



YORK

CITY OF YORK  
LOCAL PLAN

Further Sites Consultation  
Appendix 4: Changes to Allocated Sites  
April 2014

## Appendix 4: Changes to Allocated Sites

---

### Contents

<b>A4.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A4.2 ALLOCATED SITES – DETAILED PROFORMAS AND MAPS.....</b>	<b>2</b>

Site Ref	Allocation Ref	Site Name	Appendix Page Number
37	E3	Ford Garage, Jockey Lane	3
46	H30	Land to the South of Strensall Village	5
55	H26	Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington	8
64	E5	Land at Layerthorpe and James Street	11
64	E5	Land at Layerthorpe and James Street	13
72	H33	Water Tower Lane, Dunnington	15
121	H3	Burnholme School (existing building footprint)	17
127	H5	Lowfield School	19
197	H24	Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road	22
202	H4	St Joseph's monastery	24
258	H30	Land to the South of Strensall Village	26
308	H6	Land RO the Square, Tadcaster Road	29
627	H11	Land at Frederick House, Fulford Road	32
639	E11	Annamine Nursery, Jockey Lane	35
651	H25	Heworth Green North (remaining land)	38
654	H19	Land at Mill Mount	40
696	H2	Sites by the Racecourse, Tadcaster Road	43
791	H9	302 Amalgamated site west of Chapelfields 1 217 Amalgamated sites north of moor lane woodthorpe	46
792	H9	Land off Askham Lane	49
799	ST21 <sup>1</sup>	Designer Outlet	52

<sup>1</sup> ST21 refers to Leisure allocation at the Designer Outlet.

### **A4.1 Introduction**

The Preferred Options Local Plan included forty five Housing Allocations and thirteen Employment Allocations.

Further representations were submitted in relation to these sites as part of the Preferred Options Consultation (Summer 2013). Any proposed change has been considered by our technical officer group, the detailed outcomes of which are presented in section A4.3 of this appendix.

### **A4.2 Allocated Sites – Detailed Proformas and Maps**

The following section presents any allocated site at the Preferred Options stage which has been reconsidered as part of this consultation, why it has been reconsidered, their assessment and outcome.


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 37

## Ford Garage, Jockey Lane

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative Use (  
Also Rep 3024)

Submitted For: Retail



Submitted Size 1.665217354 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	1.665217354

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	1.665217354

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	1.665217354

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: **37**

## Ford Garage, Jockey Lane

Submitted For: Retail

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

This site has previously been used as a vehicle repair garage, so land contamination could be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements but unlikely to require air quality assessment. EVR infrastructure.

Green

Noise:

No noise issues.

Green

Flood Risk:

This is a brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas). This site is located in flood zone 1. Foul and surface water drainage along Kathryn Avenue and Surface Water Drain in Jockey Lane.

Green

Ecology:

No site specific comments.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

No site specific comments.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

There are protected trees along the road frontage which would pose a restriction on the developable area.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

Amenity openspace would be required for employees.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

The site is supported for B1a Office use but does not have a willing landowner

Red

The site is in an out-of-centre location and the emerging Retail Study Work being undertaken by consultants for the Council shows that the role and performance of the general Monks Cross area has improved significantly since 2007, especially in the clothing and footwear, small household goods, recreation and furniture sectors. There is concern that conversely the city centre has seen decline in its market share in these sectors and that there is concern that further new retail floorspace beyond that already permitted is likely to lead to further decline of the city centres role. This is compounded by the emerging findings of the new household survey undertaken as part of the Retail Study work which indicates that there is no additional capacity (based on retention of the current market share) up to 2028 and therefore any further retail development before this period is likely to have more impact as there is no growth to offset any impact (as well as gains in Special Forms of Trading i.e. Internet Shopping). It is not considered that there is any justification to allocate this site and that any further retail floorspace at Monks Cross should be controlled by the criteria in the NPPF rather than through plan led allocation.

Red


### CONCLUSIONS

# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 46

## Land to the South of Strensall Village (amalgamated sites south of Strensall)

Source:  
Allocation-  
Alternative  
Boundary



Submitted For: Housing

Submitted Size 6.274104330 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	Part
Local Nature Conservatio	Part
Site Size Remaining:	2.536955025

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	?

Partly

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	2.536955025

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.536955025

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 46

## Amalgamated sites south of Strensall

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

There are issues regarding Rail Halt aspiration at Strensall. Technical study required regarding access to the main street and the cumulative impact this may have.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Potential impact on air quality from locomotive emissions if ever idling in this location (locomotives idling at rail halt, which is a potential proposal through the plan). Standard Air Quality requirements including EVR infrastructure would be required.

Amber

Noise: No noise issues.

Green

Flood Risk: This is an extremely wet site, which would need to be mitigated through any development. It is a greenfield site and therefore runoff rates must comply with the 1.4 l/sec/ha. The site is located in flood zone 1.

Amber

Ecology: There is a grassland SINC site in the whole of the middle section. There is a large Great Crested Newt population in this area and it is unlikely that a license to migrate this amount could be obtained or the effects of development mitigated. The amount of developable land is limited outside of this. Site boundary should not be extended

Red

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: Site has a historic and distinctive enclosure landscape. There is well preserved ridge and furrow, which also assists in the understanding of the village and enhances its character. Extension to the existing allocation may harm this. An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits.

Red

Landscape/ Design: The landscape in this area is enhancing the historic character showing well preserved enclosure landscape and ridge and furrow. The proposed allocation should potentially be reduced to exclude the smaller field to the west to retain the landscape features. The full extent of the amalgamated sites should not be taken forward for development.

Red

Openspace/ Recreation: No site specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Not applicable

Not applicable

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: The existing allocation should remain as existing boundary and may potentially need to be reduced due to ecological and landscape issues relating to the presence of Great Crested Newts and historic enclosure patterns. Further

Red

detailed assessment required.

Outcome:

**The site boundary (H30) should not be changed but remain as current draft allocation**

Red




# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 55

## Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 5.113041495 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	Part
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	4.054935686

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	No

Partly

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Adj
Site Size remaining:	4.054600069

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	4.054600069

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 55

## Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

The site is within walking (cycling) distance of a range of local services, although assessment of infrastructure and need for upgrade (footways and crossings) is likely. Assessment of bus services would be required with potential to increase frequency/destinations and stops within 400 metres. Some limited access to Dauby Lane is feasible (subject to assessment) although some improvements would be required including footway provision and lighting.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: Part of this site has previously been used as military land, so land contamination is likely to be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including electric vehicle recharge infrastructure. Odour from the sewage plant to the South East would need to be considered.

Amber

Noise: No Noise Issues

Green

Flood Risk: Site is at risk of surface water flooding. The Environment Agency recently released a sensitivity to surface water flooding map which needs checking.

Amber

This site is split between greenfield and brownfield. Change in this location would require the applicable run-off rates. This site is located in flood zone 1.

Ecology: Part is Elvington Wood SINC and WW II huts whilst the rest is arable. No issue with developing arable but need WW II camp area retained as buffer for woodland. Track along this woodland edge would form a good footpath link to connect to Public Right of Way off Kexby Lane. Site should remain as allocated

Red

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. There is potential ridge and furrow under woodland on the site.

Amber

Landscape/ Design: The site forms a break between Elvington village and the industrial estate, though housing does exist and is proposed to the west of the village proper. Trees along the western and southern boundary will pose a restriction on developable area.

Amber

Openspace/ Recreation: If the woodland is used as openspace it would be multifunctional openspace and could be challenged in terms of accessibility. More recreation space would be required.

Amber

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

## CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

Alternative larger boundary to include land designated as SINC is not supported. Site boundary to remain as draft allocation (H26). Additional site contains woodland (SINC), World War 2 huts and potential ridge and furrow. Site would not function as multi-functional openspace as heavily wooded

Red

Outcome:

**The site boundary (H26) should not be changed but remain as current draft allocation**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 64

## Land at Layerthorpe and James Street

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative Use

Submitted For: Employment/R  
etail



Submitted Size 0.228034787 Ha


### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.228034787


Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A



#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.228034787


Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----



#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.228034787

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----



# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: **64**

## Land at Layerthorpe and James Street

Submitted For: Employment/Retail

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

Part of this site has previously been used for landfill, so land contamination is likely to be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements and electric vehicle recharge infrastructure.

Green

Noise:

There will be a noise impact from A166 so noise assessment required.

Amber

Flood Risk:

This is a brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas). This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

No site specific comments. May need bat survey.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment will be required to identify features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

No site specific comments.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

The site is currently allocated for B1b, B1c, B2, B8 uses (Site E4) within the Preferred Options Local Plan. This is considered to be a suitable allocation and supported by Economic Development Unit. Site could be suitable for a wider mix of uses subject to further detailed evaluation and assessment.

Amber

The site is located in a out-of-centre location and could compete with defined centres and therefore there is no evidence to allocate this site for retail, however it could form part of a wider mixed use area, but should be controlled through NPPF criteria and development control policies.

Red

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The site should be kept as a B1b/B1c/B2/B8 allocation. The site is not considered suitable for retail allocation as the site is in an out of centre location and could compete with defined centres including York City Centre. Should be kept as original allocation B1b, B1c, B2, B8

Red

Outcome:

**Failed Technical Officer Comments for wider mix of uses including retail**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 64

## Land at Layerthorpe and James Street

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative Use

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 0.228034787 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.228034787

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.228034787

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.228034787

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: **64**

## Land at Layerthorpe and James Street

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

Part of this site has previously been used for landfill, so land contamination is likely to be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements and electric vehicle recharge infrastructure.

Green

Noise:

No noise issues.

Green

Flood Risk:

This is a brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas). This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

No site specific comments. May need bat survey.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment will be required to identify features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

No site specific comments.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

The site is currently allocated for B1b, B1c, B2, B8 uses (Site E4) within the Preferred Options Local Plan. This is considered to be a suitable allocation and supported by Economic Development Unit. Site could be suitable for a wider mix of uses subject to further detailed evaluation and assessment.

Amber

Not applicable

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

There is a demand for small scale employment sites within the city and therefore the site should be kept as a B1b/B1c/B2/B8 allocation.

Red

Outcome:

**Failed Technical Officer Comments for alternative use**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 72

## Water Tower Lane, Dunnington

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 4.584824165 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	4.584824165

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	4.584824165

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	4.584824165

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**



# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 72

## Water Tower land, Dunnington

Submitted For: Housing (Alternative Boundary)

### TRANSPORT

The extended site is further removed from the village and services and is on the borderline for ticking boxes of sustainable travel. Public transport is available but would benefit from an upgrade to services. Access would be onto Church Balk.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including electric vehicle recharge infrastructure. Residential development may lead to the potential for exposure next to carriageway, orientation of rooms and set-back of buildings may need to be considered.

Amber

Noise: Due to the potential impact the extension of the site could have upon noise sensitive receptors in the area a noise impact assessment would be required.

Amber

Flood Risk: This site is greenfield land therefore runoff rates must be 1.4 l/sec/ha. This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology: Site is mainly arable/improved grassland. Site has no known issues.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. A Roman road (separate from the A166) runs SW/NE within the site. Good to keep separation of village from Stamford Bridge Road- over development would affect the character of village and road leading into Dunnington.

Red

Landscape/ Design: Dunnington village needs to retain a distance from the main arterial road. Extending the site beyond the existing allocation would compromise the setting of the village.

Red

Openspace/ Recreation: No site specific comments but openspace will be required on site.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Not applicable

not applicable

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: Site size should remain as that previously allocated and not extended. This would help to provide separation from the Stamford Bridge Road (A166) and prevent encroachment on the character and setting of Dunnington.

Red

Outcome: **The site boundary (H33) should not be enlarged and should stay as current draft allocation**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 121

## Burnholme School (existing building footprint)

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Mixed Use



Submitted Size 6.794073677 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	Adjacent
Site Size Remaining:	6.780989688

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Part
Site Size remaining:	2.699410780

Openspace Evidence:	No
---------------------	----

Partly

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Mixed
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.699410780

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 121

## Burnholme School

Submitted For: Mixed Use

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements and electric vehicle recharge infrastructure.

Green

Noise:

Noise could be an issue even if development was set back.

Amber

Flood Risk:

This site is split between greenfield and brownfield. Change in this location would require the applicable run-off rates. This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

Site is school land therefore there are limited issues, however will require a bat survey.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment will be required to identify features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

No landscape showstoppers.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

A more detailed masterplan is needed. Sport England would object to the loss of playing field. Secretary of State would need to approve loss of playing fields. This site is in the section 106 for Derwenthorpe as community sport provision.

Red

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

A more detailed masterplan is needed to show land uses and location. Sport England would object to the loss of playing fields and Secretary of State would need to approve loss of playing fields. This site is in the section 106 for Derwenthorpe as off-site contribution for community sport provision. It is not considered suitable to extend the housing allocation boundary to include the whole extent of the site including the playing fields. Site boundary should remain as existing building footprint

Red

Outcome:

**The site boundary (H17) should not be enlarged and should stay as current draft allocation**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 127

## Lowfield School

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 5.550994669 Ha


### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	5.550994669

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A



#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Part
Site Size remaining:	2.235993349


Openspace Evidence:	No
---------------------	----



#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Mixed
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.235993349

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----



**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 127

## Former Lowfields School

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

The site is in a sustainable location for development. It is accessible to local residences and has a frequent bus stopping alongside the site. No specific concerns relating to highways.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including EVR infrastructure would be applicable for any development in this location.

Green

Noise: No noise issues.

Green

Flood Risk:

Green

Ecology: The current openspace forms part of the acomb wildlife corridor and should be retained for this. There is opportunities for the site to consider corridor enhancement.

Amber

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/ Design: Development of this entire site would make for dense massing in this area. The open space provides an important openness and relief for the surrounding residents; it has also been identified as a green infrastructure stepping stone within the wider Acomb area.

Amber

Openspace/ Recreation: The openspace that is already there is actively and regularly used, therefore there is no reason to justify losing these playing fields to development. There is a long term plan to lease this site to a sports club. It has been suggested that pitches will be re-provisioned behind Northfield School (off Beckfield Lane). However, there has been no evidence submitted with regards to alternative provision.

Red

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Not applicable

Not applicable

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: Loss of this openspace is likely to have impacts on the urban landscape and wildlife. It is actively used for recreation and its relocation would be in a less accessible location. Extended boundary to include the existing playing fields is not supported

Red

Outcome: **The site boundary (H5) should not be enlarged and should remain as current draft**

Red




# Criteria 1 to 4 Analysis

Site: 197

## Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative Use

Submitted For: Retail (Petrol Station)



Submitted Size: 0.216811046

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.216811046

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.216811046

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.216811046

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 4 - Employment Access to Services

Stage 1 Pass

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 moved to Technical Officer Comments**

# Technical Officer Assessment

## Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road

Site: 197

Submitted For: Retail (Petrol Station)

### TRANSPORT

No Comments Collected

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

This site has previously been used as a vehicle repair garage, so land contamination could be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements. Additional traffic arising from the site will need to be screened to determine the level of AQ assessment required.

Amber

Noise:

A noise impact on the potential increase in noise from the site on existing residential dwellings may be required for this site.

Red

Flood Risk:

This is a brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas).

Green

Ecology:

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

No site specific comments.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No site specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

The site is located in a out-of-centre location and could compete with defined centres, depending on the scale of retail proposed. There is no evidence to allocate this site for retail.

Red

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The landowner objects to this site being brought forward for housing and wants it for a petrol filling station with ancillary retail. As such there is no willing landowner for residential use. The site is located in a out-of-centre location and could compete with defined centres, depending on the scale of retail proposed. There is no evidence to allocate this site for retail.

Red

Outcome:

**Failed technical officer comments for retail use**

Red




# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 202

## St Joseph's monastery

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 2.615309416 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.615309416

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	Yes

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	2.615309416

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.615309416

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 202

## St Joseph's monastery

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

No Comments Collected

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No Comments Collected

Air Quality: No Comments Collected

Noise: No comments Collected

Flood Risk: No Comments Collected

Ecology: No Comments Collected

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology: Amendment accepted to remove burial ground from developable area.

Green

Landscape/  
Design: No Comments Collected

Openspace/  
Recreation: No Comments Collected

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

No Comments Collected

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: Alternative boundary submitted to remove area containing burial ground which is to be retained by the Monastery.

Green

Outcome: **Amend boundary to remove burial ground**

Green


# Criteria 1 to 4 Analysis

Site: 247

## Land at Wilberforce House

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size: 2.048522171

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.048522171

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	No
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Adj
Site Size remaining:	2.048513277

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.048513277

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 4 - Residential Access to Services

Stage 1 Pass

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 247

## Land RO the Square, Tadcaster Road / Land at Wilberforce House

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

Potential for cumulative traffic impacts on A1036 corridor.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including electric vehicle recharge infrastructure. Potential for wider air quality impacts on existing city centre AQMA (cumulative impacts with site 696, 129, 786, 185 etc)

Green

Noise: Due to the proximity of York College and the A64 a noise impact assessment should be provided for this site.

Amber

Flood Risk: Site is greenfield therefore runoff rates must comply with the 1.4 l/sec/ha.

Green

This site is located in flood zones 1 and 2.

Ecology: The site is arable land. Great crested newts nearby - an assessment would be needed, although this shouldn't unduly affect any proposals if allocated. Good hedgerow corridors, some bat interest.

Amber

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. View from hospice elevated community room should be retained.

Amber

Landscape/ Design: Mature trees on site are of amenity value. Trees to the eastern boundary provide a good edge and are a valuable landscape asset. The landscape has a parkland quality. It is important that the views from the hospice are retained to provide an open aspect to the rear of the hospice. The developable area should therefore be reduced to reflect this.

Amber

Openspace/ Recreation: No issues with the site however openspace should be provided at the bottom of the site, adjacent to the existing playing fields.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

### CONCLUSIONS


Summary: There are mature trees within site and a valuable line of trees to eastern boundary provide good landscape asset which should be retained. It is considered that the developable area of site H6 should be reduced in order to maintain views from St Leonards Hospice rooms including the elevated community room. This land should be removed from Local Plan Preferred Options Allocation H6 to preserve the setting of the Hospice for residents.

Amber

Outcome: **Passed Technical Officer Comments with reduced boundary**

Amber  
Page 27

<b>Site ref:</b> 247	<b>Site Name:</b> Land Rear Of The Square, Tadcaster Rd
<b>Allocation Ref:</b> H6	



Crown Copyright. City of York Council, Licence No. 1000 20818. Produced by Forward Planning

<b>Site size:</b>	1.5 ha
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To reduce the site boundary for Site H6 previously allocated in the Preferred Options to protect the land adjacent to St Leonard's Hospice


# Criteria 1 to 4 Analysis

Site: 258

## Land to the South of Strensall Village

Source:  
Allocation

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size: 0.925125537

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	Part
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.034648584

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	To follow?

Fail

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.034648584

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

N/A

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.034648584

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

N/A

#### Criteria 4 - Employment Access to Services

Stage 1 Pass

N/A

**Failed Criteria 1**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 258

## Amalgamated sites south of Strensall

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

There are issues regarding Rail Halt aspiration at Strensall. Technical study required regarding access to the main street and the cumulative impact this may have.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Potential impact on air quality from locomotive emissions if ever idling in this location (locomotives idling at rail halt, which is a potential proposal through the plan). Standard Air Quality requirements including EVR infrastructure would be required.

Amber

Noise: Further investigation into the noise and vibration issues associated with the railway. This would require a full noise and vibration assessment. Development would need to be set back from the railway to mitigate any effects.

Amber

Flood Risk: This is an extremely wet site, which would need to be mitigated through any development. It is a greenfield site and therefore runoff rates must comply with the 1.4 l/sec/ha. The site is located in flood zone 1.

Amber

Ecology: There is a grassland SINC site in the whole of the middle section. There is a large Great Crested Newt population in this area and it is unlikely that a license to migrate this amount could be obtained or the effects of development mitigated. The amount of developable land is limited outside of this.

Red

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: Site has a historic and distinctive enclosure landscape. There is well preserved ridge and furrow, which also assists in the understanding of the village and enhances its character. Extension to the existing allocation may harm this. An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits.

Amber

Landscape/ Design: The landscape in this area is enhancing the historic character showing well preserved enclosure landscape and ridge and furrow. The proposed allocation should potentially be reduced to exclude the smaller field to the west to retain the landscape features. The full extent of the amalgamated sites should not be taken forward for development.

Amber

Openspace/ Recreation: No site specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: The existing allocation should be unchanged or potentially made smaller due to ecological and landscape issues relating to the presence of Great Crested

Red  
Page 30

Newts and historic enclosure patterns.



Outcome:

**The Site Boundary (H30) should not be enlarged and should stay as current draft**






# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 627

## Land at Frederick House, Fulford Road

Source:  
allocation  
support and  
wider use

Submitted For: Housing,  
Mixed Use



Submitted Size 0.777259009 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.777259009

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.777259009

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.777259009

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 627

## Land at Frederick House, Fulford Road

Submitted For: Community Use

### TRANSPORT

Need to determine whether the new use generates more traffic than previous/current use does

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

This site has previously been used as military land, so land contamination could be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements including electric vehicle recharge infrastructure.

Amber

Noise:

Due to the proximity of the Police Station (siren and vehicle noise) a noise assessment should be carried out.

Amber

Flood Risk:

This is a brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas). This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

No significant interest.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. Frontage is within the Fulford Road Conservation Area. Opportunity to bring back some of the special character of Fulford Road

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

No site specific comments.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No site specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

No issues over loss of B1a in this location. Questions over suitable access and also design constraints due to location. Considered that site is more suitable for residential as currently allocated. Would need to be more specific about the future use of the site

Amber

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The existing allocation for residential is supported and should remain. In addition to residential it is considered that additional community uses could be suitable on the site such as medical (GP surgery) or educational uses subject to demand being established.

Amber


Outcome:

**Passed Technical Officer comments.**

Amber

**Site ref: 627**  
**Allocation Ref : H11**

**Site Name:**  
**Land at Fredrick House**



Crown Copyright. City of York Council, Licence No. 1000 20818. Produced by Forward Planning

**Site Size:**  
**Recommendation:**

0.8 ha  
To include the site for residential development and/or community uses (including medical, education or local retail) within the Local Plan


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 639

## Annamine Nursery, Jockey Lane, York

Source:  
Allocation  
Support and  
Wider Use

Submitted For: Employment ( Inc B1a)



Submitted Size 1.038116656 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	1.038116656

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	1.038116656

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	1.038116656

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: **639**

## Annamine Nursery, Jockey Lane, York

Submitted For: Employment ( Inc B1a)

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality:

There is unlikely to be any air quality issues. EVR infrastructure would be required with any development.

Amber

Noise:

Site located next to Industrial park so noise from units will be an issue depending on the end use. Noise and BS4142 assessment needed. Also there is the potential for an adverse impact on housing located in Saddler's Close (opposite the site).

Amber

Flood Risk:

This is a Brownfield site and would therefore require a 70% of the existing rate through any re-development (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven connected impermeable areas).

Green

Ecology:

No known significant issues.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

A desk based archaeological assessment and evaluation of the site has been carried out. Archaeological features and deposits that will affect development have been identified and mitigation measures agreed.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

The open frontage along Jockey Lane should be maintained.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No site specific comments.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

The site is currently allocated for B1b, B1c, B2, B8 uses (Site E11) within the Preferred Options Local Plan. The site owners are seeking the addition of B1a use within the suitable uses to accommodate potential future expansion of the PortaKabin business including office use. This is considered suitable.

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The site is currently allocated for employment use (E11) for B1b, B1c, B2, B8 use). It is considered that the site would be suitable for B1a use in addition if this was connected directly to the existing Portacabin operation to allow expansion of the existing Portacabin business.

Green


Outcome:

**Passed Technical Officer comment**

Green

**Site ref: 639**  
**Allocation Ref : E11**

**Site Name:**  
**Annamine Nurseries, Jockey lane**



Crown Copyright. City of York Council, Licence No. 1000 20818. Produced by Forward Planning

**Site Size:**

1 ha

**Recommendation:**

To include this site for B1a Office Use as well as other employment within the Local Plan where this is connected to the adjacent use.


# Criteria 1 to 4 Analysis

Site: 651

## Heworth Green North (remaining land) -

Source:  
Allocation  
Support and  
Wider Use

Submitted For: Mixed Use



Submitted Size: 0.215514813

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.215514813

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.215514813

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	Par
Site Size Remaining:	0.215514813

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 4 - Employment Access to Services

Stage 1 Pass

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 651

## Heworth Green North

Submitted For: Mixed Use

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments.

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

This site previously formed part of the city gasworks, so significant land contamination is likely to be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements and electric vehicle recharge infrastructure. Odour may be an issue during development due to previous uses and likely contamination and remediation required.

Amber

Noise:

Due to the proximity of the site to existing industrial/commercial units and Layerthorpe/Hallfield Road a noise assessment would be required.

Amber

Flood Risk:

This site is greenfield land therefore runoff rates must be 1.4 l/sec/ha. This site is located in flood zones 1,2 and 3a.

Amber

Ecology:

No site specific comments but need to consider enhancement of Foss corridor.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment will be required to identify features and deposits.

Green

Landscape/  
Design:

Green corridor along the Foss to be preserved. A tree's frontage to new link road would be required.

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation:

No site specific comments. On site play provision required.

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Mixed use across the whole site is supported from a commercial perspective subject to further consideration of a revised scheme.

Green

Although the site is located in a out-of-centre location, it is located adjacent to the existing Foss Island commercial retail area, however, despite part of the wider site area benefiting from planning permission for mixed use development including retail, WYG would advise not to allocate the site for further retail as part of a mixed use site. The site should remain as currently allocated in the Local Plan to reflect the current planning permission boundary. Any further retail development would need to be considered against the key criteria of the NPPF.

Red

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The site should remain as allocated with the existing consent for mixed use development and the remaining land as a potential residential site (H25). Further detailed evidence is required for a mix of uses on this site.

Red

Outcome:

**Fails technical officer comments for alternative use. Allocation H25 should remain unchanged**

Red




# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 654

## Land at Mill Mount

Source:  
Allocation  
Support

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 0.362590886 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.362590886

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Pass

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.362590886

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.362590886

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 654

## Land at Mill Mount

Submitted For: Community Use

### TRANSPORT

No site specific comments

Green

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No Comments Collected

Air Quality: No Comments Collected

Noise: No Comments Collected

Flood Risk: No Comments Collected

Ecology: No site specific comments

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology: No site specific comments

Green

Landscape/  
Design: No site specific comments

Green

Openspace/  
Recreation: No site specific comments

Green

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Small site. Could be suitable for wider range of uses than current residential allocation. Unsure of commercial demand in this area. Would need to be more specific about the future use of the site

Amber

### CONCLUSIONS


Summary: The existing allocation for residential is supported and should remain. In addition to residential it is considered that additional community uses could be suitable on the site such as medical (GP surgery) or educational uses in connection with the adjacent All Saints School subject to demand being established.

Amber

Outcome: **Passed Technical Officer Comments**

Amber

<b>Site ref:</b> 654	<b>Site Name:</b>
<b>Allocation Ref:</b> H19	<b>Land at Mill Mount</b>



Crown Copyright. City of York Council. Licence No. 1000 20818. Produced by Forward Planning

<b>Site size:</b>	0.4 ha
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To include the site for residential development and/or community uses (including medical, education or local retail) within the Local Plan


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 696

## Amalgamated sites of Tadcaster Road

Source:  
Allocation -  
Alternative  
Boundary

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 4.906154150 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	Part
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	Part
Local Nature Conservatio	Adjacent
Site Size Remaining:	3.625025618

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	No
Habitat Evidence:	?

Partly

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Part
Site Size remaining:	2.882514223

Openspace Evidence:	No
---------------------	----

Partly

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	2.882514223

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 696

## Amalgamated sites off Tadcaster Road

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

Potential for cumulative traffic impacts on A1036 corridor.

Amber

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality:

Standard air quality requirements including electric vehicle recharge infrastructure. Additional traffic arising from the site will need to be screened to determine the level of Air Quality assessment required. Potential for wider air quality impacts on existing city centre AQMA (cumulative impacts with site 308, 129, 786, 185 etc)

Amber

Noise:

For the majority of the site noise will not be an issue. However, any frontage onto the A1036 may be affected by noise and so an assessment will be needed here.

Amber

Flood Risk:

This site is split between greenfield and brownfield. Change in this location would require the applicable run-off rates. This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

Part of the site is important grassland SINC (Knavesmire Stable meadow). Cherry Lane is also hedgerow SINC. Any development in the proposed extended site (Cherry Lane) could significantly affect the grassland value.

Red

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

Stables for racecourse are being considered for listing. Frontage of the site is within Tadcaster Road Conservation Area. An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits.

Amber

Landscape/  
Design:

It is important to retain the rural character of Cherry Lane and its setting of openness and the open aspect of the Knavesmire. The extended boundary of the site to include the area previously designated as open space is not considered suitable for development due to an adverse impact on the character of Cherry Lane and the open aspect it provides to the Knavesmire

Red

Openspace/  
Recreation:

There is a bowling green on site with a resident club. This land should be allocated as open space. If development is to go ahead the bowling green should be re-provided elsewhere. The amenity greenspace designation on Cherry Lane which was previously included within the PPG17 Study is no longer considered to form an AGS function as it is in private ownership and not publically accessible.

Amber

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

The existing allocated site (H2) is considered suitable for development on the premise that if the bowling green is developed this should be re-provided elsewhere. It should be noted that the racing stables on the site are being

Red  
Page 44

considered for listing. The larger boundary proposed through the Preferred Options consultation to include the Cherry Lane AGS is not supported. It is agreed that that site should be removed as an open space designation as it does not form publically accessible openspace however, the land performs an important function in terms of protecting the rural character of Cherry Lane, protecting the SINC quality hedgerows and providing an open aspect to the Knavesmire.



Outcome:

**The site boundary (H2) should not be enlarged and should stay as current draft allocation**




# Criteria 1 to 4 Analysis

Site: 791

## Amalgamated sites Chaplefields and Woodthorpe

Source:  
New Site

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size: 33.089596828

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	Part
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	20.066748297

Floodrisk Evidence:	No
Landscape Evidence:	Yes
Habitat Evidence:	N/A

Partly

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	Adj
Site Size remaining:	20.066686058

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

Pass

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	20.066686058

Floodrisk Evidence:	No
---------------------	----

Pass

#### Criteria 4 - Employment Access to Services

Stage 1 Pass

Pass

**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 791

## Amalgamated site west of Chapelfields

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

There is concern regarding the impact of development on the Moor Lane junction of the A1237 as well as capacity issues at the existing. The site is not considered sustainable due to location and distance from services. Would also need to confirm the sites access to public transport given its location. In terms of traffic/access overall the site is not sustainable- Acomb's local centre is over 1km away and there is no suggestion of providing facilities.

Red

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination:

This site is located within 250m of a closed landfill site, so land contamination could be present. The developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and remedial work if necessary. This will ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Amber

Air Quality:

Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including EVR infrastructure would be required. Site is not within existing area of air quality concern but as the site adjoins the outer ring road, careful consideration will need to be given to the site design to ensure any residential uses are set back from the carriageway. Orientation of habitable rooms, away from the carriageway facade, may also need to be considered to minimise potential impacts.

Amber

Noise:

Noise: Due to the proximity of A1237 and potential for noise affecting any housing, a noise assessment will be required. Barriers potentially needed bordering the roads to mitigate but it would create new receptors closer to the source of noise.

Amber

Flood Risk:

Site is greenfield therefore runoff rates must comply with the 1.4 l/sec/ha.  
This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology:

This site is all arable land of limited ecological interest. However, it also forms part of the ecological corridor on this side of the city and any development would require enhancement of this.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology:

An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. Any archaeological evidence found on the site might influence the masterplan and would need to be done prior to that process.

Amber

Landscape/  
Design:

Comments given previously on site still stand. Development of this site would compromise the setting of the city. The rural edge of the city would be lost as a result of development which is experienced on the approach from Askham Lane and the A1237. The ring road has a tall hedge but new landscaping would not provide sufficient mitigation for loss of openness, landscape character and setting. The boundary to H9 should remain unchanged

Red

Openspace/  
Recreation:

There is no mention of providing, improving or enhancing any of the open space/recreational facilities/infrastructure. Development here would not improve people's quality of life. Questions raised over whether facilities are only a 15 minute walk away.

Amber

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL



## CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

This site is not supported due to the landscape impacts of development in this location, Furthermore, the evidence presented does not consider the delivery of facilities which makes it unsustainable. It is also considered that an extension to allocation H9 should not be permitted.

Red

Outcome:

**The site boundary (H9) should not be enlarged and should remain as current draft allocation**

Red


# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 792

## Land South of Foxwood Lane, Acomb

Source:  
New Site

Submitted For: Housing



Submitted Size 4.530898740 Ha

### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	Part
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservatio	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.120156844

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	No
Habitat Evidence:	

Fail

#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	0.120156844

Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

N/A

#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Greenfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	0.120156844

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----

N/A

**Failed Criteria 1**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: 792

## Land off Askham Lane/ South of Foxwood Lane, Acomb

Submitted For: Housing

### TRANSPORT

There is concern regarding the impact of development on the Moor Lane junction of the A1237 as well as capacity issues at the existing. The site is not considered sustainable due to location and distance from services. Would also need to confirm the sites access to public transport given its location. In terms of traffic/access overall the site is not sustainable- Acomb's local centre is over 1km away and there is no suggestion of providing facilities.

Red

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: No particular concerns regarding land contamination at this site. However, the developer must undertake an appropriate assessment of the ground conditions.

Green

Air Quality: Air Quality: Standard air quality requirements including EVR infrastructure would be applicable for any development in this location.

Green

Noise: No noise issues.

Green

Flood Risk: Site is greenfield therefore runoff rates must comply with the 1.4 l/sec/ha.  
This site is located in flood zone 1.

Green

Ecology: This site is all arable land of limited ecological interest. However, it also forms part of the ecological corridor on this side of the city and any development would require enhancement of this.

Green

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/ Archaeology: An archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation will be required to identify archaeological features and deposits. Any archaeological evidence found on the site might influence the masterplan and would need to be done prior to that process.

Amber

Landscape/ Design: Previous landscape comments still stand. Extension of allocation H9 would undermine the setting of the city in this location, especially given the gentle topography of the site. Further development would therefore not be suitable.

Red

Openspace/ Recreation: There is no mention of providing, improving or enhancing any of the open space/recreational facilities/infrastructure. Development here would not improve people's quality of life. Questions raised over whether facilities are only a 15 minute walk away.

Amber

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

### CONCLUSIONS

Summary: This site is not supported due to the landscape impacts of development in this location. Furthermore, the evidence presented does not consider the delivery of facilities which makes it unsustainable. It is therefore considered that an

Red

Page 50

extension to allocation H9 should not be allocated.



Outcome:

**The site boundary (H9) should not be enlarged and should stay as current draft allocation**




# Criteria 1 to 3 Analysis

Site: 799

## Designer Outlet

Source:  
Allocation  
Support and  
Alternative Use

Submitted For: Retail/Leisure



Submitted Size: 18.482154625


### Technical Analysis

### Evidence/Mitigating Factors

#### Criteria 1 - Primary Constraints

Flood Zone 3b:	No
Historic Character:	No
Ancient Woodland:	No
Regional GI Corridor :	No
National Conservation:	No
SINC:	No
Local Nature Conservation	No
Site Size Remaining:	18.482154625


Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
Landscape Evidence:	N/A
Habitat Evidence:	N/A



#### Criteria 2 - Openspace

Openspace:	No
Site Size remaining:	18.482154625


Openspace Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----



#### Criteria 3 - Greenfield 3A

Greenfield/Brownfield:	Brownfield
Greenfield Within 3a:	No
Site Size Remaining:	18.482154625

Floodrisk Evidence:	N/A
---------------------	-----



**Pass Criteria 1234 - Move to Technical Officer Comments Stage**

# Technical Officer Assessment

Site: **799**

## Designer Outlet Existing Site

Submitted For: Retail/Leisure

### TRANSPORT

Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

### GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Contamination: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Air Quality: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Noise: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Flood Risk: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Ecology: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

### HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

Heritage/  
Archaeology: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Landscape/  
Design: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

Openspace/  
Recreation: Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

### ECONOMY AND RETAIL

Expansion within existing footprint - not applicable

The emerging Retail Study Update shows that the market share of YDO has doubled since 2007 in the clothing and footwear, small household goods sectors showing that the current format is successful, this is in the context that the city centre's market share has declined markedly in these two sectors since 2007, although White Young Green accept that this decline cannot be attributed purely to the YDO as other out-of-centre destinations (Monks Cross and Clifton Moor) have compounded the decline. Furthermore the emerging Retail Study Update has also identified that after extant planning commitments are taken into account there is no capacity for new floorspace across the city until after 2028, and therefore given the lack of capacity, any new floorspace is likely to impact on other existing destinations in the city, including the city centre. With the significant increase in floorspace being built at Monks Cross and given the uncertainty around the impact of this on the city centre, WYG believe that the city centre should be protected against further expansions of retail floorspace until such impacts are understood. Only after such time should the position of YDO be reconsidered. Whilst WYG recognise that YDO brings economic benefits to the city and contributes to the overall city's economic success this is not justification on its own to expand the facility further. From review of the representation made there is no compelling evidence to confirm that the YDO acts a complementary role to the city centre, as stated above there is more evidence from the emerging evidence from the Retail Study Update that shows the role of the city centre is diminishing in terms of the sectors that both destinations act within. The results from the Retail Study demonstrates that nearly 25% of the trade draw

Red

from the Study Area is from Zones 1 to 3 which covers the main urban area of York, with 60% of its trade coming from Zone 1 to 8, showing that the YDO is dependent on trade from within 20 minutes drive.

WYG do not believe that there is any compelling evidence provided to justify the allocation of the extension of the YDO and such extension could be contrary to the NPPF criteria as it could erode the vitality and viability of York city centre (and other centres) as well absorb any further capacity beyond the study period which would be better placed to focus initiatives on the city centre.



## CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

Consultants who are undertaking the emerging Retail Study Update for York (White Young Green) do not believe that there is any compelling evidence provided to justify the allocation of the extension of the York Designer Outlet for up to 10,000 sq m of further retail floorspace and that such extension could be contrary to the NPPF criteria as it could erode the vitality and viability of York city centre (and other centres) as well absorb any further capacity beyond the study period which would be better placed to focus initiatives in York city centre. The existing Preferred Options allocation for strategic leisure (ST21) is supported subject to detailed impact assessment.

Red



Outcome:

**Failed technical officer commentsexpansion**

Red

