these policies would help to safeguard the important role that York's historic environment plays in regards to the local economy. However this would not directly help to create jobs and deliver growth and so overall effects on this objective are considered to be neutral. <b>Mitigation</b> None identified. <b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
5. Help deliver equality and access to all.	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, Policy D1 requires that development proposals should adhere to a number of design points including the requirement to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion and help to reduce crime and the fear of crime. However, the policy does not promote access to community facilities or address any inequalities and so overall effects on this objective are considered to be neutral. Policy D3 supports the provision of cultural facilities and explicitly promotes access by all. This also supports equality within the City. This is assessed as having a minor positive effect on this objective. Overall, the policies are considered to have a minor positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, implementation of policy D1 includes a number of requirements including that new developments need to promote ease of public pedestrian and cyclist movement and establish natural patterns of connectivity. These</p>



SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<p>requirements would help to deliver a sustainable integrated transport network and therefore have significant positive effects on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.</p>
7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, Policy D1 includes a number of detailed design points which new development must adhere to including promoting ease of public pedestrian and cycling movement. This would not directly minimise greenhouse gases but would help to encourage more walking and cycling and less reliance upon use of the car. Less use of / reliance on cars would help to reduce associated vehicle emissions and have positive effects upon this objective.</p> <p>There would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	++	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Implementation of Policy D2 would help to ensure that there is a good relationship between good landscape design and biodiversity enhancement. This policy also includes a requirement that consideration will be given to the size and function of mature trees. These measures would help to conserve and enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna. Policy D1 concerns placemaking, and supports development proposals where they will improve existing urban and natural environments which could have a positive effect on the objective. Through the implementation of Policy D8 development proposals would only be supported where they do not have an adverse impact on the park's fundamental character and amenity. As historic parks and gardens will include elements of green infrastructure this policy would help to conserve green infrastructure. For these reasons policies D2 and D8 would have significant positive effects on this objective. There would be significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term. <b>Mitigation</b> No mitigation required. <b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												None identified.
9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, Policy D2 includes a requirement for development proposals to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the interrelationship between good landscape design, biodiversity enhancement and water sensitive design. Whilst this would not directly help to improve water quality and efficiency it would help to avoid any further decline in water quality. For these reasons there would be no overall effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. However, the requirements in Policy D1 for good design could help to reduce the amount of waste produced through inefficient design for example and inclusion of recycling facilities which would have a minor positive effect upon this objective. <b>Mitigation</b> None identified. <b>Assumptions</b> It is assumed that the requirement through Policy D1 for development proposals to adhere to a number of detailed design points including demonstrating the use of best practice would factor in the need to reduce waste generation as part of the design of new developments where possible, and to include facilities for recycling. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
12. Improve air quality.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. <b>Mitigation</b> None identified. <b>Assumptions</b>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)			
													None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The majority of the proposed policies have no clear relationship with this objective. Policy D2 makes reference to water sensitive design which could be important for any development in areas at risk of flooding. Water sensitive design could therefore help to reduce the impact of flooding to people and property. Policy D2 would therefore have positive effects on this objective. There would be positive effects in the short, medium and long term. <b>Mitigation</b> None identified. <b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.	
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Implementation of policies D1 – D10 would all help to have significant positive effects on conserving / enhancing York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting, and its interpretation. The Heritage Impact Appraisal (HIA)	

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<p>notes that policies will largely have a minor or significant positive effect on the townscape and historic environment.</p> <p>These policies would help to ensure that new development proposals are well designed, and would not have any adverse impacts on York’s historic environment. York’s city walls would be protected through Policy D10 which is important given the local importance of these walls to York’s historic environment.</p> <p>Implementation of policy D7 would help to ensure that non designated heritage assets in York are protected and enhanced through the requirement that development proposals will be supported where they are designed to sustain, enhance and value York’s historic environment. This is consistent with the paragraph 126 of the NPPF concerning the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Implementation of policy D9 will support policies concerning the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets by requiring the completion of a Heritage Statement for all development proposals that would affect archaeological and/or historic interests. Further brief guidance on the indicative contents of the Heritage Statement could be included in the accompanying text.</p> <p>Implementation of D3 will enable delivery of cultural facilities, including public art, which may complement the setting of the historic environment and contribute to its interpretation and understanding.</p> <p>There would be significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified – all policies would have significant positive effects.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

SA Objective	Placemaking, Design and Culture										Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												<p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None identified.</p>
15. Protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape.	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of Policy D2 in particular would have positive impacts on this objective as it sets out specific requirements for new development proposals in respect of landscape and setting, including requirements for landscape enhancements and avoidance of adverse landscape impacts. Policy D1 states that support would be given for new development proposals where they improve poor existing natural environments and also to enhance York's special qualities. These requirements would help to protect and enhance York's natural environment.</p> <p>Implementation of the other policies would help to protect York's built environment through protection for listed buildings, conservation areas, York's City Walls and Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Implementation of D3 will enable delivery of cultural facilities, including public art, which may complement the townscape and setting of the built landscape and contribute to its interpretation and understanding.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (HIA) notes that policies will largely have a minor or significant positive effect on the landscape and setting of the City area.</p> <p>Overall there would be significant positive effects on this objective. Effects would be positive in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>

Placemaking, Design and Culture											Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
SA Objective	D1 - Placemaking	D2 – Landscape and Setting	D3 – Cultural Wellbeing	D4 – Conservation Areas	D5 – Listed Buildings	D6 – Archaeology	D7 – The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	D8 – Historic Parks and Gardens	D9 - City of York Historic Environment Record	D10 - York City Walls and St.Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)		
												None identified. <b>Assumptions</b> None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>The implementation of these policies would have significant positive effects on a number of the SA objectives. Implementation of Policy D1 would help to ensure that new housing development is well designed and that appropriate building materials are used, and also the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion are considered and thereby help to meet the diverse housing needs of York’s population in a sustainable way.</p> <p>The promotion of pedestrian and cycling movements, <u>and ensuring residential amenity is not unduly affected by new development.</u> would have positive effects on health for the population of York. Policies D2 and D8 would have significant positive effects on objective 8 since green infrastructure would be enhanced through policy D2 and protected as part of requirements through Policy D8 to avoid any adverse impacts on historic parks and gardens. In particular and through the requirements of Policy D7 relating to the significance of non-designated heritage assets, development proposals will be encouraged and supported where they are designed to sustain, enhance, and add value to the special qualities and significance of York’s historic environment. This would have significant positive effects in the short medium and long term.</p> <p>All of the policies, except D3, would have significant positive effects on objectives 14 and 15. The historic environment of York and the natural and built environment would be conserved and protected through the implementation of these policies. The policies would help to control the effects of new development in relation to the historic environment and ensure enhancements for the historic environment and built and natural environment.</p> <p>Minor positive effects from policies D1 and D2 have been identified on objectives 7 and 13, whilst D3 is assessed as having minor positive effect on objective 5.</p> <p>No significant effects were identified on objectives 3, 4, 5, 9 10, 11 and 12.</p> <p>No negative effects or uncertainties have been identified.</p>												



**Table J.6 Effects of Green Infrastructure (GI1-7) Policies**

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Implementation of policies GI1-6 will support provision for diverse housing needs through helping to provide both an attractive setting for all types of housing and access to natural environments and recreational opportunities for all residents.</p> <p>Policies GI1 and GI3, in particular, will support access to greenspaces for those living in relatively high density environments and therefore offer opportunities for recreation and health which are important complements to suitable housing.</p> <p>Appropriate provision of new open spaces within new development (Policy GI6) should ensure that there is a consistent approach to the provision of open space resources of various types and hence equal opportunity of access for those in different kinds of housing. GI7 will help ensure suitable provision of burial/memorial grounds in accessible places will help support the growing population in the City of York.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>No mitigation required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Assumed that there will be consistent policy implementation, particularly in the provision of open space associated with new development.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None.</p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
2. Improve the health and well-being of York's population.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>It is expected that policies GI-6 will make a significant contribution to improving the health and well-being of the City's population. Together they establish the basis for the protection, enhancement and provision of open space resources all residents to take advantage of, both actively and passively.</p> <p>Access to natural and semi-natural environments of various kinds, and in reasonable proximity to where people live and work, is a long-proven benefit to human health. These policies will make a fundamental contribution to help realise that potential, particularly where Green Infrastructure resources can be joined together as a functional network and used as a means of helping to promote sustainable transport (see Policy T5 Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network).</p> <p>The policies will play a part in helping to improve City's air quality (Policy ENV1).</p> <p>Policy GI7 will contribute burial and memorial space, which is required within the City area due to the capacity being met in many locations. The support for appropriate development in the locations where they are needed supports wellbeing of the local population.</p> <p>The policies have the potential to make a significant contribution to maintaining and enhancing the image of the City as a pleasant place to live, work and visit, in turn benefitting the City's economy and hence well-being of the population.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>No mitigation required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									<p>Assumed that there will be consistent policy implementation through securing appropriate funding for provision and that any GI Strategy is able to establish and enhance functional links between various GI resources across the City, complemented by the provision of cycleways, for example.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The extent to which trends in car use, for example, can be stemmed and substituted with more sustainable modes of transport.</p>
3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>If realised to its full potential, the establishment of a Green Infrastructure network across the City could provide a range of opportunities for the training in countryside management and tourism opportunities, for example, as well as the establishment of new businesses. This is an aspiration that would be realised over the medium and longer term and has uncertainty over implementation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Assumed that there will be appropriate funding to establish and maintain a functional GI network across the City which could offer increased opportunities in areas such as woodland management.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Business Interest in using the GI network as the basis for developing training opportunities.</p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy.	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Strongly linked to Objective 3, the City's 'green economy' has the potential to take advantage of the policy commitments to realise a functional Green Infrastructure network across the City. Equally, related to Objective 2, the maintenance, enhancement and creation of open spaces of various types across the City is a critical part the City's image and role in attracting new businesses and retaining existing ones.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Assumed that there will be appropriate funding to establish and maintain a functional GI network across the City.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Business Interest in using the GI network as the basis for developing training opportunities.</p>
5. Help deliver equality and access to all.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Access to areas of greenspace and other recreational opportunities is a fundamental part of equality of opportunity, particularly for relatively deprived areas and certain groups in society who can become marginalised. In both cases, all the policies are likely to be of benefit over the short, medium and longer term. Equally, access to burial and memorial grounds (as proposed by GI7) supports equality to such facilities across the City area.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure							Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds		
									<p>No mitigation required.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> Assumed that there will be consistent policy implementation through securing appropriate funding for provision and that deficits in current provision, where these exist, can be addressed.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> None</p>
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network.	++	0	++	0	++	++	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Related to achieving Objective 5, the provision of a range of accessible open space for all residents will help to minimise the need to travel and encourage a modal shift towards cycling and walking. The policies, by seeking the provision of an integrated network of open spaces, and new provision associated with new development will contribute to achieving the required changes in behaviour. Benefits are likely to be secured over the short, medium and longer term and have the potential to be City-wide, although the contribution of sustainable travel plans could be significant factor in successfully achieving the Objective.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> Ensuing that the content sustainable travel initiatives complement the opportunities provided by the green infrastructure resource.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									Implementation of sustainable travel initiatives and synergy with the GI network.
7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.	++	0	++	++	++	++	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Promoting the expansion and enhancement of open spaces has the potential to play a part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, related to motor transport by encouraging more sustainable travel behaviour. Benefits are likely to be realised over the medium to longer as enhancement of the green infrastructure resource will take time to realise, as well as needing to be complemented by other policy interventions such as sustainable travel plans (see Policy T7 Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips).</p> <p>Open spaces and trees have a critical role in managing the effects of climate change as well as natural variability in climate, through flood alleviation, the temporary storage of flood water and shading of buildings, for example. It is important that these policies work in concert with partner policies concerning, for example flood risk (the City's rivers have significant floodplains [Flood Zone 3] associated with them) (ENV4), density of residential development (H2) and placemaking and design (D1-14).</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Ensuring that education provision is appropriately supported by and cross-referenced to sustainable design and travel initiatives, environmental quality policies and design policies.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									Policy integration to address climate change.
8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>These policies are the centrepiece of realising the aspiration of Objective 8 and will if consistently implemented, help to establish a sustainable green infrastructure structure across the City, with attendant benefits on other sustainability objectives (notably 2, 5, 7, 12, 14 and 15). The particular challenge rests in policy implementation and the extent to which, through the commitment to the preparation of Green Infrastructure Strategy for the City, genuine connectivity between various open space resources can be achieved, and consequently the ability to address various agendas including more sustainable travel and equality of access to open spaces. Full implementation of these policies is a long term project for the whole of the plan period and beyond, although short and medium term activity will be important to establish where the most effective long term benefits can be secured. The GI Strategy will be a significant starting point, and development activity, particularly on strategic sites has the potential to make a significant contribution to new and perhaps connecting green infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Longer term aspiration based on short and medium term activity.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Consistency and timeframe of policy implementation. The extent which new development can contribute to the City's overall GI network in a coherent fashion.</p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
9. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Safeguarding the quality of the City's green infrastructure resources is an important aspect of resource generally, and these policies will help to realise this objective. In addition, the fundamental linkages between different facets of the land resource are emphasised through these policies, in particular the importance of resource maintenance and enhancement.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The relative place of green infrastructure resource in the consideration of development priorities.</p>
10. Improve water efficiency and quality.	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The policies will make an important contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of water quality by providing natural filtration of run-off, helping to manage runoff patterns and intensity and promoting the efficient working of natural systems. Policy GI2 is assessed as having a significant positive effect on this objective by specifically ensuring water quality is maintained in the River Ouse and River Derwent.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>



SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									None identified. <b>Uncertainties</b> None identified.
11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> No link between this objective and the policies has been identified. <b>Mitigation</b> n/a <b>Assumptions</b> n/a <b>Uncertainties</b> n/a
12. Improve air quality.	++	0	++	++	++	++	+	++	<b>Likely Significant Effects</b> Promoting the expansion and enhancement of open spaces and tree cover, particularly in the City Centre and along arterial roads where AQMAs have been designated, has the potential to play an important part in improving air quality across the City, both directly through the dispersal and filtration of particulate matter and indirectly through encouraging more sustainable travel behaviour which will help to reduce vehicle emissions. Benefits are likely to be realised over the medium to longer as enhancement of the

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									<p>green infrastructure resource will take time to realise, as well as needing to be complemented by other policy interventions such as sustainable travel plans (see Policy T7 Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips).</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> None.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b> Implementing sustainable travel initiatives such as through sustainable travel plans and realising a green infrastructure network which presents genuine travel choices.</p>
13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.	++	++	++	0	++	++	+	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b> The green infrastructure resource is an important part of the City's flood management regime, through providing areas for water to pond during periods of high rainfall and providing buffer areas between river corridors and residential and commercial properties. The significant floodplains associated with the City's main rivers play an important multifunctional role, providing recreational, biodiversity and landscape benefits. Detailed maps of Green Infrastructure and flood risk across the City are set out in Policy SS1,</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
									<p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The nature and extent of climate change and extreme events both of which might require a significantly greater contribution from green infrastructure in helping to mitigate their effects.</p>
14. Conserve or enhance York's historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>The City's green infrastructure resource is a fundamental part of the historic character of the City, providing both a setting for buildings and being part of that inherent character, such as the Strays and the formal Parks and Gardens. As such, the protection and enhancement of the GI resource through Policies GI1-7 should help to fully realise the SA Objective. There are particularly important links between Policy GI4 Trees and Hedgerows and the suite of policies relating to Placemaking and Design (D1-14). The Heritage Impact Appraisal (HIA) notes largely positive impacts on the historic environment from these policies.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Ensuring long term commitments to resource protection and enhancement.</p>

SA Objective	Green Infrastructure								Commentary on the effects of each policy*
	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	
15. Protect and enhance York's natural and built landscape.	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Strongly related to Objectives 8 and 14, the City's green infrastructure is an integral part of securing this Objective, although it can be vulnerable to long term, cumulative change. As such it will be important to ensure that a strategic view is taken on overall development activity and the potential effects of cumulative change. The Heritage Impact Appraisal (HIA) for these policies notes that there are largely positive impacts for the landscape although recognises that there may be harm from the loss of open space (where appropriate under GI5) to other uses. The implementation of other policies in the plan will help mitigate such impacts.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Assessment of potential cumulative impacts.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>Extent, character and possible cumulative effects of City-wide development over the plan period.</p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The appraisal of Green Infrastructure policies has identified significant positive effects across many of the objectives. As such these policies are fundamental to realising the sustainable development aspirations for the City over the short, medium and longer term in creating a greener and better connected City which can respond to the needs and aspirations of the population and help to address the impacts of climate change and its natural variability. Their effective implementation will make an important contribution to the health and well-being of York's residents and workers, the ecological integrity of the City, air and water quality and management and the character and quality of the natural and built landscape.</p>									

Green Infrastructure									
SA Objective	GI1: Green Infrastructure	GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature	GI3: Green Infrastructure Network	GI4: Trees and hedgerows	GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	GI6: New Open Space Provision	GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds	Cumulative effect of the draft policies	Commentary on the effects of each policy*
<p>The policies provide the basis for carrying forward aspirations for more sustainable development across the City, although much rests with implementation. There are short, medium and longer term sustainability gains to be realised through implementation of the policies, appropriately supported by other policies relating to travel plans, for example. The green infrastructure policies have a greater or lesser role to play in realising all the SA Objectives and there are important cross-policy linkages to be made, particularly with regard to environmental quality and protection (ENV1-5 and design and the historic environment (D1-14). Implementation of these policies is complementary with attendant benefits for sustainability.</p> <p>Some uncertainties exist in relation to the detail of policy implementation, in particular the degree to which enhancement and extension of the green infrastructure network can be realised, although the commitment to drawing up a Green Infrastructure Strategy should provide the basis for a strategic approach to the resource and locally-specific initiatives to enhance the resource, through increasing connectivity for example.</p>									

No changes have been identified to the appraisal of the policies in the following sections of the draft Local Plan:

**Managing Appropriate Development in the Green Belt (GB1-4) Policies**

**Climate Change (CC1-3) Policies**

**Environmental Quality and Flood Risk (ENV1-5) Policies**

**Waste (WM1) and Minerals (WM2) Policies**

**Transport and Communications Policies T1-T9 and C1**

**Delivery and Monitoring: Policy DM1**