

Annex A: Comments on Heslington Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 16/3/26 – 26/4/26 (Consultation extended to 7th June 2026)

1) Heslington Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft:

General comments:

- We note that this version of the plan broadly incorporates Examiner’s recommendations from his report in 2021. These changes are welcomed; however, we have considered this submission draft afresh in the context of the many changes to the planning policy landscape of the now adopted Local Plan and latest national policy.
- We have concerns regarding general conformity with, and repetition of, the adopted Local Plan policies and national policy. We have identified these issues in our below comments where they are particularly significant.
- Some of the policy wording needs amending to improve clarity and ensure it can be effectively implemented.
- Policies should be more positively worded throughout, detailing what would be supported as opposed what will not be allowed.
- As of 25th March 2026, Sections 98 & 99 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 took effect. The new regulations introduce a requirement for neighbourhood plans to:
 - contribute to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change.
 - take account of any local nature recovery strategies (LNRS) which relate to the neighbourhood area
 - Adhere to a revised basic condition requirement that neighbourhood plans must not result in less housing being proposed; this replaces the previous requirement for neighbourhood plans to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the area’s local plan.
- LNRSs were introduced by the Environment Act 2021 and are spatial documents that are designed to map the most valuable habitats within the areas they cover, as well as showing opportunities for recovering and enhancing nature. See [Local Nature Recovery Strategy documents | North Yorkshire Council](#).

Specific comments on policies:

Policy	CYC comment
Policy HES1: Sustaining the vitality and the viability of Main Street (South)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No specific comments

Policy HES2: New Business and Employment Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Policy HES3: Rural Enterprise and Rural Diversification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Policy HES4: Sustainable Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation updated to reflect 2024 NPPF & adopted Local Plan.
Policy HES5: Crime Prevention and Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the policy (as recommended in the Examiners Report) except for updating the reference to ‘Secured by Design’ principles. • Interpretation updated to reflect 2024 NPPF & adopted Local Plan.
Policy HES6: Urban Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New wording added to the end of the first sentence of the interpretation (wording not suggested by the Examiner): <i>‘..... and particular development proposals that may impact upon those characteristics and that character.’</i> • New wording added to form a second paragraph of the interpretation (wording not suggested by the Examiner): <i>‘In particular, the policy seeks to protect valued features of the Conservation Area and to safeguard against the impacts of certain infrastructure and highways-related development, without compromising the provision of necessary works, including flexible, sustainable transport solutions.’</i> • We are generally supportive of this additional wording.
Policy HES7: The Conversion, Extension or Alteration of Existing Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Policy HES8: New Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy does not appear to have picked up the fact that the village is now inset from the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan (ie. not within the Green Belt). Need to emphasise that the sites and Heslington Village are now outside the green belt and green belt policy does not apply. See the adopted City of York Local Plan Policies Map for clarification of where the Green Belt boundary lies: https://www.york.gov.uk/adoptedLocalPlan#policies
Policy HES9: Housing Mix and Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts b) and c) repeat local plan policy, so we would recommend they be omitted from the policy.

<p>Policy HES10: Houses in Multiple Occupation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the amendments to interpretation to reflect Mandatory and Additional licencing for HMOs introduced by CYC and after previous Examiners report issued. • We note that additional amendments recommended by the Examiner have been incorporated. • The threshold ‘tipping points’ referred to in part e) of the policy are set out in Local Plan policy H8 rather than the Article 4 direction; this needs amending.
<p>Policy HES11: Community and Recreational Facilities in Strategic Housing Sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
<p>Policy HES12: Purpose-Built Student Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note that this policy was previously deleted by the Examiner who was concerned about the restrictiveness of the policy as drafted and that it was not supported by any evidence about impacts of student accommodation within the wider parish and the ability or otherwise of the University to accommodate all its accommodation needs on land within its direct control. This policy previously attracted noteworthy objection from the University as they considered that it wasn’t consistent with Local Plan Policy SS22 and was inconsistent with the interpretation text. • We consider that the new policy is less restrictive by comparison however, the policy largely repeats Local Plan policy H7, which is not necessary, and we would have concerns around the practical implementation of part b) in terms of how it would be possible to prove the need for student accommodation in <i>any</i> specific localised area. This should perhaps be reworded to instead focus on applications providing a justification for, and the suitability of, for the proposed location. • We also advise that any views submitted by the University in relation to the use of their campuses are strongly considered in further revisions of the plan.
<p>Policy HES13: Land West of Elvington Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New policy, to reflect ST15. The policy concentrates on access / transport issues related to ST15. • We consider that this policy should be worded more positively throughout. • Part f of the policy is overly prescriptive, and it is not clear which area is being referred to. Local plan policy SS13 already requires the site to incorporate open space into the development, achieve biodiversity net gain, and provide compensatory measures for any loss of biodiversity. The exact details and most appropriate locations of these measures will be agreed at the application stage and will be based on ecological evidence provided. A landscaped buffer along the south-western boundary of the site may or may not be the most appropriate approach. • Also in part f, reference to figure 5 should be corrected to figure 4.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please also note that following the adoption of the Local Plan we are working with the developer team to bring forward the site allocation. There has already been a 'Place Based Indicator event' to which the Parish has attended. Further engagement is necessary as the site progresses. • There is an opportunity to include a community action with this policy regarding ongoing engagement and dialogue with the developers as the site progresses.
Policy HES14: Land Adjacent to Hull Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a new policy, to reflect ST4 and appears to generally conform with policy SS8. • However, it should be noted that this site has planning permission with transport mitigation measures agreed, and that development has already started on site. In light of this, it may no longer be necessary or appropriate to retain this policy. <p>If to be retained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation reference should be corrected to ST4 rather than ST04. • Interpretation text incorrectly states that part vii of local plan policy SS8 indicates that there is the potential for increased traffic flows. This reference should be corrected or removed. • This policy overlaps with the requirements of local plan policy T7 Minimising and accommodating generated trips part (b) of the policy should be reworded or omitted.
Policy HES15: Local Green Spaces Designation (formerly HES13 in the Submission version)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Policy HES16: Green Infrastructure (formerly HES14 in the Submission version)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New wording added to policy to clarify how the Green Infrastructure sites within ST15 will be treated in terms of clause (b) in the policy (additional to the Examiners recommendations). • Paragraph starting 'Development proposals will not be supported where.....' is missing the word 'for' at the end of the paragraph (to read: '.....compensated for') • Elvington Airfields Grasslands not deleted from section on 'Significant Green Spaces' or the Plan 'Significant Green Spaces' plan (Figure 4) – not as recommended by the Examiner in his report (but see bullet point 3 above which includes these sites). • Text prior to policy HES16 has had significant updates to reflect current position.
Policy HES17: Sustainable Transport Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments

Policy HES18: Paths and Other Rights of Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Policy HES19: University of York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note the development principles in section 15.4. Given that this relates to the University of York campus, these principles should be developed and agreed in conjunction with the university. • The principles should be incorporated into the policy wording.
Policy HES20: University of York Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Policy – needs to reflect SS22 and ED1 in the adopted Local Plan. HES20 states that ‘no vehicular transport access or new cycling / pedestrian provision along Low Lane between the site and Heslington Village, or via Ox Carr Lane in order to preserve the lanes existing rural character.....’ This is overly restrictive and not enforceable. • Needs to reference the local plan allocation (ST27) • Local plan policy already addresses these issues • Policy should be positively worded
Community Actions	
HESCA1: Signage, Street Furniture and Lighting in the Conservation Area	No comments
HESCA2: Traffic and Highway Improvements in the Conservation Area	No comments
HESCA3: Building and Landscape Character	No comments
HESCA4: Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic	No comments
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms	No comments.
Appendices	

APPENDIX 1: UNIVERSITY OF YORK STUDENTS – ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR	No comments
APPENDIX 2: LOCAL LANES – CHARACTER AND TRAFFIC ISSUES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Auto generated image captions incorrect as many described as ‘A screenshot of a video game’ and other incorrect captions.
APPENDIX 3: LOCAL LANES – LIST OF BUSINESSES	No comments
Other issues & typos	
Paragraph 8.3.2	Has text crossed out: ‘ <i>During the day, particularly during university term time, it is a busy, often very busy road, filled with pedestrians, cyclists, and cars, vans and lorries (competing for parking places and often parked on double-yellow lines), all making use of its facilities.</i> ’
Paragraph 11.2.3	Includes error message not part of the Plan: <i>Furthermore, CYC Objective Assessment of Housing Need (Error! Bookmark not defined.) (OAN) has been updated by consultants GL Hearn in January 2019.</i>
Paragraph 14.5.1	This refers to ST15 being mentioned in paragraph 5.1.17 - however paragraph 5.1.17 does not exist in the document.
Changes to Basic Conditions requirements	<p>Significant changes to the Basic Conditions for neighbourhood plans recently came into force via the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) - these included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a requirement for neighbourhood plans not to prevent housebuilding in the wider local plan area (ie. Neighbourhood plans can no longer act as a barrier to housebuilding); a requirement that neighbourhood plans must now actively contribute to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change; a requirement to take account of any relevant Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) designed to map and recover valuable habitats; a requirement that neighbourhood plans must not conflict with or repeat national decision-making policies. <p>In terms of how parishes should address these issues, the Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan, in the Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk gives an example of an updated Basic Conditions Statement – see their website: https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20127/neighbourhood_plans/1199/walpole_cross_keys_neighbourhood_plan</p>

Policies map	
	Could the university campus area be outlined in a different colour as its extent is not clear
	Local lanes are indicated with a star – the extent of the lane should be indicated
	Policies map dated November 2024 and pre-submission plan dated November 2025. Does the policies map need updating?

2) SEA

Issue	Comment
Paragraph 1.7	ST27 will provide Use Class E, not B1b employment
Paragraph 3.6	Should refer to adopted Local Plan not draft Local Plan.
Page 19	The text in the bottom paragraph referring to the Green Belt is out of date following the adoption of the Local Plan. The reference to the 'general extent of the Green Belt' needs updating and the village is not within the Green Belt.

3) HRA

Issue	Comment
Paragraph 1.11	Should state '.....City of York Council'
Screening Assessment Table: Policy HES3 (page 18)	The policy title has not been updated to the current policy (HES3: Rural Enterprise and Rural Diversification). It is unclear whether the 'Policy Intention and Commentary' has been updated to match the latest policy.
Screening Assessment Table: Policy HES7 (page 21)	The policy title has not been updated to the current policy (HES7: The Conversion, Extension or Alteration of Existing Buildings). It is unclear whether the 'Policy Intention and Commentary' has been updated to match the latest policy.
Screening Assessment Table: Policy HES8 (page 21)	The text referring to the Green Belt is out of date following the adoption of the Local Plan. The reference to the 'general extent of the Green Belt' needs updating and the village is not within the Green Belt.
Screening Assessment Table: Policy HES17 (page 30)	The Policy number is incorrect, should refer to HES17, not HES15.
Screening Assessment Table – general issues	Consequently, it is unclear in some situations whether the screening assessment has been undertaken against the current policies in the Regulation14 Consultation document or the previous version of the neighbourhood

	plan. This should be checked for consistency, prior to submission
Paragraph 3.3 and page 37	This refers to the emerging Harrogate and Selby Local Plans. These are no longer being progressed but will be incorporated in the new North Yorkshire Local Plan.