



City of York Local Plan Modifications Consultation 2023

QUESTION SUMMARIES

DATA TRENDS

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

All Pages ▼

Respondent #170 ▼



COMPLETE

Started: Thursday, March 16, 2023 2:04:34 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 16, 2023 2:17:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:12:33
IP Address: 81.104.212.153

Page 1: Survey Information

Q1

Do you confirm that you have read and understood the privacy notice? You must select 'Yes' in order to take the survey.

Yes

Page 2: Register for consultation

Q2

Your name:

Sharon Tagger

Q3

Contact details: Please provide email and/or address

Address

City/town

Post code

Email address

Q4

Do you wish to be notified when the City of York Local Plan is adopted by the Council? If yes we will use contact details provided above

Yes

Page 3: Your response

Q5

To which consultation document does this response relate? Please note, links shown beside each option are for associated documents.

Proposed Policy Map Modifications - link

Share Link

COPY

459 responses



SIGN UP FREE



Respondent skipped this question

Page 5: Section 2: Vision

Q7

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Section 3: Spatial Strategy

Q8

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Section 4: Economy and Retail

Q9

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 8: Section 5: Housing

Q10

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 9: Section 6: Health and Wellbeing

Q11

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 10: Section 7: Education

Q12

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 11: Section 8: Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture

Q13

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 12: Section 9: Green Infrastructure

Q14

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Share Link

COPY

459 responses

Respondent skipped this question

Page 13: Section 10: Managing Development in the Green Belt

Q15

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 14: Section 11: Climate Change

Q16

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 15: Section 12: Environmental Quality and Flood Risk

Q17

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 16: Section 14: Transport and Communications

Q18

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 17: Section 15: Delivery and Monitoring

Q19

To which modification does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 18: Proposed Policy Map Modifications

Q20

To which modification does this response relate?

PMM18 - St. Peter's School (Policies Map North) link

Page 19: New evidence documents

Q21

To which evidence document does this response relate?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 20: Comment Form

Q22

Do you support or object to the proposed modification(s)?

Object

Q23

If you object, please select your reason from the list below (select all that apply):

Not positively prepared - i.e. strategy will not meet development needs

Not justified - i.e. there is no evidence to justify the modification

Not consistent with national policy - i.e. doesn't comply with the law

Q24

Please set out the reasoning behind your support or objection: Please note there is a 1000 character limit, therefore if your reason for support or objection is longer than this, please summarise the main issues raised.

Weakening planning constraints could lead to unsustainable development because of the flood risk status of the area in question. Development of the site would risk generating unsustainable traffic movements in the area. All of these render PMM18 inconsistent with the NPPF. Green Belt status for this land is consistent with NPPF reasons for Green Belt because it forms part of York's "green wedges" in the river corridors that are part of the city's historic character. Any future development of this site would conflict with York's Local Plan which recognises the "green wedges" as essential to the City's historic character. The justification for PMM18 is very weak, relying only on a suggestion about the boundary and on ideas about development which are not relevant here. It ignores evidence about the narrowness of the open space and the sustainability of any future development on the site. In short, PMM18 is not sound.

Powered by  SurveyMonkey

Check out our [sample surveys](#) and [create your own now!](#)

Local Plan Consultation: Objection to PMM 18

- **Removal of St Peter's Playing Fields from Proposed Green Belt**

PMM18 fails to meet the tests for the sound development of policy in 3 areas:

1. **it is not positively prepared;**
2. **it is only very superficially justified;**
3. **and it is not consistent with national or local policy.**

1. PMM18 does not meet the requirement of the soundness test to be **“consistent with achieving sustainable development”** and thus **it is not positively prepared:**

- The NPPF requires mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. PMM18 ignores this. The fields in question are Environment Agency Category 3 Flood Risk, the highest category, so it is hard to conceive of any form of development on these fields which would not exacerbate the flood risk both from the Ouse and from the Burdyke which runs beneath one section of the fields.
- Any more intensive use of these playing fields, for example as a commercial leisure facility, would also conflict with the “consistent with achieving sustainable development” test because it would be require an increase in private car journeys rather than reliant on a modal shift to more sustainable transport forms as demanded by York’s Local Plan and as demanded in the NPPF objective (paragraph 8) to move towards a low carbon economy. Thus, PMM18 is not consistent with “achieving sustainable development”.
- The current usage of this site serves a client-base largely from outside the City of York. Paragraph 35 (a) discusses achieving sustainable development in addressing “unmet need from a neighbouring area”. Any change to the development status of the land affected by PMM18 risks exacerbating the private car journeys on which the current usage is predominantly based.

2. PMM18 does not meet the requirement of the soundness test to be **justified. It is only superficially justified**, driven almost entirely by defining a boundary, and fails to recognise the unique City of York characteristics of the site. It does not appear to consider other arguments relating to reasons for the Green Belt:

- Paragraph 138 (d) of NPPF states that one of the functions of the Green Belt is to “preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. It is undeniable that the green space at issue in PMM18 contributes in an important way to the special character of the City of York which is a cornerstone of the City of York Local Plan. This is set out clearly in SS1 where conserving and enhancing green corridors and areas with an important recreation function is a key part of preserving York’s special character. The removal of this land from the Green Belt is not justified by arguments that recognise its contribution to historic character including views of the Bootham Conservation Area and Minster from the River Ouse, riverside paths, riverside meadow and flood bank footpath. Removing Green Belt planning constraints is not justified in this sensitive location.
- The NPPF in para 138 (a) states that the key purpose of the Green Belt is to “check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”. PMM18 removes protection against the sprawl of buildings on green open space in a sensitive area recognised in York’s Local Plan SS1. St Peter’s School under Green Belt regulations already has powers to replace any of the buildings. The

originally proposed boundaries would have worked to constrict any sprawl of buildings, thus PMM18 is not justified.

- The NPPF focus on sustainability and adaptation to climate change is not reflected in the treatment of PMM18 in relation to flood risk (see above) and is therefore not justified.
- The impact of the change of planning status on sustainability in areas like transport is likewise not considered. This again is a major lapse in argument because of the sensitivity of this riverside site of high historic value to the city's identity.

3. PMM18 does not meet the requirement of the soundness test to be consistent with national policy:

- Paragraph 138 (d) of NPPF states that one of the functions of the Green Belt is to “preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”.
- York's “green wedges” (TP1 4.3.12) as detailed in its Local Plan are key “shapers” (TP1 4.3.4) of its special character and any argument which fails to recognise the key importance of this site in preserving City of York's special character is not respecting the spirit and letter of the NPPF. Fig 4 of TP1 shows the importance of the area in PMM18.
- The area affected by PMM18 is characteristic of the area: it is low-lying, bordering the River Ouse and offering views of the Minster, historic city and Bootham Conservation Area. Narrowing the Green Belt here by about half, as PMM18 proposes, and consequently reducing planning constraints on development directly in the view of the Minster from the river corridor (potentially, for example, by the erection of floodlights) clearly does not reflect the objective of Green Belt set out in the NPPF.
- The recent raising of the height of the flood bank here has actually enhanced some views of the Bootham Conservation Area and Minster from the footpath along its top, and the openness on either side of the bank, partly within the area of PMM18, contributes hugely to this, and to the enjoyment of local residents and many visitors to the city who come precisely for this quality of experience.
- PMM18 is not consistent with the NPPF in that it fails to consider that the relaxation of planning constraints here would enable urban sprawl.

I would argue that the decision to implement PMM18 is not sound. It is not positively prepared. It is not well-justified. And it is not consistent with national or local policy.