



A summary of the representations submitted to the independent examiner at Submission stage and a summary of responses received by the City of York Council at the Regulation 17A (2) consultation.

Ref no	Respondent	Summary of Comments
Representations received at Submission consultation stage		
Huntington Submission Consultation 001	Highways Agency	No formal comments at this point in specific regard to the neighbourhood plan document.
Huntington Submission Consultation 002	Huntington Resident	The resident asked whether consideration has been given to the service utilities (i.e water, sewerage etc), and also for any future planning in the Huntington area.
Huntington Submission Consultation 003	CPRE North Yorkshire	CPRE North Yorkshire welcomed the opportunity to comment and supported the Parish Council in their vision for Huntington and the Neighbourhood Plan in general. They were pleased to see policies covering the environment in as much depth in particular tranquillity and Local Green Spaces.
Huntington Submission Consultation 004	Foss Internal Drainage Board	The Foss Internals Drainage Board welcomed the opportunity to comment on the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted that the Foss Internal Drainage Board's district covers a large area within the Huntington Parish. It was highlighted that there are a number of Board maintained watercourses within the area and also a number of ordinary watercourses, which whilst not maintained by Board, will still require the Board's consent if an applicant wanted to discharge into or construct anything within them. The Foss Internal Drainage Board set out their basic requirements under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Boards' byelaws, the Board's prior written consent (outside of the planning process) and when this is needed. The most pertinent of

		<p>which related to any construction, fencing or planting within 9 metres of a Board maintained watercourse. Full details of the Consent process can be found on our website:-</p> <p>http://www.yorkconsort.gov.uk</p> <p>Information in relation to surface water and Foul Sewage were also highlighted in the response.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 005	Huntington Resident	<p>The Huntington resident set out information in relation to Planning permission being refused 3 times and an appeal dismissed on the basis that the land is green belt on land at Avon Drive.</p> <p>The resident also recommended that no further development whether it be housing or commercial should be carried out in any part of Huntington until the roadway network is vastly improved. It was highlighted that the current road network is inadequate and would get worse if 1000 additional new houses and more businesses are built.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 006	Coal Authority	No specific comments.
Huntington Submission Consultation 007	Huntington Resident	<p>The resident highlighted that they are really pleased to see that the area of fields behind Broome Way is a 'Candidate site of importance to nature conservation' known as SINC Site North Lane Meadow. The resident hoped that this area is confirmed as a SINC Site.</p> <p>The resident raised concerns over the proposed 1000 new houses North of Monks Cross, it was considered the new houses would harm the unique character of the area and put a real strain on education and the health systems and on the road system in particular. The resident supported the additional proposed cycle paths and supported brownfield over greenfield development.</p> <p>The resident also suggested making a positive move which would be an example for other Councils to follow and plant a few hundred trees to help our environment.</p>

Huntington Submission Consultation 008	Historic England	No specific comments.
Huntington Submission Consultation 009	Huntington Resident	<p>The resident raised concerns that building almost 1000 homes on the site North of Monk's Cross will mean a 25% increase in the number of households in Huntington which would impact on health care, schools, drainage, other amenities and most importantly on roads.</p> <p>In relation to Policy H21 (section 194) walking and cycling the resident highlighted that the plan encourages people to walk and cycle more, but roads need to be made calmer and safer first for people to get out of their cars and before more housing development takes place.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 010	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Information setting out the Neighbourhood Planning legal requirements, National and local Planning Policy is included. Gladman Developments Ltd considered the requirements of national policy and guidance are not always reflected in the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan and sought to recommend some modifications to ensure compliance with basic conditions specifically in relation to Policy H15: Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Gladman Developments Ltd do not believe that Huntington Neighbourhood Plan supporting evidence is sufficiently robust to justify the proposed allocation of 5. Land next to Manor House and 16. land on corner of Yearsley Grove as LGS, given that they form extensive tracts of land. Gladman Developments Ltd recommended that the Local Green Space Policy be revisited to ensure the designations are compliant in their entirety.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 011	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East) objected to Policy H2: Housing Mix in New Housing Development Proposals in relation to the following part of the policy which states "priority should be given to the provision of smaller homes (one or two bedrooms)". It is considered that this cannot be based solely on a local needs assessment and there has to be flexibility to account for the

		<p>market. It is suggested that the wording of the policy is revised to ensure consistency with local and national policy.</p> <p>Objection was also made to Policy H3: Affordable Housing Provision and Mix it was considered that as the policy is drafted is unreasonable and is not in accordance with the emerging local plan or national planning policy.</p> <p>In relation to Policy H5: Huntington Character Buildings and Sites of Local Heritage Interest, the respondent suggested that to make the policy clearer, they would advise the inclusion of an additional plan to support Policy H5 showing the important views towards and from locally important assets in Huntington.</p> <p>The respondent objected to the use of Map 3 in relation to H14: Green Belt because the current extent of the Green Belt has not been defined at this stage and is liable to change, and as such the respondent objected to the inclusion of Map 3 at this stage, as it may well be dated shortly after adoption.</p> <p>In relation to Policy H17: Biodiversity, it states that “development proposals will be expected to maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features for biodiversity”.</p> <p>The respondent indicated that in order to provide certainty, a plan should be included within the neighbourhood plan which identifies the ecological corridors. Paragraph b of the policy is considered to be restrictive in its wording, allowing little flexibility for necessary site works, such as the removal of a small section of hedgerow to enable access to a site. The respondent advised the policy to be reworded to state “maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features where practical”</p> <p>The respondent objected to Policy H22: Developer Contributions, it was considered that typically, this matter is dealt with via the local planning authority who secure contributions from</p>
--	--	--

		<p>developers through Section 106 legal agreements. Furthermore, the policy also requests that developer contributions will be sought towards medical facilities. The respondent considered that there is no guidance as to how this contribution would work in reality and suggested that this policy is deleted.</p>
<p>Huntington Submission Consultation 0012</p>	<p>ID Planning on behalf of North Lane Developments Ltd</p>	<p>Support was given in relation to the eleven principles underpinning the vision, specific support was given to principles 1 and 8 which seek to ensure that the needs of the community are met in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Policy H1 – Meeting Housing Need, was supported in principle with an improvement suggested. It was suggested by the respondent that the scope of Policy H1 should be broadened to include any windfall sites that might come forward in the Plan Period. The policy as worded would appear to only relate to sites which are allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Specific support for paragraphs 63-69 which relate to the need for housing to meet the needs of older people.</p> <p>Support was also given for Policy H2 – Housing Mix in New Housing Development Proposals and Policy H4: Design principles.</p>
<p>Huntington Submission Consultation 013</p>	<p>ELG Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</p>	<p>It was recognised that the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan does not offer a view on housing allocations (Policy H1) being proposed through the emerging York Local Plan and it was considered by the respondent that this is a sensible approach given the clear need for York to release Green Belt land to meet its pressing housing needs.</p> <p>It was welcomed that the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to add a further layer of constraint and leaves the City of York Council to determine where it considers it most appropriate to locate housing allocations. However, the respondent suggested that it must be made clear that the Neighbourhood Plan does not place any restriction on the Council allocating further land in</p>

		<p>the Parish through the Local Plan process should this be deemed the most appropriate approach to assist in meeting York's housing needs.</p> <p>The respondent objected to the second criteria in Policy H1 which requires that any housing development, "functionally and physically connects to and integrates with Huntington Village". It was requested that this criteria is removed as it is not consistent with the spatial strategy proposed in the emerging York Local Plan.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 014	Pilcher Homes	<p>The respondent supported the eleven principles underpinning the vision.</p> <p>In relation to housing the respondent concurred with the statements made in Paragraph 51 and 58 and considered the development of housing on Avon Drive , Site No 191 is appropriate for housing.</p> <p>It was suggested that an alternative site for affordable housing is proposed as well as the Strategic Housing Allocation ST8.</p> <p>It was suggested that the requirement for the elderly population must consider the closeness of all the local amenities.</p> <p>Information was supplied in relation to extant permission at Avon Drive which is shown as Local Green Space on Map 3.</p> <p>Information in relation to site specific traffic levels, flood risk management and developer contributions were also provided by the applicant.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 015	Tom Pilcher	<p>The respondent requested a minor modification to make the neighbourhood plan legally compliant: This related to Map 3 on page 51 which it is suggested erroneously shows 1 Avon Drive, which is a consented building plot, as public open space.</p>

		<p>The respondent requested a minor modification is made to the neighbourhood plan to make it legally compliant in relation to Policy H14 Green Belt: It was suggested that the policy should be made clear that the City of York does not have and never has had a adopted local plan, and that an adopted local plan is the only method for adopting or amending a green belt boundary.</p> <p>The respondent supported Policy H15 Local Green Spaces because the policy makes clear that none of the private land, at and, north of Avon Drive, has ever been considered local green space.</p> <p>It was noted that land created for public open space by Pilcher Homes in the centre of Stratford Way is to be designated as Local Green Space. This was supported.</p> <p>The respondent indicated that Avon Drive should also be considered as a housing site.</p>
<p>Huntington Submission Consultation 016</p>	<p>City of York Council</p>	<p>The Council appreciated the amount of hard work and dedication that the Neighbourhood Planning Group put into this process to produce a locally representative document.</p> <p>The Council supported all policies, but makes the following comments on the policies below:</p> <p>It was recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan is updated to take account of the latest Local Plan timescales, housing number information and information in relation to ST8 and that the Neighbourhood Plan will be updated once the Local Plan is adopted.</p> <p>In relation to policy H2: Housing Mix in New Development it was recommended that the City of York Council SHMA (2016) is referenced.</p> <p>It was recommended that the first sentence of paragraph 99 should be clarified to refer to the Council's draft Local Heritage List, which was consulted on in 2013 but has not fully been through the statutory process to be an SPD.</p> <p>Clarification was given in relation to Policy H11: Neighbourhood Parades and the differences</p>

		<p>between the boundaries between the Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>In relation to Policy H14: Green Belt it was suggested that the same approach is used that was used in the adopted Neighbourhood Plans across York. This allows the Neighbourhood Plan to continue to apply the approach to the identification of the green belt as currently set out in the RSS and the Fourth Set of Changes Local Plan (2005) on an interim basis until such time as the Local Plan is adopted.</p> <p>In relation to H16: The River Foss the City of York Council understood that a buffer needs to be maintained between the top of the river bank and development adjacent to the River Foss. However based on information provided by City of York Council technical specialists and the response from the Foss Internal Drainage Board it was understood that there needs to be a 9m buffer which is for maintenance and not an 8m buffer which is for ecological and conservation purposes it was recommended that this policy is altered accordingly. Updates to the legislation, SINC sites and Sites of Local Interest (SLI's) was also recommended alongside the removal of reference to white-clawed crayfish.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 017	Pilcher Homes, Lime Tree Homes Ltd, Robert Pilcher and Thomas Pilcher Homes Ltd	<p>Pilcher Homes Ltd, Lime Tree Homes Ltd, Robert Pilcher and Thomas Pilcher Homes Ltd supported Policy H15 local green spaces because the policy makes clear that none of the private land, at and, north of Avon Drive, has ever been considered local green space. It was noted that land created for public open space by Pilcher Homes in the centre of Stratford Way is to be designated as Local Green Space. This was supported.</p> <p>The respondents also supported Policy H19 transport and traffic management. The creation of dual carriageway for the YORR was strongly supported.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 018	O'Neill Associates on behalf of Galtres Garden Village Development Company	<p>Information was put forward in relation to the Galtres Garden Village in support for the allocation site proposal.</p>

<p>Huntington Submission Consultation 019</p>	<p>Johnson Mowat Development Company on behalf of Redrow Homes</p>	<p>The respondent welcomed the opportunity to comment on the Huntington Parish Neighbourhood Plan and noted the Neighbourhood Plan timescales mirror the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Principle 1 was welcomed which supports the provision of housing that meets the future needs of the community, however it was noted that the Site ST8 north of Monks Cross is a strategic site which will meet the wider needs of the District and not just the Huntington Parish needs.</p> <p>In relation to section 4.1 Housing Development and Meeting Housing Need, Housing Provision, it was suggested that this section should be updated to reflect the current Local Plan position in relation to housing numbers and the latest Local Plan position in relation to hearing sessions.</p> <p>Reference in the Neighbourhood Plan to the suitability of Site ST8 was welcomed by the respondent as was the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to allocate land for housing and that this is left to the local plan to finalise.</p> <p>The respondent highlighted differences between the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan in relation to Policy H1: Meeting Housing Need criteria 2 and the need for medical facilities. The respondent also suggested criteria 4 and 5 of Policy H1 are repetitive. The respondent maintained that the ST8 allocation should be physically connected to Huntington, however the Local Plan as currently drafted does not propose this for ST8.</p> <p>There was an acknowledgement for the need to provide a range of housing types, sizes and tenures but that flexibility is required in the wording of Policy H2, to reflect that ST8 will not necessarily meet the exact identified needs of the Parish and that reference should be made to taking account of an up to date housing needs survey used in relation to the Local Plan. It was suggested that Policy H3 is too prescriptive and an objection is made to the inclusion of</p>
---	--	--

		<p>specific affordable housing bedroom requirements within this policy, which are taken from the 2016 SHMA. It was indicated that there is no reference in the policy wording to the updating of the SHMA and any consequent changes to the mix throughout the plan period which should be included.</p> <p>Information was given in relation to the community facilities which will be associated with the ST8 site.</p> <p>Comments were made in relation to Policy H14: Green Belt and the need to it to be in line with the Local Plan. It was suggested that should the Neighbourhood Plan be 'Made' prior to the Local Plan Adoption, Policy H14 should include reference to the formalisation of the York Green Belt via the Local Plan and Map 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan should be updated as necessary following adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>There was support for Policy H21: Walk and Cycling. In relation to Policy H22: Developer Contributions it was suggested that the reference to wherever possible and appropriate in the wording of the policy was welcomed, however reference to 'where viable' was also recommended.</p>
<p>Huntington Submission Consultation 020</p>	<p>Johnson Mowat Development Company on behalf of Land owners west of ST8</p>	<p>The respondent welcomed the opportunity to comment on the Huntington Parish Neighbourhood Plan and noted the Neighbourhood Plan timescales mirror the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Principle 1 was welcomed which supports the provision of housing that meets the future needs of the community, however it was noted that the Site ST8 north of Monks Cross is a strategic site which will meet the wider needs of the District and not just the Huntington Parish needs.</p> <p>In relation to section 4.1 Housing Development and Meeting Housing Need, Housing Provision, it was suggested that this section should be</p>

	<p>updated to reflect the current Local Plan position in relation to housing numbers and the latest Local Plan position in relation to hearing sessions.</p> <p>Reference in the Neighbourhood Plan to the suitability of Site ST8 was welcomed by the respondent as was the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to allocate land for housing and that this is left to the local plan to finalise.</p> <p>The respondent highlighted differences between the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan in relation to Policy H1: Meeting Housing Need criteria 2. It was considered that it would be appropriate and more logical to re-instate the land west of North Lane within the ST8 boundary, and the respondent requested the Neighbourhood Plan team take this request into consideration.</p> <p>There was an acknowledgement for the need to provide a range of housing types, sizes and tenures but that flexibility is required in the wording of Policy H2, to reflect that ST8 will not necessarily meet the exact identified needs of the Parish and that reference should be made to taking account of an up to date housing needs survey used in relation to the Local Plan.</p> <p>It was suggested that Policy H3 is too prescriptive and an objection was made to the inclusion of specific affordable housing bedroom requirements within this policy, which are taken from the 2016 SHMA. It was indicated that there is no reference in the policy wording to the updating of the SHMA and any consequent changes to the mix throughout the plan period which should be included.</p> <p>Information was given in relation to the community facilities which will be associated with the ST8 site.</p> <p>Comments were made in relation to Policy H14: Green Belt and the need to it to be in line with the</p>
--	---

		<p>Local Plan. It was suggested that should the Neighbourhood Plan be Made prior to the Local Plan Adoption, Policy H14 should include reference to the formalisation of the York Green Belt via the Local Plan and Map 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and should be updated as necessary following adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>There was support for Policy H21: Walk and Cycling. In relation to Policy H22: Developer Contributions it was suggested that the reference to wherever possible and appropriate in the wording of the policy was welcomed, however reference to 'where viable' was also recommended.</p>
Huntington Submission Consultation 021	Huntington Resident	The document could be made clearer and simplified.
Summary of responses received by the City of York Council at the Regulation 17A (2) consultation.		
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 001	The Coal Authority	No Specific Comment on the consultation document.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 002	CPRE North Yorkshire	CPRE North Yorkshire gave support for Green Belts across the UK. They also gave support for the retention of the Green Belt around York. CPRE indicated in their response that the modifications proposed was the most appropriate course of action and didn't raise any objections.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 003	Resident	In general the resident agreed with the proposed Green Belt amendments. The Green Belt as shown on Map 6 and 7 should remain. There should be no movement from the RSS and Draft Local Plan stance.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 004	Environment Agency	The Environment Agency gave no objections to the Green Belt modifications.

Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 005	Highways England	No Specific Comment on the consultation document.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 006	Historic England	No formal comments.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 007	ID Planning on behalf of North Lane Developments Ltd	Supported Policy H1,H2 and H14. In relation to H14 ID Planning states that they supported the proposed modifications to the policy and the clarification of the approach.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 008	Huntington Resident	The resident indicated that the Green Belt must be protected and support is given for Map 6 and 7. It is indicated that Huntington already have ST8 and ST17.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 009	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes	Support for the proposed modifications a)-f) as outlined in part 1 and repeated in Part 2 to the wording of Policy H14 and Supporting Text.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 010	Huntington Resident	<p>The resident's general view is that the default assumption should fall in favour of treating land within the general extent of the Green Belt as Green Belt.</p> <p>In relation to proposed paragraph 144 the resident stated: I do not agree with the change, implying as it does a negative approach to Green Belt definition. On the contrary, the default assumption should fall in favour of treating land within the general extent of the Green Belt as Green Belt. Hence reinstate the following wording: 'The effect of this process is that decisions on planning applications falling within the general extent of the Green Belt (as defined in the RSS) are taken on the basis that land is treated as Green Belt.'</p> <p>The following modifications were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 146 in deciding whether land should be regarded as Green Belt in advance of the adoption of the Local Plan: "This means that such decisions will take into account the RSS general extent of the Green

		<p>Belt, the draft Local Plan (April 2005) (Map 6), the emerging Local Plan, and site specific features and the positive-leaning default assumption as expressed in paragraph 144”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H14 Green Belt should keep the wording: ‘The Plan supports the continued designation of the majority of Huntington Parish as Green Belt.’ • After ‘site specific features’, include the wording: ‘and the positive-leaning default assumption’ as expressed in paragraph 144 and as suggested in the changes to paragraph 146 above.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 011	Avison Young on behalf of The National Grid	No specific comments on the Green Belt modifications. National Grid identified that it has no record of proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to any National Grid assets within the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan area.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 012	North Yorkshire Police	North Yorkshire Police agreed to the modifications to the Green Belt Policy as set out in part 1 and Part 2.
Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 013	Pilcher Homes	<p>Pilcher Homes stated that they generally supported the changes proposed by the Examiner’s report and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreed with Johnson Mowat and Redrow for their comments in relation to need for Green Belt modifications. • agreed that the new map 3, excluding the any colouring to show the potential location of an inner boundary is in their opinion legally compliant. • accepted that the inner boundary has not been defined and that there is no such thing as a ‘de facto’ legal designation as per Paragraph 142. <p>However, Pilcher Homes raised concerns in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Policy Framework should be considered as paramount and that it is this that aims to protect Green Belt land whether it has been correctly identified and approved through a local plan • Too much reliance on recent cases. • CYC has identified in Figure 7 that a large amount of land covered by this draft neighbourhood plan does not serve the purposes of Green Belt. Therefore an adoptable plan will

		<p>have to 'not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open' and 'define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 138 - should be removed because a draft GB does not count as a designation; • Paragraph 139 - the neighbourhood plan over reaches itself to precis the NPPF 2018 currently used for appeal decisions. • Paragraph 140 - it is incorrect to suggest that the obsession with Green Belt policy is so widely held in the parish. Only 131 responded to the neighbourhood plan out of 4400 • Almost all of the land they would like to designate for Green Belt in the previous Map 3 is privately held and does not provide for recreation • Paragraph 144 - is an oversimplification of the Cullingford Statement. <p>Pilcher Homes also highlighted that it should be noted that the neighbourhood plan has not sought to promote any development sites in the parish. None that are small or medium are considered and the strategic site ST8 is only reluctantly acknowledged.</p> <p>Pilcher Homes highlighted that it should be noted that the 2003 work identified that the land between the current draft ST8 is not necessary to be kept open for the setting and character of the City of York and in its current position it is less integrated and sustainable than if it were contiguous with the rest of the 20th century development on the eastern edge of Huntington.</p>
<p>Huntington Regulation 17A (2) consultation 014</p>	<p>York Consortium of Drainage Boards</p>	<p>No specific comments.</p>