

**STRENSALL WITH TOWTHORPE
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Submission Draft Version**

**Response by the City of York Council and Strensall with
Towthorpe Parish Council to Commencement of
Examination Procedural Note -
Strensall with Towthorpe
Neighbourhood Development Plan.**

Independent Examiner - Rosemary Kidd

Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan

The following is the formal response to the questions asked in the Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan Procedural Note. It has been drafted by the City of York Council and the Qualifying Body (Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council). The questions are highlighted below in bold, with the response below each question.

Local Plan

- **In the absence of a formally adopted Local Plan, would the LPA confirm that the statements in section 3.2 of the STNP are correct. If not, would they provide me with update of the current position on the new Local Plan;**

The statements in section 3.2 of the STNP are correct, and reflect the current position of the Local Plan.

- **Have strategic planning policies been identified that are relevant to the NP area?**

Yes. The following policies in the City of York Local Plan (Publication Draft) (February 2019) section on the 'Spatial Strategy' are considered relevant to the NP area:

- SS1 (Delivering Sustainable Growth for York). This policy sets out the Council's strategic approach to the location of development, guided through 5 spatial principles – conserving & enhancing York's historic & natural environment; ensuring accessibility to sustainable modes of transport and a range of services; preventing unacceptable levels of congestion, pollution and/or air quality; ensuring flood risk is appropriately managed; and where viable and deliverable, the re-use of previously developed land would be phased first.
- SS19 (Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall) – this policy sets out the key principles for developing the Queen Elizabeth Barracks site. However, due to a proposal to remove the site from the Plan, policy SS19 is proposed to be removed by PM13/PM14 (Proposed Modifications June 2019). The site is proposed to be 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). The City of York Local Plan is currently at Examination, therefore, the status of the site will only be confirmed once the examination is complete

- **Have any modifications been proposed since those of 2019, referred to in the assessment in Table 3 the Basic Conditions Statement, that may affect the NP area?**

A new policy GI2a (Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC)) has been proposed in the Council's Composite Modifications Schedule (April 2021). This was subject to public consultation from 25th May 2021 to 7th July 2021. The references are: PM70 – New Policy GI2a and PM71 – New Policy GI2a Justification. The policy is a bespoke one for Strensall Common to ensure that adverse effects as a result of development is mitigated. This proposed modification complies with the outcomes of the HRA (2020) for consistency.

Policy GI2a may be relevant to a number of policies listed in Table 3 of the Basic Conditions Statement: DH1 (Promotion of Local Distinctiveness), DH2 (General Design Principles), DG1 (Strensall Park), DG2 (Alexandra Road), DG3 (Howard Road), DG4 (Queen Elizabeth Barracks) and DG5 (Development Brief for the re-development of Queen Elizabeth Barracks).

See link to new policy / Mods doc – see separate attachment.

- Additionally, the Council has proposed to amend the Green Belt boundary along the eastern side of Strensall, so that the proposed Green Belt boundary should follow the edge of the densely developed site. (PM101 / City of York Local Plan Proposed Modifications – April 2021). This proposed boundary change has superseded PM39 (June 2019).

See link below the City of York Local Plan Composite Modifications Schedule (April 2021) - see PM101 (page 75) for the proposed boundary amendment:

<https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/6534/ex-cyc-58-composite-modifications-schedule-april-2021>

Representations

Would the Parish Council consider the representations that have been made and let me have any comments and revisions they may wish to propose as a consequence.

Please see separate 'Regulation 16 PC Representations Response Grid'

Proposals Map

Would the PC / LPA provide me with a Proposals Map or Maps at a scale that enables the boundaries of properties and sites to be readily identified.

This will be provided in due course by the Parish Council.

Would you revise the Proposals Map to only show those sites and buildings that are referred to / designated in the Policies of the Plan.

This will be provided in due course by the Parish Council.

Would you include the areas referred to under Policy DG3, DG4 and DG5 on the Proposals Map.

This will be provided in due course by the Parish Council.

Please note that the Community Actions are not planning policies and sites proposed under the Community Actions should be shown on a separate Map.

This is acknowledged and accepted by the PC. Strensall PC is making the necessary revisions to the Proposals Map, as discussed above. The PC is agreeable to the preparation of a separate map showing Community Actions and would welcome the LPA's assistance in this matter.

Community Facilities

Would you confirm which are registered as Assets of Community Value.

Strensall Explore Library, St Wilfrid's Church and Hurst Hall Community Centre have been successfully nominated / registered as Assets of Community Value, as listed on City of York Council's website.

Local Green Space

Would the PC identify those areas proposed as LGS that are within the Green Belt.

Assessed against The Local Plan (2005) North York Proposals Map, the following proposed LGS fall within Green Belt:- CF2-6, CF2-10, CF2-11, CF2-12, CF2-13, CF2-22, CF2-23, CF2-27, CF2-28, CF2-29, CF2-33, CF2-34, CF2-36 and CF2-37 (NB largely but not totally within Green Belt).

Assessed against The City of York Local Plan Publication Draft (February 2018) Policies Map North, as submitted for examination, a much reduced number of proposed LGS fall within Green Belt, as follows:- CF2-33, CF2-34 and CF2-37 (NB largely but not totally within Green Belt).

The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) forms the development plan for York, relating to the general extent of the York Green Belt – specifically policies YH9C and Y1C(1), which are the 'saved' policies, and the key diagram (Figure 6.2), which identifies shading around York to represent what the key describes as the 'general extent of Green Belt'.

Given the absence of an adopted development plan for the City of York, the PC is unclear as to which version of the unadopted Local Plan the examiner will use for basic condition/ examination purposes.

A number of the proposed areas lie within housing estates and are described as Amenity Green Space. Would the PC review their assessment and consider how these areas are demonstrably special to the local community and what particular significance they hold.

Please see separate 'Revised LGS Assessments' document for proposed new assessment text.

In undertaking these revised assessments, the PC has become acutely aware of the fact that a number of the separately proposed LGS sites are closely related to each other and that there would be a logic in combining such sites, thereby reducing the number of individual sites and simplifying both the policy and Proposals Map. This is particularly the case where children's play areas sit within areas of amenity green space, e.g. sites CF2-31/2-16, CF2-28/2-22, CF2-29/2-23 and CF2-26/2-24. No new land would be proposed as LGS by the combining of sites in this way. With the examiner's permission, the PC would be happy to produce a revised sites list with amended supporting assessments.

The PC also notes a lack of consistency in the naming of sites within the policy and the assessments in Appendix 2. In the interests of consistency and the avoidance of any confusion, the PC would be agreeable to regularising site names across policy and appendix.