

Annex C: Summary of the Regulation 17A (2) consultation representations and the proposed Council Response.

Respondent	Summarised Comment	Councils Response
1. The Coal Authority	No Specific Comment on the consultation document.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation document.
2. 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 did raise any objections.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation modifications and the positive response to the proposed Green Belt Policy and Supporting Text.
3. Resident	In general agree 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.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation modifications and general agreement to the proposed Green Belt modifications.
4. Environment Agency	The Environment Agency gave no objections to the Green Belt modifications.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation and providing the positive response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.
5. Highways England	No Specific Comment on the consultation document.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation document.
6. Historic England	No formal comments	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation document.
7. 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	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation and providing the positive response to the

	and the clarification of the approach.	proposed Green Belt modifications and approach.
8. 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.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation and providing the positive response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.
9. 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.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation and providing the positive response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.
10. 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>Thank you for considering the consultation document and providing a detailed response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.</p> <p>The policy modifications proposed through this consultation are deemed a lawful approach to the consideration of Green Belt in line with the applicable Judgment.</p> <p>The suggested modifications are considered to conflict with the outcomes of the High Court Judgement. The saved policies from the RSS and the 2005 Local Plan is a material consideration but should not solely define the inner Green Belt boundary as this is the role of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

	<p>The following modifications are 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: “<u>This means that such decisions will take into account the RSS general extent of the Green Belt, the draft Local Plan (April 2005) (Map 6), the emerging Local Plan, <i>and site specific features and the positive-leaning default assumption as expressed in paragraph 144</i>”</u>” • 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: ‘<i>and the positive-leaning default assumption</i>’ as expressed in paragraph 144 and as suggested in the changes to paragraph 146 above. 	
<p>11. Avison Young on behalf of The National Grid</p>	<p>No specific comments on the Green Belt modifications. National Grid have identified that it has no record of proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to any National Grid assets</p>	<p>Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation document.</p>

	within the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan area.	
12. North Yorkshire Police	North Yorkshire Police agree to the modifications to the Green Belt Policy as set out in part 1 and Part 2.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation and providing the positive response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.
13. Pilcher Homes	<p>Pilcher Homes stated that they generally support 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. • accept 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 	<p>Thank you for considering the consultation document and providing a detailed response to the proposed Green Belt modifications.</p> <p>We welcome your positive response to the proposed changes to Map 3.</p> <p>In relation to other matters, we propose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to add clarity to Para 138 by amending the first sentence to: "Over half of Huntington is designated as draft Green Belt <u><i>in the emerging Local Plan (2018)</i></u>". • No further changes proposed as set out below. <p>Legal advice considers the approach of the High Court Wedgewood Judgment sets the approach to determining whether a parcel of land should be treated as Green belt ahead of the adoption of the Local Plan. Whilst the Local Plan will set the detailed Green belt Boundaries for the first time, the proposed modifications</p>

	<p>has been correctly identified and approved through a local plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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.' • 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 	<p>to the neighbourhood plan's GB policy will ensure that land that comes forward is appropriately considered against the saved policies of the RSS, the Local Plan (2005) and emerging Local Plan (2018) currently under examination. This approach is in line with the Judgment and considered to be appropriate. No change is therefore proposed in relation to policy wording.</p> <p>We note the reference to figure 7 in the Topic Paper 1 Green Belt Addendum (2019). We would like to clarify that this did not specify all areas that serve GB purposes across the authority area. The Council have sought to clarify this issue. This is now clarified and superseded by the updated TP1 GB Addendum (2020).</p> <p>It is not considered that the neighbourhood plan is overreaching in relation to the NPPF; No modifications were suggested by the Examiner in relation to this paragraph.</p> <p>The wording in paragraph 140 reflects Huntington Parish Council research. No modifications were suggested by the Examiner in relation to this paragraph,</p>
--	---	--

	<p>and does not provide for recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 144 - is an oversimplification of the Cullingford Statement. <p>Pilcher Homes also highlight 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 highlight 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>no further clarity or change is proposed.</p> <p>We note comments in relation to the promotion of development. However, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan is decided by the Parish Council in consultation with the community. The Parish decided that it is the role of the Local Plan to define the development sites and is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan as stated in Paragraph 54 of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore no change is proposed.</p> <p>We note comments in relation to the '2003 work' in relation to keeping land permanently open. It is the role of the emerging Local Plan to define the boundaries of the Green Belt. The definition and approach to defining the Green belt boundaries will be subject of the ongoing Local Plan examination and is not relevant to the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan, as clarified in the consultation document. The Examiner's report also addresses this issue and proposes amendments to policy accordingly. No change is proposed in</p>
--	---	--

		relation to the land identified to the east of Huntington.
14. York Consortium of Drainage Boards	No specific comments.	Comments noted. Thank you for considering the consultation document.