

YORK LOCAL PLAN

EXAMINATION INTO THE SOUNDNESS OF THE CITY OF YORK LOCAL PLAN

Response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

Made on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes

Matter 8 – Non Strategic Housing Allocations

Introduction

8.1 These representations are made on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East). Our Client has a number of strategic allocations and housing allocations across the city and has made representations at all stages of the plan, together with appearing at the Examination in Public. These representations should be read in conjunction with those representations and also our separate responses to the Councils housing needs assessment.

8.1 Can the Council explain why these are referred to in the Plan (Table 5.1 - H1, H3, H5, H6, H7, H8, H10, H20, H22, H23, H29, H31, H38, H39, H46, H52, H53, H55, H56, and H58) but not made subject of any site-specific policy?

8.2 We reserve the right to comment on this following receipt of the Councils response.

8.2 If their development is to be governed by general development control policies, is this sufficient?

8.3 Given the scale of these sites and the extensive work in determining their suitability it is considered that they can be controlled by development control policies. Repeating these policies in all allocations is not considered necessary and unless a site has a specific policy requirement not covered by development management policies or further detail is required on a specific element the policies would all read the same.

8.4 This should however be read in conjunction to our response on matter 10, whereby we consider the density policy should be amended to include these allocations together with the strategic allocations when applying density.

8.5 Our Client has already received consent for site H31 and a further application is being considered for site H29 showing that these can be delivered effectively using only development management policies.

8.3 Are these sites deliverable?

8.6 With regards to our clients sites H29 and H31 these are both deliverable, one has planning permission and the other is being considered by the Council. The application has no significant issues and is being reconsulted following some amendments to the scheme.

8.4 Are there any site-specific issues relating to any of them?

8.7 There are no site specific issues with either sites H29 or H31.

8.5 Where relevant, are the Green Belt boundaries of these sites reasonably derived?

8.8 With regards to these Green Belt boundaries our client have no objections, however this is without prejudice to the wider Copmanthorpe boundary discussion at future hearing sessions.