

Annex D: Heritage Impact Appraisal



YORK

CITY OF YORK HERITAGE IMPACT APPRAISAL

DRAFT, September 2014

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2. IMPACT APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY | 5 |
| 3. OUTCOMES OF LOCAL PLAN POLICY APPRAISAL..... | 12 |
| 4. OUTCOMES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SITES APPRAISAL –ALLOCATED STRATEGIC SITES | 57 |
| 5. OUTCOMES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SITES APPRAISAL – ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIC SITES | 83 |
| 7. OUTCOMES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SITES APPRAISAL – ALLOCATED EMPLOYMENT SITES | 86 |
| 8. OUTCOMES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SITES APPRAISAL – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALTERNATIVES..... | 87 |
| 9. GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS..... | 89 |
| 10. SAFEGUARDED LAND | 90 |
| 11. MIXED USE SITES | 91 |
| STRATEGIC SITES INDEX | 92 |
| ALLOCATIONS INDEX | 94 |
| ANNEX 1: CONSULTATION WITH ENGLISH HERITAGE | 97 |

Separate Appendices

APPENDIX 2: STRATEGIC SITES, HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION RAPID APPRAISALS

APPENDIX 3: STRATEGIC SITES APPRAISAL

APPENDIX 4: HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS APPRAISAL

APPENDIX 5: STRATEGIC SITES, HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ALTERNATIVE APPRAISAL

APPENDIX 6: SAFEGUARDED LAND APPRAISAL

APPENDIX 7: GYPSIES, TRAVELLER AND SHOWPEOPLE ALLOCATIONS APPRAISAL

APPENDIX 8: ALLOCATED MIXED USE SITES

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 York's historic environment is of international, national, regional and local significance. This is recognised through the many statutory designations that apply to its heritage assets. While a 'heritage assets' approach is important at a site specific level, providing guidance about the sensitivity of a particular location, the overall pattern and profile of monuments and buildings, and indeed of other features such as historic parks and gardens, it cannot alone describe the significance and sensitivity of the wider historic environment, nor what characteristics of the city's character we should strive to protect or hope to strengthen.
- 1.1.2 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare a sustainability appraisal (SA) alongside its plan making, which would provide some understanding of the impact of development and policy options on the City's historic environment. The SA has a wide focus across all aspects of sustainability, giving consistent weight to social, environmental and economic factors. This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) allows us to specifically assess whether the strategic sites, allocations and policies of the City of York Local Plan will conserve or enhance the special characteristics of the city. The HIA is York's chosen method of appraising developing policy and site selection.
- 1.1.3 The Heritage Topic Paper (April 2013) considers existing evidence relating to the City of York's historic environment, and how the evidence is translated into the Council's understanding of the city's special qualities and its complex 2000 year history. This evidence and understanding has then been used to identify six principal characteristics of the historic environment that help define the special qualities of York, providing a detailed explanation of each characteristic. The principal characteristics detailed are:
- Strong urban form;
 - Compactness;
 - Landmark Monuments;
 - Architectural Character;
 - Archaeological Complexity;
 - Landscape and Setting.

1.2 Purpose of this document

- 1.2.1 Although the protection of York's special character has been a key element in shaping the City's Planning strategy, to date there has been no single detailed assessment of the proposed Strategic Sites against the six Principal Characteristics identified in the Heritage Topic Paper. This appraisal sets out to determine the potential impacts of the Local Plan policies and Allocations.

1.3 Previous HIA undertaken

- 1.3.1 A Heritage Impact Appraisal was undertaken for Local Plan policies to accompany the Preferred Options Consultation (summer 2013). The impact of each policy in the City of York Local Plan Preferred Options document was assessed against the historic characteristics set out in the Heritage Topic Paper.
- 1.3.2 In addition the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Local Plan included 2 objectives relating to the historic character and setting of York. These were:
- Objective 14: Conserve or enhance York’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting;
 - Objective 15: Protect and enhance York’s natural and built landscape.
 - All policy options and alternatives were considered through the SA process.
- 1.3.3 As well as a policy appraisal at the Preferred Options stage, an initial evaluation of the likely impacts upon the historic environment was used in determining the most sustainable site allocations through a sustainable location assessment which is presented in the *Sustainability Appraisal (2013) (SA)* and the *Site Selection Technical Paper (2013)*. The methodology took into consideration all three aspects of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in determining the best location for development. This was a desktop assessment using GIS based data to accurately determine the sites location relative to the criteria. The assessment followed a four stage criteria methodology to sieve out the most sustainable sites for consideration. All the sites were also subject to a supplementary assessment of environmental considerations to understand more about key assets or issues within the vicinity. This included an initial assessment of the likely impact which proposed sites might have on the historic character of York and removing those which were considered most likely to harm it special historic character or setting. Any successful sites taken forward were subject to a Technical Officer Assessment to understand in more detail any issues associated with the sites, including design, conservation and sustainable development.

1.4 Engagement with English Heritage

- 1.4.1 English Heritage has been consulted on all of the documents during statutory consultations for the Local Plan and formerly, the Local Development Framework. There has been additional dialogue to discuss the parameters for the Heritage Topic Paper, published in 2012 and updated in 2013.
- 1.4.2 There has been ongoing dialogue with English Heritage with regards to the assessment of potential site allocations and alternatives following the Preferred Options Local Plan consultation. This has informed the methodology to take forward the Heritage Impact Assessment for strategic sites and allocations. Annex 1 details comments made at the preferred options stage and subsequent comments made by English Heritage.

2. Impact Appraisal Methodology

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This section sets out the different methodologies used to assess the likely impacts of Local Plan (Submission) policies and sites on the City's principal heritage characteristics. The impact appraisal undertaken for policies and sites differ slightly to enable the best capture of issues.
- 2.1.2 The appraisals have been carried out in house using professional expertise within the Planning and Environmental Management Planning Policy) and (Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development) teams.

2.2 Appraisal Structure

- 2.2.1 The Heritage Topic Paper sets out 6 Principal Characteristics which afford York its unique character. Both appraisals use these 6 Principal Characteristics to structure comments around the likely impact of the Local Plan. Importantly, where adverse impacts are identified, the appraisal goes further to identify possible mitigation measures.
- 2.2.2 The appraisals make use of a colour coded key to present a quick visual summary of the potential likely impacts without mitigation. Where impacts are likely to depend heavily on implementation, this colour coding may show 2 or even 3 possible outcomes; explanatory comments are included within the supporting text.

Figure 1: Heritage Impact Appraisal structure

| Policy Theme or Site | 1. Strong Urban Form | 2. Compactness | 3. Landmark Monuments | 4. Architectural character | 5. Archaeological complexity | 6. Landscape and setting | Likely Impacts | Mitigation |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Eg Section 3 Spatial Vision | | | | | | | | |
| Impact Key: | | | | | | | | |
| | Significant Positive: Potential for significant positive benefit through enhancement as well as adding value. | | | | | | | |
| | Positive: Potential for positive benefit through enhancement as well as adding value | | | | | | | |
| | Minor harm: Potential for harm to historic character and significances but identified policy framework in place to provide mitigation | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Serious harm: Highly likely to cause significant harm leading to loss of historic character or substantial harm to its significance. |
| | Neutral: Negligible impact and negligible benefit |
| | Unknown: There is insufficient information to determine an impact |

2.3 Sites Appraisal

- 2.3.1 For the Sites appraisal, discussions with colleagues within the Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development Team and English Heritage led to a two-stage methodology being developed to enable a baseline position to be established for all reasonable alternatives, followed by a more detailed evaluation for strategic sites and allocations (where further information has been submitted):
- 2.3.2 Stage 1: Rapid Assessment of all Strategic Sites, Allocations and reasonable alternatives: All sites considered as 'reasonable alternatives' have been subject to a rapid appraisal. Using the structure detailed in Figure 1 above, the resultant matrix indicates the contribution a site makes against each principal characteristics and what the likely impacts development may have in this location. It is intended that that this analysis will form the baseline position for the site, on which future analysis and decision making in relation to the historic environment can be based. The assessments for this stage 1 will be iterative to allow for different site boundaries to be considered for each site.
- 2.3.3 Stage 2: Assessing the Strategic Sites, Allocations and reasonable alternatives: The stage 2 assessment allows a fuller appraisal of the likely impacts of development. This stage will build upon the stage 1 assessment to understand how the proposals are likely to impact on the special qualities and characteristics identified and suggest measures which may be implemented to mitigate against potential harmful impacts. This stage uses the full characteristics framework as set out in the Heritage Topic Paper as the basis for analysis. The framework would therefore consider:

Figure 2: Stage 2 Sites Appraisal

| | Character Elements | Key features |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Strong Urban Form | | |
| 1.1 | Large urban blocks | Mixed use blocks composed of taller (3-5 storey) buildings facing the street with lower extensions and <i>ad-hoc</i> smaller structures behind and within the blocks, retained private yards. Blocks strongly enclose streets. |
| 1.2 | Long narrow plots and gates side passages | Usually reflecting medieval or earlier building plots with side access to former workshops and gardens. |
| 1.3 | Framed shop fronts | Variety of good quality 'frames' around shop windows, providing visual support to building above whilst allowing interaction with the street. Usually associated with smaller retail premises. |

| | Character Elements | Key features |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 1.4 | Medieval street patterns | Overlaying pattern of historic routes, narrow well enclosed primary streets, gentle curvilinear routes, secondary lanes and ginnels/alleys threading through the blocks or giving access to more private enclaves. High degree of choice, connectivity and permeability. |
| 1.5 | Small squares | Close distribution of small squares intimate in scale. Larger spaces formed later by highways interventions or through provision of markets. Few examples of formal compositions such as at 'Eye of York' |
| 1.6 | Rich townscape | City centre as a place of diversity, contrasts and surprises; unfolding views of great variety and historic interest; juxtaposition of different materials and forms; experience of shock scale; bridges offering panoramic views; pre-industrial skyline of city centre; city walls as vantage points; highly legible environment |
| 1.7 | Arterial roads | Broad straight streets connecting city centre to suburbs enclosed by buildings of higher stature towards city bars; cobbled margins and tree lined avenues giving way to broad verges (at best); routes interrupted by large outlying complexes providing green open spaces. |
| 2. Compactness | | |
| 2.1 | Contained concentric form | The city is walkable and the centre is accessible by cycle and foot with relative ease. The York outer ring road accentuates the city form and the walls enclose the historic core. |
| 2.2 | Flat terrain and views | Low lying setting and compactness of city creates both long views and surprise views both out of and into the historic core. |
| 2.3 | Arterial roads | Broad straight streets connecting city centre to suburbs enclosed by buildings of higher stature towards city bars; cobbled margins and tree lined avenues giving way to broad verges (at best); routes interrupted by large outlying complexes providing green open spaces. |
| 2.4 | Dense urban fabric | Inward focussed centre , mixed uses both horizontally and vertically in urban centre, identifiable sub-areas of particular form and use. |
| 2.5 | Identifiable compact districts | Outlying development is divided into segments by the rivers, strays and arterial roads; this containment of built form positively accentuates the identity of each area whilst allowing quick access to open areas, informal green spaces and the cycle routes and riverside walks leading out the city. |
| 2.6 | Urban villages retain identity | (a) Village greens as focus or linear main streets with surviving back lanes. (b) Clusters of facilities in village core. |

| | Character Elements | Key features |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 2.7 | Planned rural villages | Enduring form of curving linear main street with burgage plots running to historic back lanes; broad planted verges common feature of main artery, later infilling and minor extensions often protect historic grain, openness, and views out to the countryside. |
| 3. Landmark Monuments | | |
| 3.1 | Buildings of high cultural significance | Visually, aesthetically and historically interesting and sometimes associated with historical events and specific individuals. |
| 3.2 | Physical and temporal landmarks | (a) The Minster in particular can be viewed from the Wolds, Moors and Dales. The walls are ever present and a perambulation of them will reveal many of the City's monuments including Terry's and the Nestle Factory. (b) Clifford's Tower is particularly associated with historical events. The Civil War is associated with the Bars . The Eye of York with Luddites. |
| 3.3 | Substantial number of medieval communal buildings | Buildings that reflect functional importance as civic centres, places of justice, work and religious activity. |
| 3.4 | Monument clustering | There is very little dispersion and most principle monuments are sited within the historic core and there is a degree of inter-visibility , especially from the City Walls. |
| 3.5 | Quantity of monuments | York has a higher than average number of listed buildings and other principle monuments |
| 3.6 | Diversity of monuments | Diversity ranges from substantial limestone structures like the Minster to Timber framed Barley Hall and Merchant Adventurers Hall. From domestic buildings to brick built railway headquarters and 19 th -20 th century factories. |
| 3.7 | Churches locked into urban fabric | Provide pockets of green space within dense urban blocks and are a haven for wildlife. |
| 4. Architectural Character | | |
| 4.1 | Architectural legacy | Buildings representing two thousand years of architectural development in close proximity to each other. |
| 4.2 | Variety | The fine grain of urban blocks accommodates a tremendous range of building types from all ages . Few streets have consistent themes, though streets have formed their own identity. |
| 4.3 | Human scale | The limits of natural materials and techniques have ensured that human scale buildings predominate. Narrow plot boundaries assist in developing rhythm. Where these limits have been exceeded to create |

| | Character Elements | Key features |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | factories, warehouses, office blocks, they have simple massing and are clustered on low ground close to the station of within extra mural compounds. Even so height is restrained , roof-tops acknowledge with modelling or decorative parapets, and facades have a level of detailed consideration. |
| 4.4 | Craftsmanship | Highly skilled craftsmen and artists have benefited from religious and secular patronage through-out York's history. Of particular significance are: stained glass, stone carving, carpentry and timber relief work, wrought and cast ironwork, monuments, brasses, bells and public statuary |
| 5. Architectural Complexity | | |
| 5.1 | Exceptional preservation in historic core | Timber foundations of Anglo-Scandinavian houses have been found well preserved in Coppergate and Hungate. Food waste and other similar organic waste is well preserved giving invaluable insight into diet, health, economy that is lacking in more conventional archaeological deposits |
| 5.2 | Depth of deposits in the historic core | Remains of successive development from Roman through to the present day. |
| 5.3 | 2000 years of urban development | Archaeological deposits relating to at least Roman through to the present day |
| 5.4 | Finite and non-renewable resource | (a) Anaerobic deposits that are extremely dependant on sustained ground conditions. Fluctuating water table creates pressures on the continued preservation of these deposits. (b) Any form of deposit removal , even by archaeologists in a controlled and recorded manner will destroy important evidence and information. |
| 5.5 | Majority of known and unknown archaeological features and deposits are not designated heritage assets. | The York HER contains some 6000 records relating to the archaeology of York and its surroundings which is only a small percentage of what actually remains. |
| 6. Landscape and Setting | | |
| 6.1 | Views in and out | (a) Long-distance views of York Minster in low-lying relatively flat vale landscape. The Minster constantly reappears at closer quarters. (b) View of the race course/Knavesmire and Terrys combined. (c) Rural edge setting viewed from majority of ring road by way of field margin (northern ring road business parks |

| | Character Elements | Key features |
|-----|---|--|
| | | exception to rule). (d) Views out to the Wolds, Moors and the Howardian Hills (orientation, identity, and sense of location/setting). |
| 6.2 | Strays (including racecourse) and common land | Openness; greenness; natural/rural character within city. Village greens. |
| 6.3 | Rivers and Ings | (a) Derwent/Ouse: Flooding; Ings meadows; retention of traditional management over centuries - still hay cropped and grazed where possible. (b) Ouse - walking along most of either bank north to Beningborough hall, south past Bishops palace. Activity on river - rowing (3 clubs) dating back to mid 19th century. (c) Foss – two rivers converging in city centre; walkway from centre to countryside beyond ring road; linking villages – the ‘hidden’ river. (d) Views along river/banks. |
| 6.4 | Open countryside and green belt | (a) The open countryside surrounding York contributes to the landscape setting of the historic City; (b) A wide variety of different habitats and landscape elements including: Lowland heath; wet acidic grassland; rich hedgerows; valley fen; open Ings landscape associated with river; wildflower meadows; (c) Airfields with large expanse of openness/cultural heritage/habitat value; (d) Village settings including: assorted land; strip field pattern/ridge and furrow; hedgerows; veteran orchards. (e) Long distance uninterrupted recreation routes with cultural significance through countryside (f) Orchards – vale of York high orchard productivity historically; veteran Pear and apple trees often in gardens of later development. |
| 6.5 | Suburban villages | Street trees, public parks, large gardens, ‘quiet streets’, pedestrian-friendly environment, strong community identity, allotments, front gardens bound by hedges |
| 6.6 | Parks and Gardens | (a) Registered historic parks and gardens (b) Parks for the people (c) Designed campus landscape (d) Matrix of accessible parks |
| 6.7 | Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages | The relationship of York to its surrounding settlements. This relationship derives from:- (a) the distance between the settlements (b) the size of the villages themselves, (c) the fact that they are free-standing, clearly definable |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | Character Elements | Key features |
| | | settlements |

3. Outcomes of Local Plan Policy Appraisal

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The following table presents the outcomes of the Heritage Impact Appraisal of emerging Local Plan (Submission) policies.

| | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| ++ | Significant Positive: Potential for significant positive benefit through enhancement as well as adding value. | - | Minor harm: Potential for harm to historic character and significances but identified policy framework in place to provide mitigation |
| + | Positive: Potential for positive benefit through enhancement as well as adding value | -- | Serious harm: Highly likely to cause significant harm leading to loss of historic character or substantial harm to its significance. |
| O | Neutral: Negligible impact and negligible benefit | ? | Unknown: There is insufficient information to determine an impact. |

| Policy Theme | Principal Characteristics | | | | | | Likely Impacts | Mitigation |
|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| | Strong Urban Form | Compactness | Landmark Monuments | Architectural character | Archaeological complexity | Landscape and setting | | |
| Section 2: Vision and Development Principles | | | | | | | | |
| Policy DP1: York Sub Area | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | This describes York's role and function within the wider sub-region. It continues to focus growth on York City Centre, further enhancing the city's | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|-----|
| | | | | | | | compactness. The conservation and enhancement of York's outstanding historic environment is recognised as paramount to the region's success, and afforded protection alongside York's landscapes, biodiversity and other areas of environmental character. Policy further defines the principle of a Green Belt around York. In doing so, in general terms, the policy sets out to safeguard the special qualities of York. | |
| Policy DP2: Sustainable Development | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ○ | ++ | The policy lists general development principles to promote a level, type and location of development appropriate within what the Plan defines as 'sustainable'. Several principles relate directly to the aspiration to protect York's environment, and, while much will be reliant on how other parts of the Plan are implemented, are likely to deliver positive impacts across the majority of historic characteristics in general terms. This is firstly due to the commitment in this policy for creating strong sustainable neighbourhoods, which will be positive for Principles 1 and 2, and secondly its commitments to conserving and enhancing York's character and setting as well as ensuring high quality design and urban design. | n/a |
| Policy DP3: Sustainable Communities | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | Further to DP2, DP3 goes on to describe how the Plan will help to deliver sustainable communities, and again points to respect for the City's historic character and landscape. Further acknowledgement is given to York's unique character through a clause promoting locally distinctive design and respect for historic character and key views. | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|-----|---|
| Policy DP4: Approach to Development Management | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy's role is to guide development in accordance with local plan policies, and as such should help to deliver places which respect and enhance York's special qualities. | n/a | |
| Section 3: Spatial Strategy¹ | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth in York | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | SS1 guides development to brownfield sites, with emphasis on protecting the character and setting of the City and its wider historic and natural environment. It continues to focus growth on York City Centre, further enhancing the city's compactness. In doing so, in general terms, the policy sets out to safeguard the special qualities of York. | | |
| Policy SS2: The Role of York's Green Belt | ++ | ++ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ++ | Further to DP1, SS2 describes the primary purpose of the Green Belt as to preserve the setting and the special character of York. | | |
| Policy SS3: The Creation of an Enduring Green Belt | ++ | ++ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ++ | SS3 identifies 'safeguarded' land, excluded from the green belt, which may be needed for development following the Plan's review. This helps to ensure the green belt's permanence. | | |
| Policy SS4: York City Centre | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | This policy is likely to have a positive or significantly positive impact on all of the characteristics as it recognises York's City Centre as the hub of the city and seeks to conserve and enhance its special qualities and distinctiveness as well as its setting and heritage assets. | n/a | |
| Policy SS5: Whinthorpe Area of Change | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS5 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i> , - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and |

¹ The spatial strategy lists a number of sites which will have been subject to Heritage Impact Appraisal as part of the HIA (SITES) document. It should be noted that the HIA (SITES) document appraises the principle of development on a site, but not a specific development type or level. The policy in the Local Plan (appraised here) tells us more about the type, level and location of development on a site, and should respond to the points raised by the HIA (SITES) document, including suggested mitigation measures. As such, the 2 appraisals may have differing conclusions.

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p>with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, the policy advises that Whinthorpe will be supported by detailed planning guidance to guide implementation through the preparation of a SPD, which will contain further detail on policy SS5. This must be guided by sufficient appraisal and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> <i>No likely impacts identified.</i> No likely impact identified.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Potentially negative impact on compactness, although existing field margin suggests a separate settlement rather than an extension to York itself.</i> Policy requires a significant buffer to the A64, in order that the development reads as a separate settlement, and sits within its own landscape context.</p> <p><i>Potential to harm experience of views to the city centre by providing another focus.</i> No reference to views – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis.</p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u> <i>Development may obscure or impact on views of the Minster and other features.</i> No reference to views – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Views of Minster should be retained in new development.</p> <p><u>Architectural Character</u> <i>Poor architectural design, including inappropriately</i></p> | <p>Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site’s characteristics (in particular views appraisal), and that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking. - Reducing the settlement size and/or moving further from the ring road/Heslington may further reinforce Whinthorpe as a free-standing settlement. - Further archaeological investigation by geophysical survey and evaluation trenching is needed to provide further information and evidence to the archaeological record. Mitigation by recording and avoidance. - Inspection of ridge and furrow should take place to decide which areas merit preservation as part of open space. - Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p><i>Development may obscure or impact on views of the Minster and other features, including the Wolds.</i> No reference to views – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Views of Minster should be retained in new development.</p> <p><i>Negative impact of new access point from A64, due to potentially substantial land take.</i> No reference to impact of access – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by further assessment.</p> <p><i>Potential negative impact on SINC/SSSI sites without appropriate mitigation.</i> Policy seeks to ensure no adverse impacts on Heslington Tilmire SSSI, and recommends an adjacent mitigating Habitat Enhancement Area. Requires impacts on biodiversity to be managed through avoidance, mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation.</p> <p><i>Potentially negative impact on existing recreational routes, including the Minster Way.</i> Ensure that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant, and avoids the Minster Way.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of buffered HEA to mitigate impacts on biodiversity, in particular on Heslington Tilmire. |
| <p>Policy SS6: East of Metcalfe Lane Area of Change</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>+</p> | | | <p>0</p> | <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS6 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i>, with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, policy advises that the East of Metcalfe Lane Area of Change will provide a well integrated and connected new development, with further masterplanning guided by a Supplementary Planning Document. This must be require sufficient appraisal</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site's |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p>and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> <i>No likely impacts identified.</i> No likely impact identified.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Potential for adverse impact on compactness, given that development would increase the distance from the city centre to the urban edge. Further, the loss of distinct boundaries or open space may erode the identity of existing residential districts. A degree of loss of compactness is unavoidable, but could be reduced through pulling back the eastern edge of the development boundary. Policy suggests improving connectivity by maximising cycle integration in and out of the site, and with the City Centre and surrounding area.</i></p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u> <i>Development may obscure or impact on views of the Minster and other features. No reference to views – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Views of Minster should be retained in new development.</i></p> <p><u>Architectural Character</u> <i>Poor architectural design, including inappropriately tall buildings, would be detrimental to the generally high quality of buildings and craftsmanship in York. Policy makes no mention of design aspirations - site should create an independent identity informed by contextual appraisals and the best of contemporary placemaking.</i></p> <p><u>Archaeological complexity</u></p> | <p>characteristics (in particular views appraisal and adjacent conservation area), and that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong landscaped edge needed to the development, particularly on the eastern edge. - Further archaeological investigation by geophysical survey and evaluation trenching is needed to provide further information and evidence to the archaeological record. Mitigation by recording and avoidance. - Inspection of ridge and furrow should take place to decide which areas merit preservation as part of open space. - Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development. Further assessment needed to identify the most significant of these. - Existing tracks and plantations should be used to |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p><i>Development and archaeological investigation of the site would have a destructive impact on any surviving remains or landscape features. Development which removed the visible inherited historic grain would be detrimental to the area. The potential loss of the farms within the site will remove agricultural character from the area.</i></p> <p>No policy reference to archaeological investigation or mitigating measures – this should be picked up in SPD. See mitigation measures for further action.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Setting</u></p> <p><i>Development may obscure or impact on views of the Minster and other features, including the surrounding rural landscape.</i> No reference to views in policy – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Key views, including those of the Minster, should be retained and help inform new development. By keeping the building heights to one-two storeys on site, providing green buffers and retaining hedgerows and trees the impact on the views from the neighbouring housing will be kept to a minimum.</p> <p><i>Potentially significantly negative impact on setting of the city by reducing the field margin between the ring road and urban areas.</i> Current site boundaries are such that despite development a reasonable gap will still exist between the ring road and the urban fringe. Green edged site boundaries and planned open green space within the site should also negate some of the loss of setting. Any potential boundary change further to the east (which would enlarge the site) should be discouraged. Areas outside the proposed allocation towards the ring road should be designated as Green Belt to ensure the remaining field margin is retained.</p> <p><i>Loss of small part of Heworth Green green wedge. This development will remove part of the countryside</i></p> | <p>guide the form of routes and open spaces on site if the historic pattern of development is not to be lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on any archaeological features or deposits should also, if possible, be presented in some form to local residents to enhance knowledge. - Investigation of the farm buildings should be undertaken to determine whether any are worthy of preservation. Existing rural buildings have potential to give local distinctiveness to architectural character of any new building. - Historic Hedgerows should be retained, or used to inform pattern of development - Railway line should be used to extend Cycle Route 66 to the new development. - Any potential boundary change further to the east (which would enlarge the site) should be discouraged. - Areas outside the proposed allocation towards the ring road should be designated as Green Belt to ensure the remaining field margin is retained. - Retain green wedge as open space/ green space. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p>surrounding the city. Development which would remove open countryside features would have a detrimental impact on this character element without mitigation. In particular, construction of housing against the northern edge of Osbaldwick would destroy its historic rural setting. Policy requires a green wedge to be established to protect the corridor of South Beck and maintain the distinction between Heworth and Tang Hall. Removing development from this wedge and instead providing green space/open space would help maintain its openness.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure no development further to the east of the current proposed boundaries. - Incorporate as much of a green buffer between the rural setting and proposed development. Green edges and buffering required for the eastern edge of the site and to boundaries of existing settlements. - Retain reasonable farmstead buildings and possibly some function and a sufficient degree of context and retain the sense of identity and historic connection that such complexes provide. - The SINC site is outside the proposed development boundary. Appropriate buffering to the edge of the SINC and development should be put in place. - No development against the northern edge of Osbaldwick. The fields immediately north of the village, which include the SINC site, and part of the Green Belt should remain open. This would mitigate some of the impact on the immediate setting of the village. - Clear margin needed between Conservation Area of Osbaldwick and the new |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected areas of ridge and furrow should also be retained where possible as part of the planned open space. - Low building heights and low-medium housing densities may also minimise the impact on the rural setting of the city. |
| <p>Policy SS7: Clifton Gate Area of Change</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>+</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS7 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i>, with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, policy advises that Land North of Clifton Moor will deliver a mix of housing, community facilities and infrastructure, with further masterplanning guided by a Supplementary Planning Document. This must require sufficient appraisal and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> <i>No likely impacts identified.</i> No likely impact identified.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Potential significant negative impacts from urban sprawl – would extend development beyond the confines of the ring road.</i> Policy promotes landscape buffers around the site to prevent coalescence with adjacent settlements and maintain the setting of Skelton. Further greenspace buffers to the south of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site’s characteristics (in particular views appraisal and the significance of the SLI/airfield), and that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking. - Impact on compactness and on the setting of the city could be mitigated through sensitive masterplanning, reducing the scale of the overall site and/or increasing the green space buffer with | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>the site would help to create distance between this development and the City itself, with Clifton Gate reading as a standalone settlement. An element of urban sprawl is inevitable.</p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u> <i>Development may obscure or impact on views of the Minster and other features.</i> No reference to views in policy – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Views of Minster should be retained in new development.</p> <p><u>Architectural Character</u> <i>Poor architectural design, including inappropriately tall buildings, would be detrimental to the generally high quality of buildings and craftsmanship in York.</i> Policy makes no mention of design aspirations - site should create an independent identity informed by contextual appraisals and the best of contemporary placemaking.</p> <p><u>Archaeological complexity</u> <i>Development and archaeological investigation of the site would have a destructive impact on any surviving remains or landscape features.</i> <i>Development which removed the visible inherited historic grain would be detrimental to the area.</i> <i>The potential loss of the farm within the site will remove remaining agricultural character from the area.</i> No policy reference to archaeological investigation or mitigating measures – this should be picked up in SPD. Non-intrusive desk based assessment and geophysical survey in progress. See mitigation measures for further action.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Setting</u></p> | <p>the ring road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An area of avoidance should be enforced to prevent coalescence with Skelton - Further archaeological investigation by geophysical survey and evaluation trenching is needed to provide further information and evidence to the archaeological record. Mitigation by recording and avoidance. - Inspection of ridge and furrow should take place to decide which areas merit preservation as part of open space. - Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development. Further assessment needed to identify the most significant of these. - Information on any archaeological features or deposits should also, if possible, be presented in some form to local residents to enhance knowledge. - Investigation of the farm buildings should be undertaken to determine whether any are worthy of |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p><i>Development may obscure or impact on views towards the city and outwards across the rural landscape. No reference to views in policy – this should be picked up in SPD and informed by views analysis. Note that landscape and setting has already been compromised by the location of the retail park.</i></p> <p><i>Potentially significant negative impact through development creating an urban corridor due to its location opposite Clifton Moor Retail Park.</i></p> <p><i>Potential harm to setting/character of Site of Local Interest for species rich grassland.</i></p> <p><i>Further erosion of setting of Skelton</i></p> <p>Policy promotes landscape buffers around the site to prevent coalescence with adjacent settlements and maintain the setting of Skelton. Further greenspace buffers to the south of the site would help to create distance between this development and the City itself, with Clifton Gate reading as a standalone settlement. SLI, on-site plantations and tree/hedge lines remain protected through policy. An element of urban sprawl is inevitable.</p> | <p>preservation. Existing rural buildings have potential to give local distinctiveness to architectural character of any new building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low density housing and buffering/landscaping to the rural edges may soften the urban character of the new development, particularly towards Skelton - SLI should remain as open space. |
| <p>Policy SS8: Land North of Monks Cross Area of Change</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS8 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i>, with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, policy advises that Land North of Monks Cross will deliver a new urban extension; a mix of housing, community facilities and infrastructure, with further masterplanning guided by a Supplementary Planning Document. This must require sufficient appraisal and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site’s characteristics (in particular landscaping, and the site’s setting on the urban edge), and that future development |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> No likely impacts identified. No likely impact identified.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Site is located within the ring road, although on the periphery of the City. Development should not extend further than the proposed eastern boundary to maintain an element of compactness.</i></p> <p>Developing the site would compromise the transition zone between primary residential area and larger scale uses at Monks Cross. The form of development must allow for a transition zone between the rural and commercial area.</p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u> No likely impacts identified. No likely impact identified.</p> <p><u>Architectural Character</u> <i>Poor architectural design, including inappropriately tall buildings, would be detrimental to the generally high quality of buildings and craftsmanship in York. Policy makes no mention of design aspirations - site should create an independent identity informed by contextual appraisals and the best of contemporary placemaking.</i></p> <p><u>Archaeological complexity</u> <i>Development and archaeological investigation of the site would have a destructive impact on any surviving remains or landscape features. Development which removed the visible inherited historic grain would be detrimental to the area. The potential loss of the farm within the site will remove remaining agricultural character from the area.</i></p> <p>No policy reference to archaeological investigation or</p> | <p>masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The creation of green corridors throughout the site will enhance connectivity and 'rural' space through the settlement. - Further archaeological investigation by evaluation trenching is needed to provide further information and evidence to the archaeological record. Mitigation by recording and avoidance. - Inspection of ridge and furrow should take place to decide which areas merit preservation as part of open space. - Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development. Further assessment needed to identify the most significant of these. - Information on any archaeological features or deposits should also, if possible, be presented in some form to local residents to enhance knowledge. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>mitigating measures – this should be picked up in SPD. Non-intrusive desk based assessment undertaken. Geophysical survey complete. See mitigation measures for further action.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Setting</u> Development of the site would reduce the field margin between the ring road and urban areas, impacting on the open rural setting of the city. The proposed area of development runs up to the ring road at its north-east corner thereby potentially removing the field margin altogether and altering the rural character of North Lane which continues on the other side of the A1237. <i>Policy advocates strategic greenspace, in part to safeguard the setting of the city and retain key strategic views towards the Minster.</i></p> <p>The loss of the remaining agricultural land here would further erode the village setting of Huntington. Several strip fields, historic field boundaries and ridge and furrow associated with the village exist across the site. <i>Policy advocates strategic greenspace, in part to conserve on-site assets including ridge and furrow, hedgerows and trees, that also contribute to the setting of Huntington.</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ways of incorporating some of the farm buildings into the new development should be explored. Green buffering should be used to maintain a rural image when looking from Galtres Farm to the new development. - Any potential boundary change further to the east should be discouraged. A new Green Belt designation in this area may assist in protecting the remaining field margin here in the future. |
| <p>Policy SS9: York Central Area of Opportunity</p> | + | ++ | O | + | - | + | C | - | - | O | <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS9 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i>, with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, York Central offers an area of opportunity promoting mixed use development including a new CBD, expanded and new cultural and visitor facilities, and a new residential community. Development on site will be guided by a Supplementary Planning Document. This must</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site's characteristics (in particular |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p>require sufficient appraisal and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> <i>Inappropriate development on this site may compromise the views to and from the area – in particular of the Minster and City Walls as well as impact on the setting of some listed buildings. (see also Landscape and Setting).</i> The policy promotes development which new place of outstanding quality and design which complements and enhances the existing historic urban fabric of the city, safeguards those elements which contribute to the distinctive historic character of the city, and assimilates into its setting and surrounding communities. Views appraisal should inform forthcoming SPD and masterplanning to mitigate potential harm. There is also the potential for this policy to have a positive impact on strong urban form, creating a new part of the city representing the best in contemporary design.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Inappropriate development may obscure views of city landmarks such as the Minster or significant elements of the railway infrastructure from within the site and further afield.</i> The policy promotes development which new place of outstanding quality and design which complements and enhances the existing historic urban fabric of the city, safeguards those elements which contribute to the distinctive historic character of the city, and assimilates into its setting and surrounding communities. Views and site appraisal should inform forthcoming SPD and masterplanning to mitigate potential harm. There is also the potential for this policy to have a significant</p> | <p>views appraisal, topography, and the character and setting of landmark buildings, including those of railway interest), and that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate archaeological mitigation strategies such as evaluation and monitoring programmes, should be undertaken as part of the planning process. - Several areas of archaeological potential have been identified in the York Central Audit of Heritage Assets 2013 on the sites of demolished buildings. This document should also be used when considering the buildings within and surrounding the area. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p>positive impact on compactness offering a mixed use development opportunity within the heart of the City.</p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u> <i>Development may subsume or seek to demolish significant buildings which would have a negative impact on the character of the area</i></p> <p><i>Potential for significant negative impact from development on the setting of listed buildings or may impact upon the clustering of the monuments in this area.</i></p> <p>Policy acknowledges the potential for harm and is clear that future development of the site must safeguard those elements which contribute to the distinctive historic character of the city. This is likely to mitigate against potential harm.</p> <p>Policy seeks outstanding quality in new design, which is likely to deliver a scheme which adds to the diversity of existing buildings and significant historic structures.</p> <p><u>Architectural Character</u> <i>Poor architectural design and craftsmanship on this site would be detrimental to the high quality of buildings in York city centre. It may also impact on the setting of the Central and St. Paul's Square Conservation Areas, and on the setting of the grouping of railway heritage assets.</i> Policy seeks outstanding quality in new design. Forthcoming SPD must ensure that urban design principles are established which guide an appropriate scale, massing and height of development on site.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|-----|------|---|---|
| | Green | Dark Green | Grey | Green | Yellow | Green | Grey | Yellow | Red | Grey | <p><u>Archaeological Complexity</u> <i>The HIA (SITES) recognises the potential for significant harm to surviving archaeological deposits, and to extant heritage assets if area not fully understood. No policy reference to archaeological investigation or mitigating measures – this should be picked up in SPD. Desk-based assessment has been completed ahead of further archaeological investigation. A WSI was agreed for trenching in c.2008 but has yet to be implemented.</i></p> <p><u>Landscape and Setting</u> <i>No likely impacts identified</i> No likely impacts identified</p> | |
| Policy SS10: Castle Piccadilly Area of Opportunity | - | + | - | + | - | O | - | + | - | + | <p>The Heritage Impact Appraisal (SITES) identifies a number of negative impacts likely as a result of developing in this location. Policy SS10 addresses these as follows (<i>HIA (SITES) comment in italics</i>, with HIA (POLICIES) response in normal text):</p> <p>In general, Castle Piccadilly offers an area of opportunity promoting regeneration and enhancement, quality civic and open space, retail, leisure, residential and employment uses. A planning brief and supporting Conservation Area Character Appraisal exist, forming the basis for understanding the special architectural and historic qualities of the proposed development and its immediate surroundings. These require sufficient appraisal and understanding to inform a scheme which responds well to its context and delivers a new place with its own character.</p> <p><u>Strong Urban Form</u> <i>Inappropriate development on this site may compromise the views to and from the area – as</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement this policy alongside others in the Plan (especially those contained within Section 8: Design and Placemaking) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. - Ensure SPD is informed by clear appraisal and understanding of the site’s characteristics (in particular views appraisal, topography, and the character and setting of landmark buildings, including those of industrial interest), and that future development masterplanning is contextually relevant and references the best in contemporary placemaking. - Non-intrusive archaeological |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p><i>well as impact on the setting of some listed buildings. (see also Landscape and Setting).</i> <i>Large scale development may result in the loss of some of the rich 18th C – 20th C townscape.</i> The policy promotes development which: ensures the setting of Clifford’s Tower and the Castle precinct is enhanced and the important views of these historic buildings are maintained; ensures development is of the highest architectural quality, which respects the scale and massing of development in the City Centre; and creates a new open and civic space around the Eye of York and Clifford’s Tower, which is of the highest quality of design, will enhance the historic character and appearance of the area, provide an appropriate setting for Clifford’s Tower and assist in the public’s understanding of the Castle Precinct; As such there, while there is potential for some harm to urban form, there is also potential for urban form to be strengthened using strong architecture at the right scale.</p> <p><u>Compactness</u> <i>Re-development will enhance this commercial area of the city centre and bring it closer to the outlying residential areas of Walmgate.</i> <i>Inappropriate development may restrict or remove existing views. Where this may impact upon key views the threat becomes more significant.</i> The policy promotes development which: ensures the setting of Clifford’s Tower and the Castle precinct is enhanced and the important views of these historic buildings are maintained. The CACA says much on this aspect - views and site appraisal should inform future masterplanning to mitigate potential harm. Sensitive redevelopment offers opportunities to open up new views, particularly of the river Foss and castle area from Piccadilly.</p> <p><u>Landmark Monuments</u></p> | <p>investigation and analysis of previous investigations should precede any archaeological excavation to assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate archaeological investigation such as trial trenching is needed to assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site and inform mitigation strategies. |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>Redevelopment may have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed buildings within and surrounding the site. It may also impact upon the Scheduled Area of the Castle or have a detrimental impact on the Core Conservation Area in general.</i></p> <p><i>Inappropriately scaled buildings will have a detrimental affect on the human scale element of this characteristic.</i></p> <p>The policy promotes development which ensures the setting of Clifford's Tower and the Castle precinct is enhanced and the important views of these historic buildings are maintained; and ensures development is of the highest architectural quality, which respects the scale and massing of development in the City Centre. A sensitive design response, mitigating impact through sympathetic styles, scale, material and appropriate layout of new builds is required in relation to listed and scheduled monuments.</p> <p><u>Architectural Diversity</u> <i>Poor architectural design and craftsmanship on this site would be detrimental to the high quality of buildings in York city centre. The policy seeks to ensure that development is of the highest architectural quality and respects the scale and massing of development in the City Centre. New buildings will add to legacy. Opportunity to request high quality design – in particular reflecting designs seen in other parts of the city or those which are York specific.</i></p> <p><u>Archaeological Complexity</u> <i>The HIA (SITES) identifies potentially significant negative impacts on this characteristic, namely that any development in this area has the potential to</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | <p><i>have a negative impact upon archaeological deposits. Development and intrusive investigation on this site would have a destructive impact on any surviving archaeological deposits.</i></p> <p><u>Landscape and Setting</u> <i>Redevelopment may have a positive impact on this character element as there is an opportunity to reveal the River Foss from Piccadilly and the Castle area. Also opportunity to increase public access to the river. Agreed.</i></p> | |
| Section 4: Economy and Retail | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy EC1: Provision of Employment Land | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | <p>The policy identifies sites and criteria to accommodate employment growth to 2030, with the City Centre remaining the focus for main town centre uses to protect its vitality and viability. In general, by identifying sites rather than responding to speculative planning applications, there is potential to manage the wider impact of development and to positively plan for how it can help to deliver social/cultural benefits through education or improved access to heritage assets, eg through CIL. This principle also has the potential to reinforce the city's compactness, reinforcing connectivity and strengthening the mix of uses within the urban core – this will be reliant on sensitive design to deliver scale and massing appropriate to individual sites. As such, impact on other historic characteristics will be dependent on the nature of development and its implementation.</p> <p>The policy lists a number of sites for a range of town centre and other employment uses. These are subject to separate heritage impact appraisal – see</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and incorporate views and reveal new views within proposed development design. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |







| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | HIA (SITES) document. | |
| Policy EC2: Economic Growth in the Health and Social Care Sectors | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | Impacts come from the scale and location of any development proposed and the implementation of policy as opposed to direct impacts from the policy. The impacts are therefore identified as neutral. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use in conjunction with other detailed policies to mitigate effects of development. |
| Policy EC3: Loss of Employment Land | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | The likely effects of this policy are unknown although depending on their location, loss of employment use may impact on principle 1 and 6 where they contribute to York's character. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider employment generating uses first. |
| Policy EC4: Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas | - | - | - | - | ○ | ○ | Policy seeks to reduce or remove the impact of harmful business uses in residential areas. Relocating such uses may have the effect of removing character in some cases where a mix of uses adds interest to the city's townscape. Many of the city's landmark buildings are associated with its manufacturing heritage. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy EC5: Tourism | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | ○ | By supporting the provision of quality visitor attractions, building on York's existing cultural heritage, there is potential to improve access to and understand of York's special character. The impact on the physical character of the city is less tangible, although by supporting attractions such as the National Railway Museum (amongst other landmark buildings/uses) there is potential too to protect aspects of the city's urban form and architectural | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | | | | character. Other historic buildings may be given longevity through new creative uses. | |
| Policy EC6: Rural Economy | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ?○ | See also EC1. Impacts come from the scale and location of any development proposed and the implementation of policy as opposed to direct impacts from the policy. The impacts are therefore identified as neutral. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy R1: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach | + | ++ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | By continuing to focus growth on York City Centre, this policy further enhances the city's compactness. The survival of small specialist retail establishments is a significant contributor to the quality of the York experience. Architecturally there is a close fit between this use and the layout and fabric of many surviving historic buildings. Importantly, this characteristic maintains the authenticity of historic form. Concentrating town centre uses within existing centres helps to maintain the city's dense urban fabric and also helps urban villages retain their identity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Policy R2: District Centres, Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades</p> | + | ++ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | <p>Policy R2 aims to manage the mix of uses within existing centres, protecting them from inappropriate development, and makes specific mention of the potential impact on the historic environment. The survival of small specialist retail establishments is a significant contributor to the quality of the York experience. Architecturally there is a close fit between this use and the layout and fabric of many surviving historic buildings. Importantly, this characteristic maintains the authenticity of historic form. Concentrating town centre uses within existing centres helps to maintain the city's dense urban fabric and also helps urban villages and rural communities retain their identity.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |
| <p>Policy R3: York City Centre Retail</p> | + | ++ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | <p>Policy R3 gives preference to locating town centre uses within York's city centre. The survival of small specialist retail establishments is a significant contributor to the quality of the York experience. Architecturally there is a close fit between this use and the layout and fabric of many surviving historic buildings. Importantly, this characteristic maintains the authenticity of historic form. Concentrating town centre uses within existing centres helps to maintain the city's dense urban fabric and also helps urban villages retain their identity.</p> <p>See also SS10: Castle Piccadilly Area of Opportunity.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| <p>Policy R4: Out of Centre Retailing</p> | + | ++ | ○ | + | ○ | - | <p>Policy R4 gives preference to existing centres, making reference to the sequential test set out in R1. Concentrating town centre uses within existing centres helps to maintain the city's dense urban fabric and also helps urban villages and rural communities retain their identity.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | There is potential for harm to historic character and, particularly, the setting of the city through the development of unidentified out-of-centre retail locations. The open countryside and green belt supports a wide variety of different habitats and landscape elements, alongside affording long distance views, recreation routes and contributing to the setting of villages. | |
| Section 5: Housing | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy H1: Housing Allocations | ? | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | H1 is a housing allocations policy, determining a list and phasing of housing sites to provide for housing need across the plan period. Refer to Strategic Sites above or HIA (SITES) document (where relevant) for full HIA appraisal. In general, the principle of allocating sites to accommodate housing need, rather than responding to speculative planning applications, has the potential to manage the wider impact of development and to positively plan for how it can help to deliver social/cultural benefits through education or improved access to heritage assets, eg through CIL. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and incorporate views and reveal new views within proposed development design. Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy H2: Density of Residential Development | ○ | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | H2 takes a zoned approach to development density, supporting higher densities within 400m of a higher frequency public transport corridor. The policy also recognises that development should respond to its context and local character. This principle has the potential to reinforce the city's compactness, reinforcing connectivity and strengthen the mix of uses within the urban core – this will be reliant on sensitive design to deliver scale and massing appropriate to individual sites. As such, impact on other historic characteristics will be dependent on the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set |

| | | | | | | | | nature of development and its implementation. | out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Policy H3: Balancing the Housing Market | ○ | + | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | This policy encourages a mix of different housing types across development sites to help meet the needs of York’s changing population. The influence on the city’s special characteristics will therefore depend on design proposals that come forward. Currently, the likely impacts are predominantly neutral, however, there is potential for enhancement or harm to both urban form and architectural character dependent on design or implementation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy H4: Housing Mix | ○ | + | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | This policy encourages a mix of different housing types across development sites to help meet the needs of York’s changing population. The influence on the city’s special characteristics will therefore depend on design proposals that come forward. Currently, the likely impacts are predominantly neutral, however, there is potential for enhancement or harm to both urban form and architectural character dependent on design or implementation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. • Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to |

| |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Policy H5: Promoting Self-build | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | <p>H5 seeks to promote self build, requiring a proportion of the largest strategic sites to be given over to small house builders. This is unlikely to have a direct impact on historic character.</p> <p>mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy H6: Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Allocations | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | <p>H5 gives protection to existing sites/plots, identifies likely need for additional sites/plots over the plan period and sets out a number of allocated sites to provide for some of that need. Criteria are also included to guide site appraisal – these include the clause to conserve and enhance York’s historic character. The likely effects are predominantly likely to be neutral for this policy. However, it has been identified that there is the potential for minor harm to Characteristic 6: Landscape and Setting in relation to the openness and purpose of the greenbelt, should sites within this be considered for this use. The type and scale of these would be dependent upon the location of sites.</p> <p>• There is the potential to mitigate against harm to the landscape and setting of the city through the identification of suitable locations, in particular by avoiding those areas identified as Green Belt Character Areas. Need to ensure that landscape policy is implemented alongside this policy to mitigate any harmful impacts.</p> |
| Policy H7: Student Housing | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | - | <p>Potential harm has been identified for characteristics 3 and 6, Landmark Monuments and Landscape and Setting respectively, particularly in relation to the provision of n housing development at the University of York’s location on the green belt periphery (note: see also ED1, which asks that future provision of student accommodation on this site should take place within the campus).. The type and scale of</p> <p>• Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | these impacts would be dependent upon the type and location of any development. See also ED1: University of York Campuses/ED2: Heslington West/ED3: Heslington East | infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |
| Policy H8: Houses in Multiple Occupation | ○ | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | Policy has a neutral impact on strong urban form by preventing any current impacts from worsening.. Policy has a potentially positive impact on the architectural character of the city and on its compactness as it is conserving existing housing stock and limiting pressures from new build development. | n/a |
| Policy H9: Affordable Housing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | H9 requires a contribution towards affordable housing from all development sites of 2+. This is unlikely to have a direct impact on historic character. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed masterplanning, the use of design briefs and/or design codes etc. should inform the development of identified locations. These should implement heritage policies set out in Section 8 of the Plan, alongside others (e.g. green infrastructure /archaeology) to mitigate and minimise harm as well as maximise enhancement opportunities. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|-----|
| Section 6: Community Facilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy CF1: Community Facilities | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | The ease of accessibility to facilities and services advocated by the policy suggests a positive contribution to compactness. The impact on the other characteristics will depend on proposed design and the implementation of other policies in the Plan. | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|---|---|---|---|-----|---|--|
| Policy CF2: Built Sports Facilities | ○ | ○ + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | This policy suggests a possible positive impact on compactness given that facilities need to be located in accessible locations, although the impacts depend on the knock on effect/locations of new facilities, if provided. | n/a |
| Policy CF3: Childcare Provision | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | This policy is likely to have neutral impact on the 6 principal characteristics. | n/a |
| Policy CF4:Healthcare and Emergency Services | - | + | + | - | ○ | - | ○ - | <p>The provision of new services to accommodate additional need generated by strategic housing allocations puts an additional demand on development land. There are limited locations for these facilities and therefore it may encourage densification of existing locations. Policy notes that the setting of important historic buildings should be protected, but the level of impact on strong urban form and character and setting depends on the scale and design of any new or expanding facility. In order to mitigate this, it will be important to implement other policies in the plan in relation to design and landscaping.</p> <p>This policy is likely to have a positive impact on compactness as this policy will minimise urban sprawl.</p> <p>There is the potential for any new buildings in connection to this policy to contribute or cause potential for harm to the architectural legacy of the city depending on the design and location of development. Given the location of existing sites, there may be some sensitivity to existing high profile/designated buildings.</p> <p>Potential harm has been identified to sites from disturbance during and as a consequence to expansion of services.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. relating to design) will be necessary to any proposed expansion/new facility to minimise harm to urban form/character and setting. Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |
| Section 7: Education | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| Policy ED1: University of York Campuses | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | <p>The impacts of this policy are generally neutral on the 6 principal characteristics. However, by encouraging development to focus on the University’s existing campuses, there is potential to reinforce the city’s compactness, and help to protect the open countryside and green belt from further encroachment.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. | |
| Policy ED2: Heslington West Campus | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | <p>Policy ED2 sets design parameters for future development on the Heslington West Campus, which encourage maintaining a low density/low level development on the site. The impacts of this policy are generally neutral on the 6 principal characteristics. However, it does help to define York’s compactness by supporting existing university campuses. It also reinforces the compactness of each University within York.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. | |
| Policy ED3: Heslington East Campus | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | <p>Policy ED3 sets design parameters for future development on the Heslington East Campus, which encourage maintaining a low density development on the site and establishing an appropriately landscaped buffer between the site and the A64 in order to mitigate heritage impacts on the character and setting of the city. The impacts of this policy are generally neutral on the 6 principal characteristics. However, it does help to reinforce York’s compactness by focusing development within the University’s existing campus.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure landscape buffer is established and maintained, to mitigate impact on the city’s character and setting, particularly as viewed from the A64. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. | |
| Policy ED4: Lord Mayor’s Walk Campus | ○ | + | + | ○ | - | ○ | - | ○ | - | ○ | <p>The York St. John University Campus is within a sensitive city centre location. Any development on the existing Campus may therefore have an impact on strong urban form in relation to density, which may be neutral or positive depending on the nature of development proposed. Also, the existing university buildings are landmarks with cultural significance, some of which are listed. In</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | <p>addition, given the campus's location, there are also potential risks to archaeological deposits. There is the potential for harm to characteristics 3,4 and 5 therefore, due to the uncertainty and location of any new expansion designs.</p> <p>A positive impact on compactness has been identified as these sites enhance the existing campus location.</p> <p>There are likely to be neutral impacts on characteristic 6 as the policy picks up on the sensitivity of the campus and its setting, although there is some risk in connection its implementation.</p> | <p>statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected.</p> |
| Policy ED5: York St John University Further Expansion | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | <p>There is potential for minor harm to strong urban form and York's character and setting depending on the extent and type of facility proposed.</p> <p>Likely neutral impact on other characteristics, but the principle to locate new facilities on central rather than peripheral sites has the potential to reinforce the city's compactness, enhancing connectivity and strengthening the mix of uses within the urban core – this will be reliant on sensitive design to deliver scale and massing appropriate to individual sites. As such, impact on other historic characteristics will be dependent on the nature of development and its implementation.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |
| Policy ED6: Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | | - | <p>There are likely to be neutral impacts on characteristics 1-5 depending on the scale, design and location of any buildings and the implementation of other policies within the plan.</p> <p>There is the potential for minor harm to be caused to landscape and setting characteristic, particularly on existing sites where change may be proposed. There is potential for mitigation however through the appropriate use of landscaping and design.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. in relation to design) will be necessary to ensure any sensitive locations and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Policy ED7: Further and Higher Education | ○ | + | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | | - | <p>There may be a positive or negative impact on compactness due to the range of locations identified</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. in relation to |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>for school sites. Generally a neutral impact on characteristics 1, 3, 4 and-5 depending on the scale of development and the effects identified through design and other policies in the plan. There may be minor harm caused to the landscape and setting characteristic. Without appropriate mitigation the inclusion of the potential new University of York South of Heslington East Campus may result in significant harm although there is potential for mitigation through landscaping and design. On balance, minor harm is assigned to characteristic 6 as the majority of sites are expansions to existing facilities and some sensitive locations have been identified.</p> | <p>design) will be necessary to ensure any sensitive locations and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development.</p> |
| Policy ED8: Community Access to Sports and Cultural Facilities on Education Sites | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | Neutral impact on the 6 principal characteristics. | |
| Section 8: Place-making and Design | | | | | | | | |
| Policy D1: Landscape and Setting | ++ | ++ | + | ○ | + | ++ | <p>D1 encourages development which responds to, conserves and enhances the city's landscape quality and character. As such, there are likely to be strong positive impacts on landscape and setting (directly) and compactness (indirectly). Much of the city's suburban townscape is punctuated by historic greenspace (strays, ings and parks). The protection of such landscapes can be expected to have a positive impact on the city's townscape. Greenspace often provides the setting for significant landmark monuments, including the Minster and, particularly within the urban core, these provide breathing spaces or pockets which are often a haven for wildlife. Protection of landscapes may also assist in protecting archaeological deposits/features.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|---|--|
| Policy D2: Placemaking | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ○ | ++ | The intent of D2 is to support development which responds positively to York’s special qualities and significances. There is little in the policy to protect features below ground, but in all other cases, the impact on historic character is likely to be significantly positive. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (particularly D7: Archaeology) will be necessary to ensure archaeological complexity characteristic is protected. |
| Policy D3: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | ○ | ○ | D3 encourages additions to existing buildings where they respect and reinforce local character and the building/structure’s wider setting. This is likely to have a positive impact on strong urban form and compactness, encouraging the reuse of buildings and extending their useful life. It also aims to protect the city’s architectural character, giving protection to existing architectural features and heritage assets. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (particularly D7: Archaeology) will be necessary to ensure archaeological complexity characteristic is protected. |
| Policy D4: Conservation Areas | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ○ | ++ | D4 aims to conserve and enhance the special character and appearance of the City’s conservation areas, and promote better understand of their special character. Conservation areas contain some of the most significant features of historic interest in the City, whether individual landmark monuments or because of their composition. They also offer unique townscape features. While there is little in the policy to protect features below ground, in all other cases the impact on historic character is likely to be significantly positive. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (particularly D7: Archaeology) will be necessary to ensure archaeological complexity characteristic is protected. |
| Policy D5: Listed Buildings | ++ | ○ | ++ | ++ | ○ | ○ | D5 manages the impact of development on listed buildings, with the aim of sustaining their significance and promoting better understanding of their special qualities. York has a higher than average number of listed buildings and other principle monuments – this is a defining characteristic of York which has succeeded in conserving so much of its architectural and artistic legacy. Blocks of listed buildings provide the structure for much of the city’s core, offer a sense of enclosure and often provide a guide to earlier | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (particularly D7: Archaeology) will be necessary to ensure archaeological complexity characteristic is protected. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|----|---|----|----|---|--|
| | | | | | | | building plots (sometimes medieval). Within the city centre many retain their original intended use. Impact on townscape character, urban form architectural character and landmark monuments is therefore likely to be significantly positive. | |
| Policy D6: York City Walls and St. Mary's Abbey Walls | ++ | + | ++ | ○ | ○ | + | The walls are ever present and by walking them, the city reveals many of its monuments, including Terry's and the Nestle Factory. They enclose the historic core, and entry points provide gateways separating rural from urban. They are a very significant contributor to York's unique identity. D6 promotes a better understanding of the principle characteristics which contribute to the Walls' significance, and ensures that development affecting the Walls and their setting is of the highest quality and does not cause harm to their special qualities. Their elevated position affords interesting views from within the historic city, across York's relatively low-lying vale landscape. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (particularly D7: Archaeology) will be necessary to ensure archaeological complexity characteristic is protected. |
| Policy D7: Archaeology | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ++ | ○ | D7's primary purpose is the avoidance of harm to archaeological deposits, or where this is unavoidable, ensuring that deposits are appropriately recorded. Its impact on characteristic 5 is likely to be significantly positive. | |
| Policy D8: Historic Parks and Gardens | + | + | + | ○ | + | ++ | York currently has 4 sites on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, the character of which is protected through D8. Much of the city's suburban townscape is punctuated by historic greenspace (strays, ings and parks). The protection of such landscapes can be expected to have a positive impact on the city's townscape. Greenspace often provides the setting for significant landmark monuments, including the Minster and, particularly within the urban core. Protection of parks and gardens helps maintain the compact nature of the city and may protect underlying | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|--|--|
| | | | | | | | archaeological deposits from disturbance. | |
| Policy D9: City of York Historic Environment Record | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +++ | HER can provide information on significance and value of landmarks and lesser known monuments. HER can provide information on previous archaeological interventions to inform on the archaeological impact of development proposals. An element of protection to landscape and setting may be afforded through the development of the HER through the provision of information on significance/value of landscapes covered in grey literature. In general, maintaining and developing the HER ensures that development proposals are developed and appraised within the context of the most up date and comprehensive understanding of the City's special characteristics. It also provides a facility from which further interpretation and education can be distilled. | |
| Policy D10: The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets | + | ○ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | In a similar vein to D5: Listed Buildings, D10 promotes the aim of sustaining the significance and better understanding of the special qualities of non-designated assets. Such assets can be important landmark monuments, and offer contextual historic eferences within a streetscene/neighbourhood. Policy recognises the range of significances such assets may hold. As a result, their protection is likely to have significantly positive impacts on may of the city's special characteristics. | |
| Policy D11: Shopfronts | ++ | ○ | ○ | ++ | ○ | ○ | This policy is aimed at managing change to all shopfronts, not only those within historic buildings. There is balance between the design of an original shopfront (fascia, stallriser and shop window) and its host building. Incremental change can offset this balance, dramatically changing the character of an individual building and the wider streetscene. By managing change, the impacts on architectural | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|----|---|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | character and townscape are therefore likely to be significant. | | |
| Policy D12: Advertisements | ++ | ○ | ○ | ++ | ○ | ○ | D12 is aimed at all advertisements, including shopfront signage. Inappropriate signage and adverts become noticeable and harmful features in the streetscene, and can result in a change to the character of that streetscene. By managing change, the impacts on architectural character and townscape are therefore likely to be significant. See also D11: Shopfronts. | | |
| Policy D13: Security Shutters | ++ | ○ | ○ | ++ | ○ | ○ | D13 promotes internal shuttering ahead of other types of security shutter, and gives further guidance on preferred security shuttering on heritage assets or within conservation areas. The implementation of the policy is likely to have significantly positive impacts on architectural character and townscape. See also D11: Shopfronts | | |
| Section 9: Green Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy: GI1 Green Infrastructure | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ++ | This policy is likely to have a significantly positive impact on characteristic 6 given that it would help to enhance landscape and setting through the provision of green infrastructure. The commitment to undertaking a Green Infrastructure Strategy gives further strength to the long term management and protection of designated and non-designated green spaces, including York's historic Strays and Ings, grasslands, parks and gardens. There is also potential for characteristic 3 to be positively affected since green infrastructure can contribute to the setting of landmark buildings. Characteristic 1: Strong urban form may also be positively impacted where green infrastructure is recognised or used to reinforce urban design. | n/a | |
| Policy GI2: Biodiversity and access to nature | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | + | ++ | Protection of bio-diverse assets often also benefits landscape and setting. Similarly the rivers and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. in relation to |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | strays are integral to York’s urban form. This policy has therefore been recognised to potentially have a significantly positive impact on characteristic 6. Characteristic 1: Strong urban form may also be positively impacted where public access or biodiversity is recognised or used to reinforce urban design. This may also have similar effects on architectural character. | design) will be necessary to ensure any sensitive locations and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. | |
| Policy GI3: Trees | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ++ | | | Trees have been recognised to have a positive influence on a number of the characteristics due to their potential positive contribution to setting of buildings and monuments. Policy includes specific aim to retain trees and hedges that make a significant contribution to the character of setting of a conservation area or listed buildings. Trees/woodlands are a key feature in, and influence on, the urban form. | n/a | |
| Policy GI4: Green Infrastructure Network | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ++ | Green Corridors are a primary influence on the Plan’s spatial strategy, included as an area of constrain within which development would be inappropriate. As such, the Plan acknowledges that green corridors are a significant feature in affording the City its unique setting (including of landmark monuments). The impact on urban form is more difficult to predict – a positive impact would require the implementation of other supporting design policies. Retaining/creating local access to green infrastructure on residents’ doorstep also potentially contributes to compactness. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. in relation to design) will be necessary to ensure any sensitive locations and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Policy GI5: Protection of open space | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. Ensure that heritage |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | However, there may some potential benefit for archaeological deposits as safeguarding openspace may mean they are not disturbed. | statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. | |
| Policy: GI6 New open space and recreation provision | ○ | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | + | <p>Policy requires all new residential development to contribute towards provision of on-site open space. Additionally, it identifies strategic greenspace, the function of which is to help to protect the historic character and setting of the City. The impact on landscape and setting therefore requires sensitive negotiation and masterplanning. There is potential to harm setting depending on nature of open space provision. Potential to contribute to overall compactness by way of availability of local facilities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |
| Section 10: Managing Development in the Greenbelt | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy GB1: Development in the Green Belt | | + | ++ | + | ○ | ○ | | ++ | | <p>The City's green belt is a key contributor to protecting the historic setting of the City, maintaining a compact centre and preserving the distinction between the city itself and its outlying villages. By protecting green belt land from development this policy should have significant positive impacts on both characteristic 2: Compactness and 6: Landscape and Setting.</p> <p>Ensuring development in the green belt would not harm the special characteristics of the city would potentially have a positive impact on its landmark</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy states that planning permission should only be granted where it wouldn't harm the special characteristics of York. • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | monuments, such as the Minster – there is a unique contribution of cultural/historic significance important for the setting of York. Positive impacts are also identified for strong urban form as respecting the green belt boundary may help to reinforce existing settlements, encouraging the reuse of existing buildings rather than promoting village expansion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |
| Policy GB2: Development in Settlements 'Washed Over' by the Greenbelt | + | + | ○ | ○ | + | + | GB2 controls the type of development appropriate within 'washed over' villages – these are protected in recognition of their important contribution to the openness of the green belt. This policy is likely to have positive impacts on characteristics 1, 2 and 6 as it intends to protect strong urban form and promote compactness through only allowing small scale development contained within the built-up area. This should also have a positive impact on landscape and setting as it should also help to retain strong settlement boundaries and the distinction between outlying settlements and the urban edge. Further, by protecting the green belt from further development, archaeological deposits are likely to remain undisturbed. | n/a |
| Policy GB3: Reuse of buildings | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | + | + | GB3 encourages re-use rather than new build within green belt locations. This policy predominantly has positive impacts associated with the historic environment. The most apparent impact is likely to be in relation to the city's landscape and setting. By managing the scale of development appropriate in sensitive green belt locations it is possible to protect the green belts openness, As with GB2 above this policy is likely to have positive impacts on characteristics 2 and 6 as it intends to protect strong urban form and promote compactness through only allowing small scale development contained within the built-up area. This should also have a positive | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | impact on landscape and setting as it should also help to retain strong settlement boundaries and the distinction between outlying settlements and the urban edge. Further, by protecting the green belt from further development, archaeological features above and below ground are likely to remain undisturbed. | | | |
| Policy GB4: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing in the Green Belt | + | - | + | - | ○ | + | - | ○ | + | - | The impacts from this policy could be positive or cause minor harm depending upon implementation of policies in the plan as well as the location and design of a proposal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |
| Section 11: Managing Climate Change | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy CC1: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | This policy will have mostly neutral impacts on the principal characteristics given that adverse visual impacts on historic/settings landscapes are to be managed through the development process. Any potential harm to landscape and setting should be managed through the development process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy refers to considering impact on historic character/setting or diverse landscapes. Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | setting of the city. |
| Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | - | Policy requires that all new development, including conversions, considers sustainable design principles. It will be important to ensure that proposals give careful consideration to their setting as such low/carbon/renewable energy generators could impact negatively on the city’s historic environment, particularly on its architectural character. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any policy or mitigation proposed to protect architectural complexity should be considered in conjunction with other relevant policies in the plan. Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected. |
| Section 12: Environmental Quality and Protection | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy ENV1: Air Quality | ○ | ○ | + | + | + | + | | | This policy will have a generally neutral impact on principal characteristics 1 and 2. However, an indirect positive impact may be made to characteristics 3-6 through any improvements to air quality and the implementation of low emissions infrastructure. | n/a |
| Policy ENV2: Managing Environmental Quality | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | | EQ2 manages the impact of development on its surroundings, and includes a clause to protect local character and distinctiveness from unwanted environmental impacts. This policy will therefore have mostly neutral impacts on the principal characteristics. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy references minimising harm to local character and distinctiveness. Any policy or mitigation proposed should be considered in conjunction with other relevant policies in the plan |
| Policy ENV3: Land Contamination | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | | | A generally neutral impact on strong urban form and architectural character has been identified but there is the potential for change to the grain of street depending on the location of any remediation. Predominantly a neutral impact on characteristics 2, 3 & 6, although this is largely dependent upon location and remediation methods. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any policy or mitigation proposed should be considered in conjunction with other relevant policies in the plan (e.g in relation to design and conservation), particularly in relation to characteristics 2, 3, 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | Minor harm may be caused to archaeological deposits due to remediation of land from contamination. There may be some benefits gained through remediation for understanding history of the site. However, on balance, it is likely that there is more potential to be harmful by removal than the benefit gained through excavation and understanding. | and 6. | |
| Policy ENV4: Flood Risk | ○ | + | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | + | - | <p>The Local Plan's development strategy avoids land at greatest risk of flooding, and promotes sites which are within lower risk zones. This risk avoidance strategy has the effect of retaining historic development patterns. Flood risk has helped to constrain the development of York and provide a compact city with accessible green space. Development on sites with higher flood risk may have an impact on this and there are uncertainties over what mitigation measures could be implemented. Impact would depend on measures required.</p> <p>Generally a neutral impact on characteristic 5 although there is the potential for a positive impact here by maintaining flood risk to land which may protect waterlogged archaeological deposits. Flood risk has helped to provide the city with accessible green space. Development on sites with higher flood risk may have an impact on this. However, there are uncertainties over what mitigation measures could be implemented. Impact would depend on measures required.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation in relation to characteristics 2 & 6. Mitigation measures would need to be considered against other policies in the Plan to ensure adverse impacts are avoided. |
| Policy ENV5: Sustainable Drainage | ○ | + | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | - | <p>Overall, surface water management is likely to have a neutral impact on HE characteristic. There is potential for a positive impact on archaeological complexity by maintaining flood risk to land which may protect waterlogged archaeological deposits. Water management has helped to provide the city with accessible green space. Development on sites</p> | 2 & 6. Mitigation measures would need to be considered against other policies to ensure adverse impacts are avoided. | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | with higher flood risk may have an impact on this. However, there are uncertainties over what mitigation measures could be implemented. Impact would depend on measures required. | |
| Section 13: Waste and Minerals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy WM1: Sustainable Waste Management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | Neutral impacts have been identified on the 6 principal characteristics. The policy contains constraints for ensuring no significant adverse effects occur to the historic environment through waste management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that any specific locations for waste management are dealt with in accordance with other policies within the plan and the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan, where applicable. |
| Policy WM2: Sustainable Minerals Management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | General neutral impact on the 6 principal characteristics given that the policy would only permit minerals development where York's heritage and environmental assets are conserved and enhanced. In the long-term, there may be a positive impact as a result of mitigation following any development that has occurred. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that any specific locations for minerals management are dealt with in accordance with other policies within the plan and the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan, where applicable. |
| Section 14: Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy T1: Sustainable Access | + | - | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | T1 aims to locate high trip generating development in locations where access to frequent high quality public transport links are available, and that provision is made to promote sustainable modes of travel. It does not make reference to the need for impact on character to be appraised, and as such should be mitigated by the implementation of other supporting design policies. There is potential that promoting accessible sites could be to the detriment of the city's compactness and setting, as peripheral sites along high frequency transport corridors could be promoted. Conversely, by promoting higher density development along primary corridors there could be a positive impact in terms of the city's urban form and compactness, maintaining and reinforcing those | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | strong arterial roads which follow historic routes. | |
| Policy T2: Strategic Public Transport Improvements | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | T2 As with T1 above, T2 makes no reference to the need to consider the design implications of development proposed, and should be mitigated by other supporting policies. Changes to bus lanes or access points could impact on the cobbled margins and tree lined avenues which run alongside the city's arterial routes. The provision of larger facilities, including new railway stations, is likely to impact on townscape, but the nature of that impact is unknown until sites and masterplans have been established. Some may have the positive impact of reducing transport movements on currently congested arterial routes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Policy T3: York Railway Station and Associated Operational Facilities | + | 0 | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Proposals that enhance the Grade II* station and its setting that conserve and enhance its historic environment, particularly those that improve the visual amenity at the station and its environs, are likely to result in significant positive impacts on the stations architectural character. Further, as one of York's diverse landmark monuments, the Station buildings add richness and interest to the City's townscape. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that any proposals refer to the relevant policies on design and Listed Buildings. |
| Policy T4: Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | T4 makes no reference to the need to consider the design implications of development proposed, and should be mitigated by other supporting policies. Changes to the transport network could impact on the cobbled margins and tree lined avenues which run alongside the city's arterial routes. By increasing capacity on some routes there may be the knock on effect of reducing transport movements on other currently congested arterial routes. | |
| Policy T5: Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | As with T1 above, T5 makes no reference to the need to consider the design implications of development proposed, and should be mitigated by other supporting policies. Changes to existing cycle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | lanes or new provision could impact on the cobbled margins and tree lined avenues which run alongside the city's arterial routes. | sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Policy T6: Development at or Near Public Transport Corridors, Interchanges and Facilities | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | T6 protects unused land which has been identified as having viable future transport development potential. The policy promotes higher density development in the vicinity of well served interchanges, but notes that this should not have an adverse impact on the character, historic environment and amenity of the area – this should be established through pre-application appraisal work, and any application informed by a supporting heritage appraisal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |
| Policy T7: Demand Management | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | T7 promotes changes to existing carriageways as one means of improving the overall flow of traffic in and around York city centre. Changes to existing routes could impact on the cobbled margins and tree lined avenues which run alongside the city's arterial routes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Policy T8: Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | T8 focuses on the information to be included within a transport statement. No likely impacts identified. | |
| Policy T9: Freight Consolidation | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | The location of future freight consolidation is likely to be within the city's green belt, as is the proposed site near Askham Bryan. Such sites have the potential to negatively impact on the openness of the green belt, providing new features within otherwise rural settings. It will be important for such proposals to consider their impact on view corridors, the city's natural/rural character, the setting of villages and on | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | other habitats and landscapes which afford the city its setting. | |
| Policy T10: Safeguarded Routes and Sites | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | As with preceding transport policies, there is potential that changes to the existing road network could result in the loss of features (street trees, cobbled margins) which add to the city centre's character. The impact from other development sites should be mitigated through pre-application appraisal work, and any application informed by a supporting heritage appraisal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that heritage statements are produced where development is proposed, to enable a better understanding of heritage assets affected – this should include the historic setting of the city. |
| Policy C1: Communications Infrastructure | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | This policy will have mostly neutral impacts on the principal characteristics given that adverse visual impacts and impacts on sensitive green belt or other historic landscape areas, are to be managed through the development process. Further, the policy promotes rationalising street 'clutter' where facilities are no longer operational. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy refers to considering impact on historic character/setting or diverse landscapes. Implementation of other policies in the plan (e.g. design) will be necessary to ensure the sensitive location and any sensitive receptors are appropriately considered in any future development. |
| Section 15: Delivery and Monitoring | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy DM1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | C1 allows for contributions to be sought for infrastructure provision, including for public realm improvements and the protection and improvement of the historic environment, which can include improved interpretation. As such, C1 is likely to have generally positive impacts on the city's special characteristics. | |

4. Outcomes of the Local Plan Sites Appraisal –Allocated Strategic Sites

The Local Plan (Submission) document identifies sites to accommodate strategic growth in housing and employment over the plan period. In total, 30 sites have undergone a full Heritage Impact Appraisal, 27 of which have been taken forward as Strategic Allocations. This section provides an overview of the outcomes from the Heritage Impact Appraisal of Local Plan Sites (Submission). The full HIA is appended at Appendix 3.

4.1 British Sugar (ST1)

4.1.1 Two site options were considered for ST1. Overall the assessment of this site for both options 1 and 2 identified that development in this location would not cause any serious harm to the principal characteristics of York and has the potential to improve the former industrial site.

Figure 3: British Sugar (ST1) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | - | - | + | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |

4.1.2 A minor harm grading has been awarded against principal characteristics 3 and 6 particularly due to the potential for harm to views to and from the site and potential harm to the setting of the river/ings area. Partial minor harm may occur to characteristics 2, 4 and 5 due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design and potential harm to pockets of archaeological deposits which may have survived the construction and demolition of the factory structures. Undisturbed areas included in option 2 may have higher archaeological interest although initial investigations suggest there is little on the site.

4.1.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- A views analysis is required to assess the impact of development on any views which may be available from the site also to assess the impact of the development against the setting of the river/ings areas.
- Open space should be designed in the river corridor areas.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Limited archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any deposits on site.
- SINC site needs protection through green buffering and landscaping.

4.2 Former civil service sports ground (ST2)

4.2.1 Two options have been considered for ST2. Overall the assessment of both options submitted for this site has identified that development in this location would not cause any serious harm to the principal characteristics of York.

Figure 4: Fmr Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |

4.2.2 Partial minor harm may occur to principal characteristics 4 and 5 particularly due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design and the potential for harm to any surviving archaeological deposits or historic landscape features. The site does not significantly contribute to the open countryside surrounding York, particularly since the re-location of Manor School adjacent.

4.2.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- A views analysis is required to assess the impact of development on any views which may be available from the site also to further inform design proposals on how the development may appear from nearby areas due to its slightly elevated topography.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.
- Retention of the 18th century field boundary should be sought if possible as not many survive in this area.

4.3 The Grain Stores, Water Lane (ST3)

4.3.1 Only one option was considered for ST3. Overall the assessment of this site has identified that development in this location would not cause any serious harm to the principal characteristics of York.

Figure 5: The Grain Stores (ST3) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |

4.3.2 Potential minor harm has been identified against principal characteristics 4 and 5 particularly due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design and possibility of harm to known surviving archaeological deposits primarily relating to the former airfield.

4.3.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Development on the border with Victoria Farm should be sympathetically integrated to fit in with the immediate surroundings of the farm.
- Further archaeological investigation may be required when proposals are known to assess the impact on known archaeological deposits.

4.4 Land adjacent to Hull Road, Grimston Bar (ST4)

4.4.1 Only one option was considered for ST4. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 6: Land adj Hull Road (ST4) summary

| | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |

4.4.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may potentially result in serious harm to principal characteristic 5 regarding the archaeological complexity of the site. A desk based assessment has confirmed that the site may contain features relating to the prehistoric and Romano-British period. The threat to archaeological deposits can be mitigated against through planning policy and guidance.

4.4.3 Minor harm may occur to principal characteristics 3, 4 and 6 (and partial minor harm to 2) particularly due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design and its visibility occupying an elevated position, the potential harm on views from the hillside and the loss of a buffer between the university campus and residential areas. Kimberlow Hill currently provides 360 degree views towards the historic core and The Minster and outwards across the rural landscape of the Wolds and the Vale.

4.4.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic. Roofscape needs to be carefully designed given the elevated position of the site.
- Develop site with low-medium density housing and small scale buildings due to the topography of the area.
- Retain, frame and create new views of the Minster, rural area and cityscape through the housing layout.

- Good tree cover required to maintain a degree of separation between the development and the campus, while buildings should complement the landscape structure of Heslington east campus.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.

4.5 York Central

4.5.1 Only one option was considered for ST5. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 7: York Central (ST5) summary

| | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 5 | 0 | - | - | -- | - | -- | 0 |

4.5.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 5. Development may cause serious harm to any surviving archaeological deposits and non-designated extant buildings without appropriate mitigation. Excavations have proven that Romano-British archaeology still survives in some pockets across the area despite 19th century construction of the railway. The site also falls partly within the Central Area of Archaeological Importance. The threat to archaeological deposits can be mitigated against through planning policy and guidance.

4.5.3 Minor-serious harm may occur to several other characteristics (2, 3, and 4) particularly due to the potential harm to views of landmark buildings and monuments, the unknown nature of proposed development design, the impact of development on the setting of nearby listed buildings and scheduled monuments and that the site falls partly within the Central Historic Core. A partial minor harm grading has been awarded to characteristic 1.

4.5.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation

- Retention of important railway buildings and the remaining functionality of the railway should mitigate against potential loss of character.
- There is an opportunity to potentially create new revealed views of the Minster and other key buildings. Existing views can be protected by carefully choosing the site of new builds and/or regulating their height.
- Development in the area of these listed and scheduled structures should be designed so it does not detract from their setting or impact upon their inter-visibility.
- The setting of listed buildings within and bordering the area should be protected. Proposed development plans should also aim to sympathetically covert as many of

the significant industrial buildings as possible for modern use-in particular those which have been nominated for inclusion on the Local List of Heritage Assets.

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic. Some taller structures may be acceptable providing they do not harm views across the city, the appearance of the central conservation area or detract from the setting of the listed buildings.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.

4.6 Land east of Grimston Bar (Formerly ST4)

4.6.1 Two options were considered for ST6. Option 1 had potential to cause varying degrees of serious harm to characteristics 2 and 6. Option 2 is substantially larger than the original preferred options proposed boundary. The Heritage Impact Appraisal concluded that the enlargement of the site may mean serious harm (rather than minor-serious) would occur to principal characteristic 6 (landscape and setting). This site has now been renumbered and forms part of Safeguarded Land (SF13).

4.7 Land to the east of Metcalfe Lane (ST7)

4.7.1 Two options have been considered for ST7. Despite the enlargement of the site to the north and the south it was concluded that the impact on the principal characteristics of York would be the same for both options. The main threat being to principal characteristic 3 due to the views of the Minster from the site one of which has been identified as a Key View.

Figure 8: Land East of Metcalfe Lane (ST7) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----|---|---|----|--|---|----|---|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | 0 | - | -- | - | - | -- | 0 | - | -- | - | - | -- |

4.7.2 The assessment of this site for both option 1 and 2 has identified that serious harm may be caused to principal characteristic 3 as development may obscure key views (Key View 5 identified in YCHCCA) of the Minster.

4.7.3 Minor-serious harm has been identified in relation to characteristics 5 and 6 due to the potential for harm to any surviving archaeological deposits and historic landscape features, removal of open countryside and impact on setting of Osbaldwick.

4.7.4 Development of this site has been identified as causing minor harm in relation to characteristics 2 and 4 particularly due to the potential impact on compactness and the unknown nature of proposed housing design.

4.7.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1&2:

- Reduce site by its eastern edge perhaps in line with buildings around Cottage Farm. A degree of loss of compactness is unavoidable.
- Further views analysis needed against proposed development plans. Significant views of the Minster or other important buildings/landscapes should be respected within proposed scheme.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic. Characteristic materials and forms of the rural farmsteads should be used to inspire design. Distinctive spatial configuration should also be recognised.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Ways of incorporating some of the oldest farm buildings into the new development should be explored.
- Evaluation required to assess the impact of development on the setting of the Conservation Area
- Clear margin needed between Conservation Area of Osbaldwick and the new development. The fields immediately north of the village should remain open to mitigate some of the impact on the immediate setting of the village.
- Use of strong green edge boundaries to the site and planned open green space may partially negate some loss of setting when viewed from the ring road.

Option 2 as above and:

- Reduce/move development away from or provide green/open space in the Heworth Green/Stray area.

4.8 Land north of Monks Cross (ST8)

- 4.8.1 Only one option was considered for ST8. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 9: Land North of Monks Cross (ST8) summary

| | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |

4.8.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may cause minor harm to principal characteristics 2, 4, 5 and 6. This is due to the distance of the development away from the city centre, the unknown nature of proposed housing design, the potential for harm to any surviving archaeological deposits or historic landscape features and the impact on the rural edge setting of the city.

4.8.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Development should not expand further than the proposed eastern boundary
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Ways of incorporating some of the farm buildings into the new development should be explored.
- Reduce site in the north-eastern corner to the line of North Lane to create a gap between the development area and the ring road.
- Reduce the size of the site on the northern and eastern edge so the development is further away from ring road/Monk Cross Link Road junction.

4.9 Land north of Haxby (ST9)

4.9.1 Two options have been considered for ST9. The impact of development on the Option 1 site was generally assessed to be of potential minor harm. Option 2 is larger than the original preferred options proposed boundary. The Heritage Impact Appraisal concluded that the enlargement of the site may potentially cause an element of serious harm (rather than minor) to principal characteristic 5 (archaeological complexity). However, the threat to archaeological deposits can be mitigated against through planning policy and guidance.

Figure 10: Land North of Haxby (ST9) summary

| | OPTION 1 | OPTION 2 |
|--|----------|----------|
| | | |

| | (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |

4.9.2 The assessment of option 1 and 2 concluded that development in this area may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 2, 4 and 6. Harm may be caused due to the further loss of compactness of Haxby, the unknown nature of proposed housing design and the potential impact on the surviving historic landscape of Haxby. Option 2 development may also impact upon the perception of the rural setting of the area viewed from Moor Lane.

4.9.3 The assessment of option 1 identified that development in this location may cause minor-serious harm to principal characteristic 5 due to the increased potential threat to any surviving archaeological deposits or historic landscape features. This was increased to minor-serious harm for the enlarged site of option 2 particularly due to the previous recovery of a Roman coin hoard located within the additional development area.

4.9.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1&2:

- Reduce the site to the existing building line.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Suitable landscape treatment to the north, east and western boundaries may soften the urban edge of the development
- New development should maintain a gap and provide screening between it and the existing residential estate.

Option 2 as above and:

- Pull the development away from the edge of Moor Lane or maintain a green space in the field closest to it.

4.10 Land at Moor Lane, Woodthorpe (formerly ST10)

4.10.1 One option was considered for ST10. Option 1 had the potential to cause harm to several principal characteristics of York to characteristic 6 (landscape and setting). This has now been renumbered and is part of Safeguarded Land (SF12).

4.11 Land at New Lane, Huntington (ST11)

4.11.1 Only one option was considered for ST11. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 11: Land at New Lane, Huntington (ST11) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | -- |

4.11.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to characteristic 5. Archaeological deposits relating to prehistoric settlement, Romano-British activity and medieval and post-medieval agricultural practices may be present. A Scheduled Ancient Monument (temporary Roman camp) exists within the proposed site. A Grade II listed building also borders the site. Several other non-designated heritage assets are located within this area such as ridge and furrow and historic field boundaries. Development of this site may cause serious harm to these archaeological features.

4.11.3 The potential for minor harm was identified against principal characteristics 4 and 6 particularly because of the unknown nature of proposed housing design and the loss of green space further eroding the openness, rural character and setting of the eastern edge of Huntington and its separation from Monks Cross.

4.11.4 A neutral-minor harm grading was given to characteristic 2 due to the loss of a break in the landscape between Monks Cross commercial area and residential areas should development go ahead here.

4.11.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.

- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Evaluation of the impact on setting of the SAM and listed building needed.
- The SAM site should remain as open space.
- The construction of buildings close to the SAM and Huntington Grange need to be sympathetic in terms of scale and character to have the least impact on setting.
- Retain separation from Monks Cross.

4.12 Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe (ST12)

4.12.1 Two options have been considered for ST12. While Option 1 had the potential to cause minor harm to some elements of the principal characteristics, Option 3 is slightly larger and had a marginally more detrimental impact on the historic environment.

Figure 12: Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe (ST12) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 3 (Submission Boundary) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | -- | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | -- | 0 | - |

4.12.2 The assessment of option 1 identified that development in this location may result in minor-serious harm to principal characteristic 5 due to the potential harm to archaeological deposits and minor harm to characteristic 4 because of the unknown nature of proposed housing design. Archaeological deposits relating to prehistoric and Romano-British activity may be present on site particularly due to its topography and the location of the York-Tadcaster Roman road running through the site.

4.12.3 The assessment of option 2 identified that development in this location may result in partial minor harm to characteristics 2 and 6 (in addition to potential harm to 4 and 5 already identified in option 1). This is due to the expansion of the residential area to the north and west of Copmanthorpe village spilling over the current boundary of Manor Heath and the higher visibility from the west and on the northern approach to Copmanthorpe after leaving the A64 junction. This site may also have a minor detrimental impact on the wider open countryside character element.

4.12.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1&2:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- The Roman road should be respected within the development with information presented on site to further reveal this and other elements of the historic landscape.

Option 3 as above and:

- Restrict development from spreading further to the west of the current proposed boundary.
- Reduce size of proposed site so it lies closer to Copmanthorpe centre.

4.13 Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe (ST13)

4.13.1 Only one option was considered for ST13. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 13: Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe (ST13) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |

4.13.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 4 and 5 due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design and the potential harm to archaeological deposits

4.13.3 This site does not significantly contribute to the open countryside surrounding York or to the village setting of Copmanthorpe.

4.13.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.

4.14 Land to the north of Clifton Moor (ST14)

4.14.1 Two options have been considered for ST14. Both options have the same outcome from the Heritage Impact Appraisal.

Figure 14: Land to North of Clifton Moor (ST14) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|----|---|---|---|----|--|----|---|---|---|----|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| 14 | 0 | -- | 0 | - | - | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | - | - | -- | - | -- |

4.14.2 The assessment of this site both options 1 and 2 has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 2 as this site will cause urban sprawl outside of the ring road.

4.14.3 The development of this site has been assessed as having the potential to cause minor-serious harm to characteristics 5 and 6. There are known archaeological deposits on this site dating from the Iron Age – post-medieval period including an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement. There is also a high quantity of legible non designated landscape features. The main impacts on characteristic 6 relate to the rural setting and reduction of area of coalescence between Haxby, Skelton, outlying farmsteads and York.

4.14.4 The possibility for minor harm was identified against characteristic 4 due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design while the harm to characteristic 3 was deemed as potentially causing neutral-minor harm.

4.14.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1 only:

- Proposed development area could be reduced in size with the southern boundary, or indeed the whole site, shunted further north away from the ring road. The site could also be reduced in size by removing land on the western edge, close to Skelton.
- Reduce site on its western edge to fall in line with the drain and Moor Lane (or a compromise between the drain and the proposed edge). This would enhance the gap between Skelton and the new settlement.

Option 1&2:

- Reduce development area in size and move away from the ring road to make new settlement rather than an extension.
- Reduce and locate site closer to the ring road with a small green buffer to assist in maintaining compactness.

- Views analysis required in relation characteristic 3 and 6
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Ways of incorporating existing farm buildings into the new development should be explored.
- Development should include carefully designed landscaping and buffering to its outer edges – in particular the western edge to Skelton and southern boundary to ring road.
- Development should not be allowed up to the ring road itself – it should be well screened and set back.
- Low density housing to the rural edges may soften the urban character of the new development.

4.15 Whinthorpe (ST15)

4.15.1 Three options have been considered for ST15 identified through the Preferred Options, Further Sites Consultation and Submission stages. Option 1 had the potential to cause minor and elements of serious harm to several principal characteristics of York. Particular concern was given towards characteristic 6 (landscape and setting). Options 2 and 3 saw the site enlarge in both cases further to the north-west. The Heritage Impact Appraisal concluded that the enlargement of the site for options 2 and 3 may still result in serious harm to principal to characteristic 6 with serious harm also to characteristic 5 (archaeological complexity).

Figure 15: Whinthorpe (ST15) summary

| Site 15 | Characteristic | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Option 1 Preferred Options | 0 | - | - | - | - | -- |
| Option 2 Further sites consultation | 0 | - | - | - | -- | -- |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|
| Option 3 Submission boundary | 0 | - | - | - | -- | -- |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|

4.15.2 The assessment of options 1, 2 and 3 identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 6 primarily due to its role in the open countryside/rural setting of York and the views afforded from and to the site.

4.15.3 The development of this site was been assessed as having the potential to cause minor-serious harm to characteristic 5 for option 1 and serious harm for options 2 and 3 due to the impact on the archaeological deposits in this area. The site includes archaeological features dating from the Iron Age – post-medieval period including an Iron Age/Romano-British field system (west of Prospect Farm). Option 2 and 3 boundaries are larger than option 1 meaning the development of the site therefore has the potential to have a more destructive impact on archaeological remains. It also includes additional historic farmsteads.

4.15.4 Possible minor harm was identified against characteristics 2, 3 and 4 for all three option boundaries particularly due to the potential harm to views to and from the site and the unknown nature of proposed housing design.

4.15.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1&2:

- Views analysis required. View of Minster should be retained within new development.
- Development should be well screened and set back from the ring road.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic. Existing rural buildings have potential to give local distinctiveness to architectural character.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Locate the development away from the route of the Minster Way.
- Development should include carefully designed landscaping and buffering to its outer edges and should be well set back and appropriately screened from ring road.
- Reduction of the proposed development area and relocation from the ring road may further reinforce Whinthorpe as a free-standing settlement.

- Further assessment of access to new settlement required.
- Buffering and landscaping required in the vicinity of the SINC and SSSI sites.

Option 3 only:

- Reduce settlement so it is moved away from the roundabout e.g. for the northern boundary to fall in line with White House Farm and the western edge of Ox Close Farm.
- Site could be reduced further north away from the airfield e.g. in line with Langworth Lodge. A strip of fields will remain as a buffer between the development and the airfield. Appropriate landscaping/screening may assist in providing mitigation against the loss of openness surrounding the airfield.

4.16 Terry's Chocolate Factory (formerly ST16)

4.16.1 Only one option was considered for ST16. The Heritage Impact Appraisal concluded that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristics 3 and 4. Development may potentially impact on the attributes that contribute to, or affect the setting of the Terry's/Racecourse Conservation Area, listed buildings within and surrounding the site and views of landmark buildings.

This site has been renumbered and is now part of Mixed Use (MU2).

4.17 Nestle South (ST17)

4.17.1 Only one option was considered for ST17. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 16: Nestle South (ST17) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | - | - | -- | - | - | 0 | + |

4.17.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor-serious harm to principal characteristic 3 and minor harm to principal characteristics 4 and 5. Development has the potential to seriously harm the attributes that contribute to, or affect the setting of the Nestle/Rowntree Conservation Area and on the listed buildings within and surrounding the site. The extant industrial buildings on site form an important part of York's heritage relating to chocolate production and the Nestle/Rowntree brand. Inappropriate development surrounding the extant factory buildings may detract from their local significance. Therefore a minor harm grading has been applied to characteristic 4 due to the unknown nature of development design.

There may also be the potential for minor harm to occur to any surviving archaeological deposits that may have survived the construction of the factory.

4.17.3 A neutral-minor impact on characteristic 2 was identified related to the potential harm to the identity/distinctiveness of the factory area. There may be some potential to enhance the landscape characteristic (6) with regard to the close proximity of the Stray and disused railway line cycleway.

4.17.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Extant early 20th century factory buildings should be re-used and sympathetically respected within the development.
- The heights of new builds should not detract from the dominance/importance of the landmark structures.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.

4.18 Monks Cross North (ST18)

4.18.1 Only one option was considered for ST18. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 17: Monks Cross North (ST18) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |

4.18.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 4 and 5 due to the unknown nature of development design and potential for harm to occur to any surviving archaeological deposits or landscape features on the site.

4.18.3 **Key recommendations/Mitigation:**

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.

- The former line of the railway should be revealed across the site.

4.19 Northminster Business Park (formerly ST19)

4.19.1 Three options were considered for ST19. Option 1 (Preferred Option) proposed three separate parcels of development. This option had the potential to cause elements of minor harm to principal characteristics 4, 5 and 6. Option 2 (Further Sites Consultation), produced the same results in the Heritage Impact Appraisal as option 1, despite being a larger development to the south of the business park. The third option (Submission boundary), a single small area of development to the south of the park, has been identified as causing the least impact to the principal characteristics of York although the outcome is broadly similar to options 1 and 2. This has now been renumbered and is part of Employment Allocations (E17).

4.20 Castle Piccadilly (ST20)

4.20.1 Only one option was considered for ST20. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 18: Castle Piccadilly (ST20) summary

| | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 20 | - | + | - | - | - | - | 0 + |

4.20.1 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 5 (archaeological complexity) with minor-serious harm potentially to characteristic 3 (landmark monuments). Previous investigations have revealed a wealth of features and deposits across this site dating from the Roman period to present day, in addition to the visible heritage assets in the area. There is the potential for further archaeological deposits to remain in undisturbed pockets of land across the site. These known and unknown deposits are at significant risk from re-development of this area. In relation to characteristic 3, inappropriate development may detract from the most significant and listed buildings in the area, restrict existing views of landmark buildings or impact upon their dominance. Redevelopment may also have a detrimental impact upon the Scheduled Area of the Castle and/or the Core Conservation Area in general.

4.20.2 Characteristics 1 and 4 may suffer minor harm as a result of development of this site. Inappropriately scaled buildings, poor architectural design and the removal of existing squares/open space would have a detrimental impact on the urban form and architectural complexity of the area.

4.20.3 Characteristic 2 may be partially subjected to minor harm through development which restrict or remove existing views; where this may impact upon key views the threat becomes more significant.

4.20.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Lot of opportunity to improve area through quality buildings, shop fronts, public realm etc.
- Views analysis required. Opportunities to reveal new views of the River Foss and the Castle area from Piccadilly.
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Sympathetic styles, scale, material and appropriate layout of new builds required in relation to listed and scheduled monuments.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.

4.21 Naburn Designer Outlet (ST21)

4.21.1 Only one option was considered for ST21. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 19: Naburn Designer Outlet (ST21) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |

4.21.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristic 5. The harm has been identified as particularly relating to the potential for harm to occur to any surviving archaeological deposits. The site has produced some evidence for prehistoric/Romano-British activity and field systems and settlements are known in the vicinity. However, the construction of the current retail buildings as well as the asylum buildings which stood here previously will have had an adverse impact on any archaeological features.

4.21.3 Due to the boundaries of this site, close to an existing out of town retail area, the impact of development on the other characteristics has been identified as neutral.

4.21.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.
- Development should not extend further west of the existing Outlet site.
- Avoid enlarging site to the north and north-west where it would meet the ring road and Fulford.

4.22 Germany Beck (ST22)

4.22.1 Only one option was considered for ST22. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 20: Germany Beck (ST22) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----|---|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22 | 0 | - | -- | 0 | - | -- |

4.22.2 Overall the assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 5 due to the potential for harm to occur to archaeological deposits and landscape features. This site contains possible evidence for a prehistoric/Romano-British field system and enclosure ditches. Further field systems are known immediately to the south and the line of a Roman road runs close to the eastern boundary of this area. The Battle of Fulford is also thought to have taken place in the vicinity.

4.22.3 The threat of minor-serious harm has been identified to characteristic 2 due to the distance from the city centre and the erosion of rural character/traditional form of Fulford village.

4.22.4 Minor harm may occur to characteristic 4 and 6 if development occurs in this location. The harm to characteristic 4 relates to the unknown nature of development design and its impact on Fulford Conservation Area. In relation to characteristic 6 (landscape and setting), development in this location may have an adverse impact on long distance view of Minster from ring road and an impingement onto land identified as protecting the rural setting.

4.22.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.

- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.
- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Views analysis required.
- Consideration should be given to reducing the size of the proposed development area to the Germany Beck border to the south.
- Green buffering around the outer edges of development will mitigate the impact of the boundary between rural landscape and urban fringe.

4.23 Derwenthorpe (ST23)

4.23.1 Only one option was considered for ST23. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 21: Derwenthorpe (ST23) summary

| | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site/characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |

4.23.2 Overall the assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 4, 5 and 6. Harm has been identified due to the unknown nature of development design, its impact on Osbaldwick Conservation Area, the potential for harm to occur to archaeological deposits/landscape features and the impact of the removal of open space surrounding Osbaldwick.

4.23.3 Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement evidence as well as an Iron Age roundhouse and enclosures were investigated approximately 1.3km to the south at Heslington East prior to the expansion of the university campus. This suggests that area was settled and farmed at these times although no evidence exists in Osbaldwick itself. Evidence for Romano-British settlement is known to the north-east at Apple Tree Farm. Part of a possible 10th-11th century toft enclosure was investigated on the west side of Metcalfe Lane prior to development at Derwenthorpe (within this development boundary).

4.23.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.

- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits.
- Historic field boundaries and hedge rows should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- The line of the former railway should be respected within the new development.
- Selected areas of ridge and furrow (if appropriate) and historic boundaries should be retained where possible.

4.24 York College (ST24)

4.24.1 This site was not assessed as development as the majority of development has been completed.

4.25 Land south of Designer Outlet (ST25)

4.25.1 Two options were considered for ST25 resulting in the same outcome after a HIA. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 22: Land South of Designer Outlet (ST25) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 1 (Preferred Options stage) | | | | | | OPTION 3 (Submission Boundary) | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- |

4.25.2 The assessment of both options identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 6 mainly due to the harm to the extended green wedge and loss of open countryside in this area.

4.25.3 Development may cause minor harm to principal characteristic 5. This is due to the potential impact to any surviving archaeological deposits. Prehistoric/Romano-British field systems and settlements are known in the area. The Battle of Fulford may also have taken place in the vicinity.

4.25.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

Option 1&3:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.

- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Planting, particularly to the south and west may assist in protecting an element of the rural setting of the city in this area. Screening to the western boundary of the proposed site should also mitigate against any impact on Bishopthorpe.
- Landscape appraisal which also considers the setting of the Conservation Area required.
- A portion of semi-open countryside will be removed regardless of mitigation.

Option 1 only:

- Assessment of the farm buildings required – retention should be sought of any significant structures.

4.26 South of Airfield Business Park (ST26)

4.26.1 Only one option was considered for ST26 at Further Sites Consultation. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 23: South of Airfield Business Park (ST26) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |

4.26.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 5 and 6. This is due to the potential impact to any surviving archaeological deposits, impact on the setting of the city and distance between industrial and rural areas.

4.26.3 Partial minor harm may occur to characteristic 4 however it is a partially industrial area.

4.26.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.

- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Screening may partially assist in mitigation against the erosion of the semi-rural setting of the airfield.
- Reduction in distance between Industrial Estate and farmsteads is inevitable.

4.27 Heslington East University Campus Extension (ST27)

4.27.1 Only one option was considered for ST27 at Further Sites Consultation. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below. The appraisal concentrates on the new parcel of land to the south of the existing campus.

Figure 24: Heslington East University Campus Extension (ST27) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |

4.27.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in serious harm to principal characteristic 6. This is due to the potential loss of open countryside – affecting the rural setting of the city and the close proximity of the development to Heslington.

4.27.3 Minor harm may be caused to characteristics 4 and 5 because of the potential for poorly designed architectural design and impact to any surviving archaeological deposits. Prehistoric-Romano-British settlement and activity is known across the existing campus site. This has already been mitigated against through excavation/recording prior to the construction of the new campus. Further archaeological features (yet unknown) may exist outside the existing campus boundary.

4.27.4 Partial minor harm may occur to characteristic 2 (compactness) by expansion of this site.

4.27.5 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.
- Historic landscape features/grain should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.

- Development will result in the loss of part of the open countryside/rural setting of York. However, benefits of development may outweigh this loss.
- Screening and landscaping may afford some protection to the rural view from the ring road.
- Buffer the site on the eastern edge to push and screen the development from the ring road. Buffering to the west may mitigate against possible harmful impacts to views from the Conservation Area of Heslington.
- Significant green infrastructure to mitigate effects will be required
- Reduce site by one field on the eastern edge to bring the development a little further away from the ring road.
- Reduce proposed site to create a new western boundary along Green Lane to enlarge the gap between Heslington and development (obviously if both this and the above reduction were made site would be unviable).

4.28 Land Adj to & R/O Windy Ridge & Brecks Lane Huntington (ST28)

4.28.1 Only one option was considered for ST28 at submission boundary stage. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 25: Land Adj to & R/O Windy Ridge & Brecks Lane Huntington (ST28) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 3 (Submission Boundary) | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |

4.28.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may cause minor harm to principal characteristics 4, 5 and 6. This conclusion was reached due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design, the potential for harm to any surviving archaeological deposits and the loss of historic landscape features and open space.

4.28.3 An element of minor harm was identified to characteristic 2 due to the potential removal of land which separates residential and retail/industrial areas.

4.28.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- The form of development must allow for a transition zone between the rural and commercial area.

- Planting and screening may assist with separation of developments.
- Reduce the size of the site at the southern boundary to fall in line with existing building of Sunnymead to retain a buffer between developments (albeit a small one).
- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.
- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Retention of any good examples of ridge and furrow is encouraged.
- Reduce the size of the site at the southern boundary to fall in line with existing building of Sunnymead to retain part of this landscape.
- As much of the inherited landscape characteristics should be retained within design proposal. E.g. using existing boundaries to guide development plots and retaining as many green boundaries as possible.

4.29 Land at Boroughbridge Road, Millfield Lane (ST29)

4.29.1 Only one option was considered for ST29 at Further Sites Consultation. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 26: Land at Boroughbridge Road, Millfield Lane (ST29) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |

4.29.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 4, 5 and 6. This is due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design, the potential impact to any surviving archaeological deposits, impact on the rural setting of the city and also the area of coalescence between Poppleton and York.

4.29.3 Development may cause an element of minor harm to characteristic 2 due to potential impact on this approach into the city.

4.29.4 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits on site.
- Suitable buffering is needed to front the A59 and A1237 to minimise the impact of the development on the setting of York as experienced from the various approaches.
- Buffering and landscaping may assist in maintaining a green boundary between the two settlements.
- The village will also still be separated from the city by the ring road.

4.30 Land to the north of Stockton Lane (ST30)

4.30.1 Only one option was considered for ST30 identified at the Preferred Options stage. A summary of the impact of development in this area on the principal characteristics of York is set out below.

Figure 27: Land to the north of Stockton Lane (ST30) summary

| Site/characteristic | OPTION 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |

4.30.2 The assessment of this site has identified that development in this location may result in minor harm to principal characteristics 4, 5 and 6. This is due to the unknown nature of proposed housing design, the potential impact to any surviving archaeological deposits and impact on the landscape and setting of the city and of the village of Heworth.

4.30.3 Key recommendations/Mitigation:

- -Detailed information on architectural proposals required to further assess impact on architectural complexity characteristic.
- -Archaeological investigation required to further assess the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits or historic landscape features on site.
- Historic field boundaries should be retained and enhanced where possible or at least respected in the design of the new development.
- Use green buffers and landscaping to the edges of development.

5. Outcomes of the Local Plan Sites Appraisal – Alternative Strategic Sites

Eleven sites have undergone a rapid (stage 1) Heritage Impact Appraisal as alternative options for Strategic Sites. This section provides an overview of the outcomes from the alternative sites appraisal. The table also indicates whether the site was assessed for residential use or employment land.

| OPTION 1 PREFERRED OPTION | | | | | | | RES | EMP |
|-------------------------------------|---|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| 167 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 170 | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | - | X | |
| 250 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 297 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |
| 302 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | -- | -- | X | X |
| 317 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 327 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | X | X |
| 607 | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | -- | X | |
| 691 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | | X |
| OPTION 2 FURTHER SITES CONSULTATION | | | | | | | | |
| 763 | ○ | -- | ○ | -- | - | -- | X | |
| 764 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 777 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |

6. Outcomes of the Local Plan Sites Appraisal – Allocated Housing Sites

The local plan has identified sites to accommodate residential growth across the city. In total 51 Housing Sites have undergone a full Heritage Impact Appraisal, with 46 included as potential housing allocations in the Local Plan. This section provides an overview of the outcomes from the sites chosen as Housing Allocations within the Plan.

Key: Characteristic 1: Strong urban form, 2: Compactness, 3: Landmark monuments, 4: Architectural character, 5: Archaeological complexity and 6: Landscape and setting

| Site | Option 1 (Preferred Options) | | | | | | Option 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|--|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | | |
| H1 | ○ | + | - | + | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H2 | ○ | + | - | - | -- | -- | - | -- | - | -- | ○ | + | - | - | -- | - | - |
| H3 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | ○ | | | |
| H4 | ○ | + | ○ | + | -- | - | -- | ○ | | | | | | | | | |
| H5 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | ○ | | | |
| H6 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| H7 | ○ | ○ | -- | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H8 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H9 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | -- | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | ○ | |
| H10 | ○ | ○ | -- | - | -- | -- | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H11 | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H12 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H13 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H14 | ○ | + | ○ | + | - | -- | - | -- | - | -- | ○ | | | | | | |
| H15 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H16 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | |
| H17 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H18 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H19 | ○ | ○ | - | -- | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H20 | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H21 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H22 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H23 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H25 | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | - | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | - | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| H26 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | | | | | | | | | |
| H27 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H28 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H29 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|
| H30 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | - | -- | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | - | - | -- |
| H31 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | |
| H32 | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | |
| H33 | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | - | -- | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | -- | - | - | - |
| H34 | ○ | ○ | ○ | -- | - | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | - | ○ | |
| H35 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H37 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | -- | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | -- |
| H38 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H39 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H40 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H43 | ○ | ○ | ○ | -- | - | ○ | | | | | | | | | | |
| H46 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | -- |
| H47 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | - | - | ○ | - |
| H48 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | - | ○ | |
| H49 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | - | ○ | - |
| H50 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | - | - | -- |
| H51 | | | | | | | | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | |

7. Outcomes of the Local Plan Sites Appraisal – Allocated Employment Sites

The local plan has identified sites to accommodate employment growth across the city. In total 16 Employment Allocations have undergone a rapid (stage 1) Heritage Impact Appraisal. This section provides a brief overview of the outcomes from the sites taken forward as Employment Allocations within the Local Plan. The table also indicates whether the site was assessed for residential use as well as employment land.

Key: Characteristic 1: Strong urban form, 2: Compactness, 3: Landmark monuments, 4: Architectural character, 5: Archaeological complexity and 6: Landscape and setting

| OPTION 1 PREFERRED OPTIONS | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site | Characteristic | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| E2 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | |
| E3 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | |
| E4 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | |
| E5 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | |
| E6 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - |
| E7 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E8 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E9 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E10 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | ○ |
| E11 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| E12 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E13 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| OPTION 2 FURTHER SITES OPTIONS | | | | | | | |
| E14 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | ○ | - | ○ |
| E15 | ○ | - | + | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E16 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| OPTION 1, 2 & 3 SUBMISSION BOUNDARY | | | | | | | |
| E17 OPT 1 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - |
| E17 OPT 2 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |
| E17 OPT 3 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ |

8. Outcomes of the Local Plan Sites Appraisal – Housing and Employment Alternatives

The local plan has identified alternative sites for both housing and employment. In total 48 alternative sites have undergone a rapid (Stage 1) Heritage Impact Appraisal. This section provides a brief overview of the outcomes from the sites chosen as housing and employment land alternatives within the Plan. The table also indicates whether the site was assessed for residential and/or employment land.

Key: Characteristic 1: Strong urban form, 2: Compactness, 3: Landmark monuments, 4: Architectural character, 5: Archaeological complexity and 6: Landscape and setting

| ALTERNATIVE SITES | | | | | | | Analysed for: | |
|-------------------|----------------|------|-----|------|------|------|---------------|------------|
| | Characteristic | | | | | | Residential | Employment |
| Site | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| 9 | ○ | ○ - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |
| 30 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 61 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | X |
| 87 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - ○ | - ○ | ○ | | X |
| 130 | ○ + | ○ | - + | - | - | + | X | X |
| 137 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | - | X | |
| 147 | ○ | ○ - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |
| 163 | ○ | ○ - | -- | -- | -- | ○ | X | X |
| 165 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 167 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 171 | ○ | -- | ○ | -- | - | -- | X | |
| 191 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | X | |
| 200 | ○ | - | - + | - | - | -- + | X | |
| 216 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - -- | -- | X | |
| 226 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - -- | -- | X | X |
| 227 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - -- | -- | X | X |
| 229 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |
| 303 | ○ | - | ○ - | - -- | - | - -- | X | |
| 311 | ○ | -- | ○ | -- | -- | -- | X | |
| 318 | ○ + | ○ | - | ○ | - | ○ | X | X |
| 565 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | X | |
| 581 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X | X |
| 598 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | X | X |
| 623 | ○ | ○ -- | ○ | - | - | - -- | | X |
| 624 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | X | X |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| 626 | ○ | ○ | ○ | -- | - | ○ | | X | X |
| 629 | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | -- | - | X | X |
| 645 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | | X |
| 648 | ○ | ○ | ○ | -- | - | ○ | | X | X |
| 649 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | X | X |
| 653 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | ○ | | X | X |
| 657 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | -- | ○ | | X | X |
| 660 | ○ | ○ | - | -- | -- | - | | X | X |
| 661 | ○ | ○ | ○ | -- | -- | ○ | | X | X |
| 669 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | X | X |
| 676 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | X | |
| 700 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | X | X |
| 733 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | X | |
| 737 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | | X | |
| 738 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | | X | |
| 742 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | | X | |
| 744 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | | X | |
| 748 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | X | |
| 749 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X | |
| 752 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | X | |
| 753 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | | X | |
| 758 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | X | |
| 788 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | -- | | X | |

9. Gypsy and Travellers

The local plan has identified 3 sites to accommodate Gypsy, Travellers and Showpeople. These sites underwent a full Heritage Impact Appraisal. This section provides a brief overview of the outcomes from the sites chosen as potential Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople sites within the Plan.

| OPTION PREFERRED OPTION | | | | | | | | RES | EMP |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|
| Site | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| 819 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | --- | |
| 818 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | |
| 22 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | |

10. Safeguarded Land

The local plan has identified 15 sites as Safeguarded Land. These sites underwent a rapid (stage 1) Heritage Impact Appraisal. Some have been assessed more fully as they were previously considered as Strategic Sites. This section provides a brief overview of the outcomes from the sites chosen as Safeguarded Land within the Plan.

| OPTION 1 PREFERRED OPTIONS | | | | | | | OPTION 2 FURTHER SITES CONSULTATION | | | | | | RES | EMP |
|-------------------------------------|---|----|---|---|---|----|-------------------------------------|----|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|
| Site | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | |
| SF1 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | |
| SF2 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | |
| SF3 | ○ | - | - | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | |
| SF4 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| SF5 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | |
| SF6 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | ○ | - | | | | | | |
| SF8 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | -- | | | | | | |
| SF9 | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| SF10 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| SF11 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| SF12 | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | X | X |
| SF13 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | - | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | X | X |
| SF14 | ○ | -- | ○ | - | - | -- | | | | | | | | |
| OPTION 2 FURTHER SITES CONSULTATION | | | | | | | OPTION 3 SUBMISSION BOUNDARY | | | | | | | |
| SF15 | ○ | ○ | ○ | - | - | - | ○ | ○ | - | ○ | - | - | - | X |

11. Mixed Use Sites

The local plan has identified 2 sites for Mixed Use. These sites both underwent a rapid (stage 1) Heritage Impact Appraisal. This section provides a brief overview of the outcomes from the sites chosen as Mixed Use within the Plan.

| OPTION 1 PREFERRED OPTIONS | | | | | | | | | RES | EMP | |
|------------------------------|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|-----|-----|---|
| Site | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | | |
| MU1 | - | + | - | -- | - | -- | -- | ○ | + | X | X |
| MU2 | ○ | ○ | -- | -- | - | ○ | - | | | X | X |

Strategic Sites Index

(In 'Allocation Ref' order in each relevant Chapter)

| ST ref. | Site Ref | | | Site | Proposed Use |
|---------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | Option 1 (Preferred Options) | Option 2 (Further Sites Consultation) | Option 3 (Submission) | | |
| ST1 | 295 | n/a | 295 | British Sugar/Manor School | Residential |
| ST2 | 321 | n/a | 321 | Former civil service sports ground | Residential |
| ST3 | 45 | n/a | 45 | The Grain Stores, Water Lane | Residential |
| ST4 | 35 | n/a | 35 | Land adjacent to Hull Road- Grimston Bar | Residential |
| ST5 | 293 | n/a | 293 | York Central | Opportunity area |
| ST6 | 181 | 181 | 181 | Land East of Grimston Bar | Now Safeguarded land (SF) |
| ST7 | 699 | n/a | 699 | Land to the east of Metcalfe Lane | Residential |
| ST8 | 329 | n/a | 329 | Land north of Monks Cross | Residential |
| ST9 | 690 | 823 | 823 | Land north of Haxby | Residential |
| ST10 | 148 | 148 | 148 | Land south of Moor Lane, Woodthorpe | Now Safeguarded land (SF) |
| ST11 | 692 | n/a | 692 | Land at New Lane Huntington | Residential |
| ST12 | 723 | n/a | 723 | Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe | Residential |
| ST13 | 131 | n/a | 131 | Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe | Residential |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-----|--------|-----|--|--|
| ST14 | 698 | 822 | 822 | Land to the north of Clifton Moor | Residential |
| ST15 | 727 | 821 | 821 | Whinthorpe (new settlement) | Residential |
| ST16 | 470 | 470 | 824 | Ferry's | Now Mixed Use (MU2) |
| ST17 | 485 | n/a | 485 | Nestle South | Residential |
| ST18 | 724 | n/a | 724 | Monks Cross North | Employment |
| ST19 | 689 | 793 | 91 | Northminster Business Park | Employment – now general employment allocation E17 |
| ST20 | 725 | n/a | 725 | Castle Piccadilly | Opportunity area |
| ST21 | n/a | 799 | 799 | Naburn Designer Outlet | Leisure |
| ST22 | 458 | n/a | 458 | Germany Beck | Residential |
| ST23 | 457 | n/a | 457 | Derwenthorpe | Residential |
| ST24 | 461 | n/a | 461 | York College | Residential |
| ST25 | n/a | 800 | 800 | Land south of Designer Outlet | Employment |
| ST26 | n/a | 97/815 | 97 | South of Airfield business park | Employment |
| ST27 | n/a | 794 | 816 | Heslington East University Campus Extension | Employment |
| ST28 | n/a | n/a | 560 | Land Adjacent to & right of Windy Ridge & Brecks Lane Huntington | Residential |
| ST29 | n/a | 779 | 779 | Land at Boroughbridge Road, Millfield Lane | Residential |
| ST30 | 187 | 187 | 187 | Land to the north of Stockton Lane | Residential |

Allocations Index

(In 'Allocation Ref' order in each relevant Chapter)

| Housing Allocations | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Allocation Ref | Site Ref | Name |
| H1 | 472 | Former gas works, 24 Heworth Green |
| H2 | 692 | Sites by racecourse, Tadcaster Road |
| H3 | 121 | Burnholme School |
| H4 | 202 | St Joseph's Monastery |
| H5 | 127 | Lowfield School |
| H6 | 308 | Land right of The Square Tadcaster Road |
| H7 | 172 | Bootham Crescent |
| H8 | 58 | Askham Bar Park and Ride |
| H9 | 177 | Land off Askham Lane |
| H10 | 656 | Barbican Centre |
| H11 | 627 | Land at Frederick House, Fulford Road |
| H12 | 192 | Land right of Stockton Lane/Greenfield Park Drive |
| H13 | 7 | Our Lady's Primary School (existing building footprint) |
| H14 | 556 | 32 Lawrence Street |
| H15 | 120 | Beckfield Lane Depot |
| H16 | 25 | Sessions, Huntington Road |
| H17 | 631 | Burnholme WMC |
| H18 | 80 | Land off Woodland Chase, Clifton Moor |
| H19 | 654 | Land at Mill Mount |
| H20 | 124 | Oakhaven EPH |
| H21 | 99 | Woolnough House EPH |
| H22 | 59 | Heworth Lighthouse |
| H23 | 98 | Grove House EPH |
| H24 | 197 | Former Bristow's Garage, Fulford Road |
| H25 | 651 | Heworth Green North |
| H26 | 55 | Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington |
| H27 | 49 | Land at the Brecks, Strensall |
| H28 | 11 | Land to the north of North Lane, Wheldrake |
| H29 | 166 | Land at Moor Lane Copmanthorpe |
| H30 | 322 | Land to the south of Strensall village |
| H31 | 300 | Eastfield Lane, Dunnington |
| H32 | 562 | The Tannery, Strensall |

| | | |
|-----|-----|--|
| H33 | 72 | Water Tower Land, Dunnington |
| H34 | 8 | Land north of Church Lane, Skelton |
| H35 | 52 | Land at Intake Lane, Dunnington |
| H36 | 580 | Land at Blairgowerie House, Upper Poppleton |
| H37 | 6 | Land at Greystone Court, Haxby |
| H38 | 677 | Land right of Rufforth Primary School, Rufforth |
| H39 | 8 | North of Church Lane, Elvington |
| H40 | 193 | West Fields, Companthorpe |
| H41 | 596 | Land adj to 26 and 38 Church Lane, Bishopthorpe |
| H42 | 597 | Builer Yard, Church Lane, Bishopthorpe |
| H43 | 193 | Manor Farm Yard Copmanthorpe |
| H44 | 618 | RO Surgery and 2a/2b Petercroft Lane, Dunnington |
| H45 | 579 | Land adjacent to 131 Long Ridge Lane, Nether Poppleton |
| H46 | 182 | Old School Playing Field New Earswick |
| H47 | 298 | Sites at Connaught Court |
| H48 | 757 | Haxby Hall EPH |
| H49 | 13 | Station Yard Wheldrake |
| H50 | 180 | Malton Road |
| H51 | 125 | Morrell House EPH |

Employment Allocations

| Allocation Ref | Site Ref | Name |
|----------------|----------|---|
| E2 | 635 | Land north of Monks Cross Drive |
| E3 | 37 | Ford Garage, Jockey Lane |
| E4 | 64 | Land at Layerthorpe and James Street |
| E5 | 307 | Sites at Layerthorpe and James Street |
| E6 | 697 | Common Lane, Dunnington |
| E7 | 599 | Wheldrake Industrial Estate |
| E8 | 600 | Wheldrake Industrial Estate |
| E9 | 602 | Elvington Industrial Estate |
| E10 | 706 | Common Lane, Dunnington |
| E11 | 639 | Annamine Nurseries, Jockey Lane |
| E12 | 684 | Land at York Business Park |
| E13 | 685 | End of Great North Way |
| E14 | 686 | Site to the south of York Business Park |
| E15 | 138 | Land at Hull Road |
| E16 | 742 | Upper Poppleton Garden Centre |

| | | |
|-----|----|--|
| E17 | 91 | Northminster Business Park (formerly ST19) |
|-----|----|--|

| Safeguarded land | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Allocation Ref | Site Ref | Name |
| SF1 | 825 | Land south of Strensall Village |
| SF2 | 824 | Cliftongate |
| SF4 | 814 | Land north of Haxby |
| SF5 | 826 | Land to the west of Copmanthorpe |
| SF6 | 815 | Elvington Industrial Estate |
| SF8 | 793 | Land at Northminster Business Park |
| SF9 | 811 | Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington |
| SF10 | 802 | Land at Elvington village |
| SF11 | 752 | East Field, Wheldrake |
| SF12 | 148 | Land at Moor Lane, Woodthorpe (former ST10) |
| SF13 | 181 | Land East of Grimston Bar (former ST6) |
| SF14 | 810 | Earswick |
| ST15 | 182 | Land to the North of Escrick |

| Mixed Use Allocations | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Allocation Ref | Site Ref | Name |
| MU1 | 456 | Hungate |
| MU2 | 470 | Terry's (formerly ST16) |

Annex 1: Consultation with English Heritage

July 2013: Response to the Preferred Options Local Plan.

| Page | Section | Comments | CYC Comments |
|-------------|----------------|---|--|
| - | General | <p>Given the purpose of the Heritage Impact Assessment and its role in helping to develop a strategy which safeguards those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city, this assessment should have, as a starting point, examined what impact each of the various options might have upon the six elements which contribute to the special character of York. Several Options, including some of those which have been chosen, look likely to harm elements of York's Special Character.</p> <p>As currently structured, it merely assesses the chosen options (and is therefore , one step beyond what the current SA is considering.)</p> | Noted. The HIA and Sustainability Appraisal published at the Preferred Options Stage have been used to establish a single baseline for the policies included within the Local Plan to ensure all alternatives have been considered. This is summarised in Section 3 and detailed in Annex 2. |
| - | General | It is not particularly helpful to merely state "there is potential for harm to historic character". Without specifying what aspect of York's special character is likely to be harmed by a proposal, it is difficult to assess what | Noted. The assessment has been amended to include analysis against each of the principal characteristics. |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|---|
| | | <p>mitigation measures might be appropriate to offset that harm.</p> <p>The last version of the Heritage Impact Assessment evaluated each Policy and proposal against the six characteristics which contribute to the special character of York. We would suggest that a similar approach is utilised again. This is particularly important in the case of the Strategic Sites where each should be assessed against the six elements identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as contributing to the special character and setting of York.</p> | |
| - | General | <p>The mitigation measures need to be more specific. For certain sites, harm to elements of York’s historic environment can only be overcome or reduced by excluding certain areas from the allocations or through developing the sites in a certain manner. This assessment is only of help if it enables developments to come forward in a manner which will not harm the historic environment of the City.</p> | <p>Noted. Mitigation measures will be detailed in individual assessments.</p> |
| 2 | Paragraph 2.1 | <p>The impact which the Plan’s Policies might have upon those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city will not always be clear-cut. In many instances the impact will depend upon how the Policy is implemented. Therefore, there</p> | <p>Noted and actioned.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | should be two additional Impacts along the lines of those set out on page 57 of the Sustainability Appraisal. This would also assist in better read-across between this document and the SA. | |
| 4 | Spatial Strategy, Policy SS3 (Spatial Distribution) | The assessment of this Policy needs to consider each of the sites individually. Given the large number of sites in this Policy, the only general conclusion is that the effect will be uncertain – which does not assist the decision-making process. | Noted. Individual site assessments have been undertaken. |
| 4 | Spatial Strategy, Policy SS3 (Safeguarded Land) | The assessment of this Policy needs to consider each of the sites individually. Given the large number of sites in this Policy, the only general conclusion is that the effect will be uncertain – which does not assist the decision-making process. | Noted. Individual site assessments have been undertaken. |
| 6 | Spatial Strategy, Policy EMP2 (Provision of employment land) | The assessment of this Policy needs to consider each of the sites individually. Given the large number of sites in this Policy, the only general conclusion is that the effect will be uncertain – which does not assist the decision-making process. | Noted. Individual site assessments have been undertaken. |
| 8 | Spatial Strategy, Policy H3 (Housing land allocations) | The assessment of this Policy needs to consider each of the sites individually. Given the large number of sites in this Policy, the only general conclusion is that the effect will be uncertain – which does not assist the decision-making process. | Noted. Individual site assessments have been undertaken. |

January 2014: Initial feedback on the methodology for sites analysis.

As part of ongoing dialogue with English Heritage, a number of comments were received in relation to the draft methodology shared to enable agreement of the way forward.

| English Heritage suggestion: | CYC Comments: |
|---|---|
| <p>(a) <u>Identify those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City.</u></p> <p>Using the various Character Elements which contribute to the six Principal Characteristics as set out in <i>Heritage Topic Paper</i>. As well as two additional elements to the “Landscape and Setting in the City” characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages • The open countryside surrounding York which contributes to the landscape setting of the historic City | <p>Agreed. We have added these additional characteristics into the matrix for assessment.</p> |
| <p>(b) <u>Assess what contribution this area of land in its current form makes to the special character and setting of the historic City.</u></p> <p>Given the location of most of the Strategic Sites, this is likely to concentrate mainly on the Character Elements identified in the <i>Heritage Topic Paper</i> under the Principal Characteristic “Landscape and Setting” (including the amendments suggested above) although there may be other Character Elements (such as “Compactness” which might need to be considered).</p> | <p>Noted. Whilst we agree that any analysis of the Strategic Sites is likely to focus on the certain characteristics, further discussion with the Design, Conservation and Sustainability team revealed that they were keen to have analysis for each of the principal characteristics to ensure consistency across the</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | assessment and to capture all applicable issues. |
| <p>(c) <u>Evaluate the likely impact which the loss of the currently-open area and its subsequent development might have upon the special character and setting of the historic City.</u></p> <p>This should be made with reference to the latest proposals for the design and layout of these sites.</p> | Agreed and implemented. We have included a two-stage approach in assessing sites. Stage 2 of the sites assessment will assess site masterplans where applicable. |
| <p>(d) <u>Identify what mitigation measures might be used to remove or reduce any harm to the special character and setting of the historic City.</u></p> <p>These might include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reducing its scale ○ Amending its location ○ Leaving certain parts of the site undeveloped ○ Limiting the scale of buildings or potential uses in certain areas. ○ Landscaping etc | Noted. These will be detailed in the individual assessments. |
| <p>(e) <u>Consider what opportunities the development of this site might provide to enhance the special character and setting of the historic City.</u></p> | Noted. These will be detailed in the individual assessments. |
| <p>(f) <u>Assess what impact the development might be likely to have upon those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City with the mitigation measures in place.</u></p> | Noted. A narrative explaining the mitigation suggested will be included in the individual assessments. |

May-August 2014: Feedback on Strategic Sites HIA.

| Site/Characteristic | EH Analysis | CYC response |
|--|--|---|
| ST1.1 & 1.2 British Sugar Comments on Rapid Appraisals (same for both) | Characteristic 4: The redevelopment of this former industrial site will not have any impact upon this Principal Characteristic unless the design of the scheme is of sufficient quality that it makes a positive contribution to the architectural legacy of the City. One would hope that the development of every site allocated in the plan would contribute to this Character Element although, judging by some recent examples around the City, one would suspect most will not. Consequently, it might be more appropriate not to make any reference to the potential that the site can make to this Principal Characteristic. | CYC believe that there is the potential to improve this currently derelict site. Generally all sites have been graded as having the potential to cause minor harm to this characteristic although we agree that this depends on the design schemes offered. |
| 2.2 Flat terrain and views | <u>Mitigation</u> Producing a views analysis is only the first stage in mitigating any harm on this element of York's character. The next step is to ensure that, in any scheme for the site, important views are safeguarded and that the possibility of opening up new views of these assets is maximised. | Agree. The appraisals do not go into a lot of detail regarding mitigation. Assume that a views analysis would make suggestions regarding important views and opening up of views. |
| 3.1 Buildings of high cultural significance | <u>Impact</u> This Character Element is, essentially, about the City's legacy of buildings of high cultural significance. Consequently, the redevelopment of this area seems unlikely to have much impact upon this particular aspect of York's character. It would also seem somewhat improbable that this redevelopment of this area will contain buildings of high cultural significance | This may relate to 3.2, Agree although it is not impossible that buildings of significance may be built on this site. |
| 4.1 Architectural legacy | <u>Impact</u> The redevelopment this former industrial site will not have any impact upon this Character Element unless the buildings are of sufficient quality that they make a positive contribution to the architectural legacy of the | CYC believe that there is the potential to improve this currently derelict site by contributing to the architecture of the area. Generally all sites have been graded as having the potential to cause minor |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>City. One would hope that the development of every site allocated in the plan would contribute to this Character Element although, judging by some recent examples around the City, one would suspect most will not. Consequently, it might be more appropriate not to make any reference to the potential that the site can make to Character Element 4.1.</p> | <p>harm to this characteristic although we agree that this depends on the design schemes offered.</p> |
| 6.2 Strays | <p><u>Impact</u> It should also be noted that the site is visible from (and therefore, could impact upon the character of) Acomb and Clifton Ings and the River Ouse.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Producing a views analysis is only the first stage in mitigating any harm on this element of York’s character. The next step is to ensure that, in any scheme for the site, important views towards the site from Acomb and Clifton Ings and the River Ouse are safeguarded and that the possibility of opening up or improving views from these areas is maximised.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> CYC feel that we have covered this and that the character of Acomb would not be impacted upon.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree. The appraisals do not go into a lot of detail regarding mitigation. Assume that a views analysis would make suggestions regarding important views and opening up of views.</p> |
| 6.3 Rivers and Ings | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Producing a views analysis is only the first stage in mitigating any harm on this element of York’s character. The next step is to ensure that, in any scheme for the site, important views towards the site from the River Ouse are safeguarded and that the possibility of opening up or improving views from the river is maximised.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree. The appraisals do not go into a lot of detail regarding mitigation. Assume that a views analysis would make suggestions regarding important views and opening up of views.</p> |
| <p>ST2.1 and 2.2 Former Civil Service Sports Ground</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>Although Manor School lies to the north of this site, visually the School it is not perceived as lying within the built-up area of the City. As a result, extending housing up to the school site will, to some extent, extend the edge of the main part of the built-up area of York further away from the City Centre and, thereby, harm its compact nature. Consequently, this development would be likely to cause Minor Harm to Character Element 2.1</p> <p>Although the Millfield Road frontage this site lies between existing development to the north and south, the frontage alongside the A59 is undeveloped and this open area contributes to the setting and approach</p> | <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 2 is neutral-minor harm given the sequential change to have occurred over the last few years.</p> <p>Since the draft version of ST2.1 and 2.2 was sent to</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | to the City from the north-west. The loss of this area could, therefore result in Minor Harm to the rural edge of the City (Character Element 6.1 (a)) | English Heritage the impact of development on Characteristic 6 has been upgraded to minor harm. |
| 2.1 Contained concentric form | <p><u>Impact</u> Although Manor School lies to the north of this site, visually the School it is not perceived as lying within the built-up area of the City. As a result, extending housing up to the school site will, to some extent, extend the edge of the main part of the built-up area of York further away from the City Centre and, thereby, harm its compact nature. Consequently, this development would be likely to cause Minor Harm to this Character Element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which the impact upon this particular Character Element is reduced will be dependent upon the extent to which the north-western boundary of the site is moved away from the ring road.</p> | <p>The proposed site would have fairly strong relationship with existing development and is well connected both to the city centre and Poppleton.</p> <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on characteristic 2 is neutral-minor harm given the changes that have occurred in the area.</p> |
| 6.1 Views in and out | <p><u>Impact</u> Although the Millfield Road frontage this site lies between existing development to the north and south, the frontage alongside the A59 is undeveloped and this open area contributes to the setting and approach to the City from the north-west. The site is also partially visible from the ring road and is perceived as being part of the swathe of open land between the edge of the main built-up area of York and the A1237. The loss of this area could, therefore result in Minor Harm to the rural edge of the City</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> In order to reduce the harm, the southern part of this site alongside the A59 should remain undeveloped and existing trees within the site should be retained.</p> | Agree that minor harm may be caused to this character element – amendments made to HIA. Harm can be reduced by suitable mitigation including design and landscaping. |
| ST 3 The Grain Stores | No comments supplied. Planning permission granted. | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>ST4 Land adj to Hull Road</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>Development would result in Serious Harm to Characteristic 6</p> | <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 6 is minor harm.</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> It might also be noted that development on this site may impact upon views from the south, especially on the higher areas of the site and thus impact upon the character of the rural edge of the City when viewed from the ring road.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> One of the ways in which the impact of the site could be mitigated is to ensure that all development occurs on the lower (i.e. northern) part of the site with a requirement that none of the development on this site be visible in views towards the site from the south.</p> | <p>CYC consider that development of site would not have impact on the setting of the city from the ring road. However, it is likely to be visible from the university campus hence impacting on the rural setting of the campus.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree. This would reduce the impact on the campus setting. CYC maintain that harm can be reduced by suitable mitigation including design and landscaping.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Landscaping will not reduce the impact upon this Character Element since the development still involves the loss of a large area of open countryside. The only way to reduce the harm is to reduce the size of the site.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> The site currently contributes to the apron of open fields surrounding the city – in this case as seen from Hull Road and Field Lane. Therefore, a loss of open space could not be avoided if this site comes forward but provision of open space and access to landscape could provide some mitigation.</p> |
| <p>ST5 York Central</p> | | |
| <p>2.5 Identifiable compact districts</p> | <p>It should be noted that this site presents an opportunity to create an identifiable new district in the City.</p> | <p>Agreed– amendments made to HIA.</p> |
| <p>3.4 Monument Clustering</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Given the potential for the redevelopment of this site to impact upon important several key buildings of the City, one of the mitigation measures should be the development of a Development Brief and Masterplan for the</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> A development brief for this site is ongoing. This isn't seen as a mitigation option rather as part of the emerging planning process.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | area. | |
| 3.5 Quantity of monuments | <u>Mitigation</u> Given the potential for the redevelopment of this site to impact upon important several key buildings of the City, one of the mitigation measures should be the development of a Development Brief and Masterplan for the area. | <u>Mitigation</u> A development brief for this site is ongoing. This isn't seen as a mitigation option rather as part of the emerging planning process. |
| 4.1 Architectural legacy | <u>Mitigation</u> Given the potential for the redevelopment of this site to impact upon important several key buildings of the City, one of the mitigation measures should be the development of a Development Brief and Masterplan for the area. | <u>Mitigation</u> A development brief for this site is ongoing. This isn't seen as a mitigation option rather as part of the emerging planning process. |
| 4.2 Variety | <u>Mitigation</u> Given the potential for the redevelopment of this site to impact upon important several key buildings of the City, one of the mitigation measures should be the development of a Development Brief and Masterplan for the area. | <u>Mitigation</u> A development brief for this site is ongoing. This isn't seen as a mitigation option rather as part of the emerging planning process. |
| 4.3 Human scale | <u>Mitigation</u> Given the potential for the redevelopment of this site to impact upon important several key buildings of the City, one of the mitigation measures should be the development of a Development Brief and Masterplan for the area. | <u>Mitigation</u> A development brief for this site is ongoing. This isn't seen as a mitigation option rather as part of the emerging planning process. |
| ST6 (Now SF 13) Land east of Grimston Bar | Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Element 2.1, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 2. | Agree. Since the draft version of ST6 was sent to English Heritage the impact of development on Characteristic 2 has been upgraded to serious harm. |
| Comments on Rapid Appraisal | Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Elements 6.1 and 6.4, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6. | Agree in part. Since the draft version of ST6 was sent to English Heritage the impact of development on Characteristic 6 has been upgraded to minor-serious harm. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>2.1 Contained concentric form</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the eastern edge of the built-up area, reducing its compactness and decreasing the walkable nature of the City.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element is not capable of mitigation. Reducing the size of the site or, for example, limiting development to the south-west corner only, would be unlikely to significantly reduce the impact which the development of this area would have on the compact nature of York.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree with statement – added into HIA.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree in part that mitigation measures will not significantly reduce impact on compactness. However, the site may be suitable for another use other than residential. A more industrial/employment based development may have less of an impact on compactness than a residential development.</p> |
| <p>2.5 Identifiable compact districts</p> | <p>This site would result in a free-standing residential area poorly related to the form and character of the City.</p> | <p>Agree with statement – added into HIA.</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site would bring the edge of the built up area of the City to within 250 metres of the ring road.</p> <p>The topography of the site means that any development would dominate views towards, and be particularly noticeable in views from, the ring road.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element is not capable of mitigation. Reducing the size of the site or limiting development to, for example, the south-west corner only, would still be likely to harm the rural edge of the City when viewed from the ring road because of the location of the site relative to the A64 and its topography.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree with statement on impacts. Upon review the impacts on element 6.1 have been upgraded to serious harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> CYC believe that the impacts can be mitigated to a degree by the measures given in the HIA.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>6.4 Open country side and green belt</p> | <p><u>Impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would bring the edge of the built up area of the City to within 250 metres of the ring road. • Because of the topography of this site, any development would dominate views towards, and be particularly noticeable in views from, the ring road. • It would erode the rural character of this part of the City • It would reduce the distance between the built-up edge of the City and the Livestock Centre from 1.03km to just 500 metres. Even from the edge of the electricity sub-station, it reduces the gap from 700 metres to 500 metres. This is a <u>substantial reduction</u> and would further lead to the urbanisation of the experience of travelling along this part of the ring road. <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>The impact upon this particular Character Element is not capable of mitigation. Reducing the size of the site or limiting development to, for example, the south-west corner only, would still be likely to harm the rural edge of the City when viewed from the ring road because of the location of the site relative to the A64 and its topography.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Agree with statement on impacts although we disagree on the degree of harm development may have upon this element. CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.4 is minor harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>CYC believe that the impacts can be mitigated to a degree by the measures given in the HIA.</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site would be likely to result in minor harm-serious harm to the relationship of York to Murton:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would bring the edge of the built-up area of York to within 770 metres of the south-western part of village of Murton. In view of the topography of this area, this is likely to be a <u>noticeable reduction</u> and would be likely to affect the character of the village and its relationship with York <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element is capable of mitigation to some extent by reducing the size of the site and so increasing the distance between the village and any new development.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Whilst the development would reduce the physical distance between York and Murton, this would not cause serious harm to this relationship from the ring road. Furthermore the development is distant from Murton Lane. CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.7 is minor harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree with the statement on mitigation.</p> |
| <p>ST7.1 Land to the east of Metcalfe Lane</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Element 2.1, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 2.</p> <p>Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Elements 6.1 and 6.4, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> | <p>Since the draft version of ST7.1 was sent to English Heritage the impact of development on Characteristic 2 has been downgraded to minor harm. It was agreed that although the site was located someway from the city centre it was a continuation of existing urban areas and was not as detrimental to this characteristic as other proposed sites.</p> <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 6 is minor harm-serious harm.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>2.1 Contained concentric form</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element to Minor Harm will be dependent upon the extent to which the eastern boundary of the site is moved away from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Whilst a pulling back of the eastern edge would make actual distances between development and the existing urban form walkable, access to facilities and green space could be incorporated into the design to reduce perceived distances to community centres.</p> |
| <p>2.5 Identifiable compact districts</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Given that the original site boundary provides no indication whatsoever of what this development might look like if allocated, it is not possible to reach any conclusion about whether or not it might, either, create an identifiable compact district or, conversely, erode the character of those communities that exist on the eastern edge of the City. At present, therefore, it is almost impossible to state what impact this allocation might have upon this element of York’s character.</p> | <p>The site potentially has strong association with existing communities. There is the potential to provide integrated extensions to the existing communities with additional facilities available to all. Landscape infrastructure could aid individual identification of adjacent communities. Ensuring the creation of compact districts and identifiable communities is dealt with more fully through planning policy.</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> (c) This site is prominent in views from the ring road and the development of this area would reduce the gap between the A64 and the edge of the built-up area from 1.3km at its narrowest point to just 575 metres. It would therefore, result in Serious Harm to the views towards the eastern edge of the City from the ring road. The only way to reduce this impact would be to reduce the size of the allocation in order to retain a significant swathe of open countryside between the new development and the ring road.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree development would be visible from ring road. The decrease in distance could therefore potentially harm the quality of view and setting of Minster/city because currently foreground buildings are distant with a substantial depth of open lowland in the foreground, typifying the setting of the minster and the city. There is scope for sensitive building design and some landscape mitigation by creating a suitable landscape setting for the development along its eastern edge. Deemed as causing minor harm to this</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | characteristic element. |
| 6.4 Open countryside and green belt | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) Just because the site is not included in one of the areas specifically identified by the Council in its Green Belt Appraisal does not mean that it is, necessarily, of lesser importance in the contribution it makes to the special character or setting of the historic City. Indeed, this site is a key part of the swathe of open land to the east of the City that contributes to York’s special character. The second observation that you have made regarding the site falling specifically outside any specifically earmarked areas should be deleted.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Given that you have concluded that the loss of the open countryside to the east of the City is likely to result in Serious Harm to this Character Element, ensuring that development is no further east than the currently-proposed eastern boundary will not reduce the harm in any way whatsoever. By bringing development to within 575 metres of the ring road, it will result in serious harm to the character of the open countryside on the eastern side of the city. The only way to reduce this impact would be to reduce the size of the allocation in order to retain a significant</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree that despite not being earmarked for setting of the city that the tract of land does contribute to York’s special character.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Agree development would be visible from ring road. The decrease in distance could therefore potentially harm the quality of view and setting of Minster/city because currently foreground buildings are distant with a substantial depth of open lowland in the foreground, typifying the setting of the minster and the city. There is scope for sensitive building design and some landscape mitigation by creating a suitable landscape setting for the development along its eastern edge. Deemed as causing minor harm to this characteristic element.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>swathe of open countryside between the new development and the ring road.</p> <p>(d) This development would be just 155 metres from the northern edge of the Osbaldwick Conservation Area. A large residential development this close to the village would impact upon the rural setting of the Conservation Area and result in harm to its setting. The only way to retain this rural setting is to increase the distance between any new housing development and the Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay “<i>special attention</i>” to “<i>the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance</i>” of its Conservation Areas. Consequently, before allocating this area for development there will need to be some evaluation of the contribution which this currently-open area makes to the setting of the Conservation Area and an assessment of what impact its loss and subsequent development might have upon the character of the Conservation Area.</p> | <p>(d) CYC agree that a more detailed evaluation is required. Added to HIA.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) The development of this area would reduce the gap between the existing edge of the built-up area of the City from 1.6 km to 720 meters, which is quite a marked reduction - i.e. it could not be described as leaving a “reasonable gap” between Murton and the new eastern edge of the City.</p> <p>This Character Element deals with York’s relationship with the free-standing settlements in the Green Belt. Therefore, it does not include Osbaldwick, Tang Hall or any other areas on the edge of the built up area.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) In order to retain the relationship of the main built-up area of York with Murton, a substantial area of open countryside should be retained between any new housing and the village.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) CYC maintain that the development is located some distance from Murton and that the impact of development on this character element is minor as Murton and York will be separated by a strip of fields and the ring road and can be mitigated against though landscaping.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Site offers potential to incorporate suitable mitigation to mitigate negative effects through development on the eastern edge of the city. Principally this will include sensitive, high quality design and landscaping.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>ST7.2 Land to the east of Metcalfe Lane</p> | <p>Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Element 2.1, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 2.</p> <p>Because of the harm that would be caused to Character Elements 6.1 and 6.4, the development of this site would result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> | <p>Since the draft version of ST7.2 was sent to English Heritage the impact of development on Characteristic 2 has been downgraded to minor harm. It was agreed that although the site was located someway from the city centre it was a continuation of existing urban areas and was not as detrimental to this characteristic as other proposed sites.</p> <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 6 is minor harm-serious harm.</p> |
| <p>2.1 Contained concentric form</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element to Minor Harm will be dependent upon the extent to which the eastern boundary of the site is moved away from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Whilst a pulling back of the eastern edge would make actual distances between development and the existing urban form walkable, access to facilities and green space could be incorporated into the design to reduce perceived distances to community centres.</p> |
| <p>2.5 Identifiable compact districts</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Given that the Indicative Block Plans provide little more than general areas where housing might be developed, it is not possible to reach any real conclusions about whether or not the development of this area might, either, create an identifiable compact district or, conversely, erode the character of those communities that exist on the eastern edge of the City.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The site potentially has strong association with existing communities. There is the potential to provide integrated extensions to the existing communities with additional facilities available to all. Landscape infrastructure could aid individual identification of adjacent communities.</p> |
| <p>4.3 Human scale</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> It is not clear why you have made any reference to high-rise buildings in this Assessment when it has not been identified as an issue in the evaluation of the Original ST7 (or indeed any of the other sites). Given that this is a detailed design issue, it would be better not to include it at all.</p> | <p>This was an error and has been corrected. We think it is worth mentioning that good design which takes into account scale and architectural style is required in any new development.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> (c) This site is prominent in views from the ring road and the development of this area would reduce the gap between the A64 and the edge of the built-up area from 1.3km at its narrowest point to just 575 metres. It would therefore, result in Serious Harm to views towards the eastern edge of the City from the ring road. The only way to reduce this impact would be to reduce the size of the allocation in order to retain a significant swathe of open countryside between the new development and the ring road.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree development would be visible from ring road. The decrease in distance could therefore potentially harm the quality of view and setting of Minster/city because currently foreground buildings are distant with a substantial depth of open lowland in the foreground, typifying the setting of the minster and the city. There is scope for sensitive building design and some landscape mitigation by creating a suitable landscape setting for the development along its eastern edge. CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.1 is minor harm.</p> |
| <p>6.2 Strays</p> | <p>The proposed additional land up which now extends the site up to Stockton Lane would involve the loss of part of the Green Wedge linked to Heworth Stray.</p> <p><u>Impact</u> The incursion of development into the Green Wedge would harm a key element which contributes to the special character of York. This would result in Serious Harm to this Character Element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The only way in which this harm can be mitigated is to remove any development from the area identified as being part of the Green Wedge.</p> | <p>Agree that the site occupies part of the Green Wedge linked to Heworth Stray. Added to HIA.</p> <p><u>Impact</u> Land is required for access. CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.2 is minor harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> CYC maintain that there is the potential to reduce degree of harm through the use of landscaping/providing green space in the area of the Stray.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Given that you have concluded that the loss of the open countryside to the east of the City is likely to result in Serious Harm to this Character Element, ensuring that development is no further east than the currently-proposed eastern boundary will not reduce the harm in any way whatsoever. By bringing development to within 575 metres of the ring</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree that despite not being earmarked for setting of the city that the tract of land does contribute to York's special character.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>road, it will result in serious harm to the character of the open countryside on the eastern side of the city. The only way to reduce this impact would be to reduce the size of the allocation in order to retain a significant swathe of open countryside between the new development and the ring road.</p> <p>(d) This development would be just 155 metres from the northern edge of the Osbaldwick Conservation Area. A large residential development this close to the village would impact upon the rural setting of the Conservation Area and result in harm to its setting. The only way to retain this rural setting is to increase the distance between any new housing development and the Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Consequently, before allocating this area for development there will need to be some evaluation of the contribution which this currently-open area makes to the setting of the Conservation Area and an assessment of what impact its loss and subsequent development might have upon the character of the Conservation Area.</p> | <p>(a) Agree development would be visible from ring road. The decrease in distance could therefore potentially harm the quality of view and setting of Minster/city because currently foreground buildings are distant with a substantial depth of open lowland in the foreground, typifying the setting of the minster and the city. There is scope for sensitive building design and some landscape mitigation by creating a suitable landscape setting for the development along its eastern edge. Deemed as causing minor harm to this characteristic element.</p> <p>(d) CYC agree that a more detailed evaluation is required. Added to the HIA.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>(a) The development of this area would reduce the gap between the existing edge of the built-up area of the City from 1.6 km to 720 meters, which is quite a marked reduction - i.e. it could not be described as a “reasonable gap.</p> <p>This Character Element deals with York’s relationship with the free-standing settlements in the Green Belt. Therefore, it does not include Osbaldwick, Tang Hall or any other areas on the edge of the built up area.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>(a) In order to retain the relationship of the main built-up area of York with</p> | <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>(a) CYC maintain that the development is located some distance from Murton and that the impact of development on this character element is minor as Murton and York will be separated by a strip of fields and the ring road and can be mitigated against though landscaping.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>(a) Site offers potential to incorporate suitable mitigation to mitigate negative effects through development on the eastern edge of the city.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Murton, a substantial area of open countryside should be retained between any new housing and the village. | Principally this will include sensitive, high quality design and landscaping. |
| <p>ST8 Land north of Monks Cross</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 2 since the development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the north-eastern edge of the built-up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City (Character element 2.1). Whilst it is true that development to the north of Huntington extends as far as the ring road, the development of this site would substantially increase the extent of the City in a north-easterly direction.</p> <p>This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would bring the edge of the built up area of the City right up to the northern the ring road. This would result in Serious Harm to the rural edge of York (Character Element 6.1(a)). • This site would represent a huge expansion of the City into the open countryside to the north of York resulting in Serious Harm to the City’s landscape setting (Character Element 6.4(a)). | CYC acknowledge harm but maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 2 and 6 is minor harm-serious harm. |
| 2.1 Contained concentric form | <p><u>Impact</u> This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to this Character element since the development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the north-eastern edge of the built-up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City. Whilst it is true that development to the north of Huntington extends as far as the ring road, the development of this site would substantially increase the extent of the City in a north-easterly direction.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element to Minor Harm will be dependent upon the extent to which the north-eastern boundary of the site is moved away</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 2.1 is minor harm. The impact on compactness is limited since Huntington centre is within a reasonable distance. Furthermore, the size of development would accommodate additional readily accessible facilities which would also be available to existing residents.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level. | |
| 6.1 Views in and out | The Key features column notes that there are few views of the rural edge of York from the northern ring road. In this particular site, this Character Element is unlikely to be affected by this development. | Disagree. See CYC HIA. |
| 6.4 Open countryside and green belt | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site would cause Serious Harm to the Open Countryside in this part of the City:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would bring the edge of the built up area of the City right up to the northern the ring road. This would result in Serious Harm to the rural edge of York and, therefore, to Character Element 6.1(a). • This site would represent a huge expansion of the City into the open countryside to the north of York resulting in Serious Harm to the City's landscape setting and, therefore, to Character Element 6.4(a). <p><u>Mitigation</u> Reducing the extent of this site "slightly" will have little impact in reducing the harm which the site in its current configuration would be likely to have upon this Character Element. The only way to make any real reduction to the degree of harm would be to reduce the size of the development substantially and move its north-eastern edge away from the ring-road in order to create a substantial gap between the development and the A1237.</p> | <p>Agree that there would be a degree of harm to the setting of the city by way of loss of open space as viewed from the ring road. However, CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.4 is minor harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree. Some wording has been changed on HIA.</p> |
| 6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages. | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element (Galtres Farm is not a "surrounding village" nor is it a sizeable development in the open countryside (such as Askham Bryan College)).</p> | Agree that farms are not sizeable settlements but are components of a rural community which may be impacted upon by development. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>ST9.1 North of Haxby</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site is unlikely to have any impact upon Character Element 6.1 (views in and out) • The development of this area will have no impact upon Character Element 6.7(a) since it does not reduce the distance between Haxby and other settlement. • It will have an impact upon Character Element 6.7 (b) insomuch as it will increase the size of the settlement. However, Haxby/Wiggington is, already, the largest free-standing settlement in the York Green Belt and this allocation would increase its size by about 10%. • This development would have no impact upon Character Element 6.7(c) since Haxby would still be a free-standing, clearly definable settlement. | <p>Agree. CYC HIA generally reflects these comments.</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p>The development of this area will have no impact upon Character Element 6.1(c) which deals with views of the rural edge of the main built-up are of the City from, primarily, the ring road.</p> | <p>Agree. Although CYC maintain that local rural views may be affected by residential growth.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of York to the surrounding villages</p> | <p>The development of this area will have no impact upon Character Element 6.7(a) since it does not reduce the distance between Haxby and other settlement.</p> <p>It will have a slight impact upon Character Element 6.7 (b) insomuch as it increases the size of the settlement. However, Haxby/Wiggington is, already, the largest free-standing settlement in the York Green Belt and this allocation would increase the size by about 10%.</p> | <p>Agree settlement will grow while not reducing distance between Haxby and elsewhere. CYC HIA has been amended to further recognise this.</p> |
| <p>ST9.2 North of Haxby</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site is unlikely to have any impact upon Character Element 6.1 (views in and out) • It will have no impact upon Character Element 6.7(a) since it does not reduce the distance between Haxby and other settlement. • It will have a slight impact upon Character Element 6.7 (b) insomuch as it increases the size of the settlement. However, Haxby/Wiggington is, already, the largest free-standing settlement in the York Green Belt and this allocation would increase the size by about 12%. • This development would have no impact upon Character Element | <p>Agree. CYC HIA generally reflects these comments.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 6.7(c) since Haxby would still be a free-standing, clearly definable settlement. | |
| 6.1 Views in and out | The development of this area will have no impact upon Character Element 6.1(c) which deals with views of the rural edge of the main built-up are of the City from, primarily, the ring road. | Agree. Although CYC maintain that local rural views may be affected by residential growth. |
| 6.7 Relationship of York to the surrounding villages | The development of this area will have no impact upon Character Element 6.7(a) since it does not reduce the distance between Haxby and other settlements It will have a slight impact upon Character Element 6.7 (b) inasmuch as it increases the size of the settlement. However, Haxby/Wiggington is, already, the largest free-standing settlement in the York Green Belt and this allocation would increase the size by about 12%. | Agree settlement will grow while not reducing distance between Haxby and elsewhere. CYC HIA has been amended to further recognise this. |
| ST10.1 (Now SF 12) Land at Moor Lane, Woodthorpe Comments on Rapid Appraisal | This allocation would be likely to result in Minor/Serious Harm to this element since the development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the south-western edge of the built-up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City. What you have noted down here would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By reducing the distance between the edge of the built-up area of the City and the ring-road, it would result in would harm one of the Key Views of the Minster (Character Element 6.1(a)). • It would result in Serious Harm to the rural edge of the City when viewed from the ring road (Character Element 6.1(c)). This site would represent a large expansion of the City into the open countryside to the south of York resulting in Serious Harm to the City's landscape setting (Character Element 6.4(a)). | CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 2 is neutral-minor harm and on 6 is minor harm. |
| 2.1 Contained concentric form | <u>Impact</u> This allocation would be likely to result in Minor/Serious Harm to this Character element since the development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the south-western edge of the built- | <u>Impact</u> CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 2.1 as neutral as the proposed development relates closely to the existing |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element will be dependent upon the extent to which the south-western boundary of the site is moved away from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level.</p> | <p>community and is a fairly limited extension into a large tract of open fields.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree that reducing the size of the site would reduce the impact on characteristic 2.</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site would cause Serious Harm to the rural setting of the City:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would result in a reduction in the gap between the edge of the built-up area of the City and the ring-road, affecting appreciation of the views of the Minster and the City when seen across open countryside. This view is one of the Key Views of the Minster. This would result in Minor/Serious Harm to Character Element 6.1(a) • It would result in Serious Harm to views of the rural edge of the City from the ring road (Character Element 6.1(c)). <p><u>Mitigation</u> In his Report to the York Green Belt Local Plan in 1994, the Inspector considered that :- <i>“Moor Lane provides a clear and satisfactory edge to the developed area of York”.</i> He felt that this land helped:- <i>“... to separate York and Copmanthorpe and to prevent further sprawl of the built-up area”</i> In his opinion development south of Moor Lane would:- <i>“... be very harmful to the underlying objectives of the Green Belt”</i></p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree that the development may be visible within the key view. CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.1 is minor harm. Development would represent a degree of encroachment into open country side as viewed from ring road – again degree of harm is considered minor.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Development can be mitigated by way of landscape structure, architectural style and building mass.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>[Inspector’s Report, page 95, Paragraph C78.4].</p> <p>In view of these comments, the only way to reduce this impact would be a substantial reduction in the size of the allocation in order to retain a significant swathe of open countryside between the new development and the ring road.</p> | |
| 6.4 Open countryside and green belt | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) Just because the site is not included in one of the areas specifically identified by the Council in its Green Belt Appraisal does not mean that it is, necessarily, of lesser importance in the contribution it makes to the special character or setting of the historic City. Indeed, this site is a key part of the swathe of open land to the south of the City that contributes to York’s special character. In view of the comments of the York Green Belt Local Plan Inspector, the incursion into the open countryside to the south of the City would be likely to result in Serious harm to Character Element 6.4(a).</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element will be dependent upon the extent to which the southern and western boundaries of the site are moved away from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree that development will impact upon the open countryside especially as experienced from Moor Lane – see CYC HIA. However, CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.4 is minor harm-serious harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree that reducing size of site would reduce the impact of development (although this may also affect viability).</p> |
| <p>ST10.2 Land at Moor Lane, Woodthorpe</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Character Element 2.1(a) since the development of this area would increase the distance (by a further half mile or so) between the city centre and the south-western edge of the built-up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City.</p> | <p>On reflection CYC agree that the development may cause serious harm to Characteristic 2. HIA amended.</p> |
| 2.1 | <u>Impact</u> | <u>Impact</u> |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Contained concentric form</p> | <p>This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Character Element 2.1(a) since the development of this area would increase the distance between the city centre and the south-western edge of the built-up area, reducing the compactness of York and decreasing the walkable nature of the City.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon this particular Character Element will be dependent upon the extent to which the south-western boundary of the site is moved away from both the southern and western sections of the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the Assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this Character Element to an acceptable level.</p> | <p>Agree. CYC have amended HIA to show serious harm to this character element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> CYC recommended that the development area be reduced so it was located closer to Moor Lane and existing developed areas (i.e the Option 1 boundary).</p> |
| <p>6.1 Views in and out</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> In his Report to the York Green Belt Local Plan in 1994, the Inspector considered that :- <i>“Moor Lane provides a clear and satisfactory edge to the developed area of York”</i>. He felt that this land helped:- <i>“... to separate York and Copmanthorpe and to prevent further sprawl of the built-up area”</i> In his opinion development south of Moor Lane would:- <i>“ ... be very harmful to the underlying objectives of the Green Belt”</i> [Inspector’s Report, page 95, Paragraph C78.4].</p> <p>In view of these comments, the only way to reduce this impact would be a <u>substantial reduction</u> in the size of the allocation in order to retain a <u>significant swathe of open countryside</u> between the new development and the ring road.</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree that a substantial reduction would be required to reduce the impact on 6.1. CYC recommend that the development area be reduced so it was located closer to Moor Lane and existing developed areas (i.e the Option 1 boundary).</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) The precise degree to which it is possible to reduce the impact upon</p> | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree that a substantial reduction would be</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>green belt</p> | <p>this particular Character Element will be dependent upon the extent to which the southern and western boundaries of the site are moved away from the ring road. To be of any assistance to those drawing up revised plans, the assessment should give some indication of the extent to which the site should be reduced in size to bring the impact upon this character element to an acceptable level. Given the previous Local Plan Inspector’s comments, one would suspect that only a substantial reduction in the size of this area would be appropriate.</p> | <p>required to reduce the impact on 6.4. CYC recommend that the development area be reduced so it was located closer to Moor Lane and existing developed areas (i.e the Option 1 boundary).</p> |
| <p>ST11 Land at New Lane, Huntington</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>It should also be noted that this development could harm the setting of the grade II Listed Huntington Grange.</p> | <p>This has been highlighted within both rapid and full appraisals. It has now been made clearer in the rapid version.</p> |
| <p>ST12 Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>This development is likely to result in Minor Harm to this Principal Characteristic:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of almost 15 hectares of land will impact upon Character Element 6.4 <p>Although Askham Bryan College is not a “village”, as such, nonetheless, it is a sizeable development in the open countryside to the west of the City and the development of this site would substantially reduce the current gap between Copmanthorpe and the large assortment of buildings to its north-west around the College. As such it will harm Character Element 6.7</p> | <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development on Characteristic 6 is neutral (see below).</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The loss of almost 15 hectares of land will impact upon Character Element 6.4. Given the location of the site, the amount of tree screening, and its degree of visibility from the A64, this harm is likely to be Minor Harm</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element could be mitigated though reducing the size of the proposed allocation</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Agree that development would result in the loss of open countryside, the impact of which would be relatively local. However, CYC maintain this will result in neutral level of harm.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Agree that reducing size of proposed allocation will reduce impact on characteristic.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Although Askham Bryan College is not a “village”, as such, nonetheless, it is a sizeable development in the open countryside to the west of the City and the development of this site would substantially reduce the current gap between Copmanthorpe and the large assortment of buildings to its north-west around the College. Because this would, theoretically, threaten the free-standing character of Copmanthorpe, this is likely to result in Minor Harm to this Character Element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element could be reduced by increasing the gap between the northern edge of the allocated area and Askham Bryan College.</p> | <p><u>Impact and mitigation</u> The ring road and junction contributes a major mitigating factor to a reduction in gap between Askham Bryan and Copmanthorpe.</p> <p>Site has potential to contribute to overall tree cover that is read in the landscape in association with Askham Bryan College.</p> <p>CYC maintain that the impact of development is likely to be neutral.</p> |
| <p>ST 13 Land at Moor Lane Copmanthorpe</p> | <p>No comments supplied</p> | |
| <p>ST14.1 Land to the north of Monks Cross</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>What you have noted down here would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> | <p>CYC maintain that site 14.1 will result in minor-serious harm being caused to Characteristic 6 as stated in the HIA.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) The development of this site would fundamentally affect the impression that one has of the rural setting of this part of the City when travelling along the ring road since there would be development on both sides of the 1237.</p> <p>(d) Development of this area would bring development to within 620 metres of the village of Skelton. This would have a significant impact upon the rural setting of this settlement and would constitute Serious Harm to this aspect of this Character Element.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) Agree, but there are varying degrees of sensitivity and existing influences along the full length of the ring road which contributes to the overall impression of York. (d) Agree there is potential harm. See CYC HIA comments.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Agree reducing size of site would reduce the degree of harm, but CYC maintain that there</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) Landscaping of the site’s outer edges will not reduce the impact upon this Character Element since the development still involves the loss of a large area of open countryside to the north of the city. Moving development further north away from the ring road, again, will not lessen the harm to this Character Element. The only way to reduce the harm is to reduce the size of the site.</p> <p>(d) Moving the western edge of the development back to the drain would not result in much appreciable defence to the rural setting of Skelton. The only way to make any real reduction in the degree of harm would be to reduce the size of the development substantially or, alternatively, move it further north in order to create a substantial gap between the village and any new housing.</p> <p>The development of housing in this area would be unlikely to have any positive effects on the setting of Skelton.</p> | <p>are other measures available as well – See CYC HIA comments.</p> <p>(d) There are consequences relating to the sensitivity of Moor Lane and its relationship with Skelton by potentially moving the site further north. See also point (a) above.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The development of this area impacts upon two aspects of this Character Element. Firstly is the effect it has on the setting of the settlements of Haxby and Skelton and their relationship with one another. The second is how this new development, itself, relates to York. With the exception of Earswick which is considerably smaller in size, the settlements beyond the ring road are all free-standing. This development would simply be an extension to Clifton Moor and would therefore not reflect the way in which settlements have developed around York.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> “Slightly” reducing the size of the development would not have a great impact upon the harm that this scale of development in this location would be likely to have upon this Character Element. Any development in this location would compromise the separation between, and distinct</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The allocation has to be of a certain size for it to operate as a free-standing community rather than an extension to development on the inside of the ring road. CYC have already recognized this as having the potential for significant harm. Agree separation from the ring road would assist in this.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> CYC maintain that, although an element of harm will still be caused to this character element a partial site reduction and well designed/landscaped development will mitigate against the amount of harm caused. The existing woodland blocks in the area also provide</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>individual identity of, Haxby and Skelton. The only way in which the harm could be reduced to any great extent would be for a substantial reduction in the size of this development and/or it being located further away from the edge of the built-up area of the City.</p> <p>The development of housing in this area would be unlikely to have any positive effects on this Character Element.</p> | <p>significant mitigation dividing Haxby, the ring road and the proposed development.</p> |
| <p>ST14.2 Land to the north of Monks Cross</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>What you have noted down here would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> <p>It should also be noted that:- The proposed Park and Ride site intrudes into the area identified as being an Extension of the Green Wedge centred on Bootham Stray.</p> <p>N.B English Heritage have analysed the developers proposed outline and not the CYC option 2 boundary- this has been stated where appropriate.</p> | <p>CYC maintain that site 14.2 will result in minor-serious harm being caused to Characteristic 6 as stated in the HIA.</p> <p>The proposed park and ride site does not fall within the site boundary (option 2) as put forward by CYC.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) The development of this site would fundamentally affect the impression that one has of the rural setting of this part of the City when travelling along the ring road since there would be development on both sides of the 1237.</p> <p>The proposed Park and Ride Site would be a clear incursion into the Extension of the Green Wedge which is centred on Bootham Stray and would have Serious Harm upon this aspect of the Character Element.</p> <p>(d) Development of this area would bring development to within 620 metres of the village of Skelton. This would have a significant impact upon the rural setting of this settlement and would constitute Serious Harm to this aspect of this Character Element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) Agree, but there are varying degrees of sensitivity and existing influences along the full length of the ring road which contribute to the overall impression of York.</p> <p>Proposed Park and Ride was put forward by developer and is not part of CYC option 2.</p> <p>(d) Agree there is potential harm. See CYC HIA comments which identifies minor-serious harm on this character element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (b) Agree reducing size of site would reduce the degree of harm, but there are other measures</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>(a) Landscaping of the site’s outer edges will not reduce the impact upon this Character Element since the development still involves the loss of a large area of open countryside to the north of the city. Moving development further north away from the ring road, again, will not lessen the harm to this Character Element. The only way to reduce the harm is to reduce the size of the site.</p> <p>The harm that would be caused to the Extension of the Green Wedge which is centred on Bootham Stray can be mitigated completely by the deletion of this aspect of the Scheme.</p> <p>(d) Development of this area would result in Serious Harm to the setting of the village of Skelton. Ensuring that no development occurs further west of the current site boundary would not reduce the harm that this scale of development in this location would be likely to have upon this Character Element. The only way to make any real reduction in the degree of harm would be to reduce the size of the development substantially or, alternatively, move it further north in order to create a substantial gap between the village and any new housing.</p> <p>The development of housing in this area would be unlikely to have any positive effects on the setting of Skelton.</p> | <p>available as well – See CYC HIA comments.</p> <p>(d) Agree that reducing the size of the development would reduce the potential harm. The suggested green infrastructure would also reduce visual impact. Moving development further north has implications for Moor Lane and setting/approach to Skelton. See also comments to (a) above.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The development of this area impacts upon two aspects of this Character Element. Firstly is the effect it has on the setting of the settlements of Haxby and Skelton and their relationship with one another. The second is how this new development, itself, relates to York. With the exception of Earswick which is considerably smaller in size, the settlements beyond the ring road are all free-standing. This development would simply be an extension to Clifton Moor and would therefore not reflect the way in which settlements have developed around York.</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> The allocation has to be of a certain size for it to operate as a free-standing community rather than an extension to development on the inside of the ring road. Agree separation from the ring road would assist in this.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> CYC maintain that, although an element of harm will still be caused to this character element a</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Mitigation</u> Ensuring that no development occurs beyond the current site boundaries would not reduce the harm that this scale of development in this location would be likely to have upon this Character Element. Any development in this location would compromise the separation between, and distinct individual identity of, Haxby and Skelton (and, indeed, Option 2 would result in greater harm than Option 1 because its northern boundary is now closer to the edge of Wiggington). The only way in which the harm could be reduced to any great extent would be for a substantial reduction in the size of this development and/or it being located further away from the edge of the built-up area of the City.</p> <p>The development of housing in this area would be unlikely to have any positive effects on this Character Element.</p> | <p>partial site reduction and well designed/landscaped development will mitigate against the amount of harm caused. The existing woodland blocks in the area also provide significant mitigation dividing Haxby, the ring road and the proposed development.</p> <p>Note the north boundary of Option1is the same as Option 2 (the developer’s proposal takes it further north).</p> |
| <p>ST15.1 Whinthorpe Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>It should also be noted that the development of this site would also be likely to harm the enjoyment of those using the Minster Way which runs along the western boundary of this area (Character Element 6.4)</p> <p>A development of this size and in this location would not reinforce the pattern of settlements around York.</p> | <p>Agree with comments on Minster Way – added to CYC HIA.</p> <p>Although larger in size, CYC maintain that this site would be similar to those settlements surrounding York.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) In evaluating the impact which a development in this location would have upon one’s appreciation of the rural setting of the historic City, one also needs to bear in mind the fact that the University has expanded significantly towards the ring road and that the character of the land lying to the north of the A64 is now quite urban in character – i.e. it is now playing fields, sports buildings rather than farmland. Developing right up to the southern edge of the ring road in conjunction with what is happening at the University, would fundamentally change the rural setting of this quadrant of the City.</p> <p>Just because the site is not included in one of the areas specifically</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> (a) Agree that development will impact on the rural setting of the city and have identified this as minor-serious harm. CYC assessment does not concur that the character of the area has become urban due to university developments.</p> <p>(b) The land falls outside of the green wedge area but we agree that it informs the rural context extending beyond the ring road. However, this area is not located within/does not contain any of the key views of the city.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>identified by the Council in its Green Belt Appraisal does not mean that it is, necessarily, of lesser importance in the contribution it makes to the special character or setting of the historic City. Indeed, this site is a key part of the swathe of open land to the south of the City that contributes to York’s special character. The second observation that you have made regarding the site falling specifically outside any specifically earmarked areas should be deleted.</p> <p>An additional consideration is the adverse impact which a new access off the A64 (with, potentially, a grade-separated junction and lighting) would be likely to have upon the rural setting of the City.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the development of this area would also be likely to harm the enjoyment of those using the Minster Way which runs along the western and southern boundaries of this area</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> (a) The most way to ensure that this Character element is safeguarded is to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the size of the development and/or locate it considerably further away from the ring road and • Ensure that any access to the development does not come from a new junction on the A64. <p>Locate the development away from the route of the Minster Way</p> | <p>Agree that consideration is needed of the impact of creating new access off A64 as land take here may be substantial. Added to CYC HIA.</p> <p>Agree with comments on Minster Way – added to CYC HIA.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> See CYC HIA original comments.</p> <p>Suggested Minster Way mitigation added to HIA.</p> |
| <p>ST15.2 Whinthorpe 6.4 Open countryside and green belt</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>As above</p> |
| <p>ST16, 17 and 18</p> | <p>No comments received. ST 16 and 17 are existing commitments. For ST18 see ST8.</p> | |
| <p>ST19.1 Northminster Business Park</p> | <p>What you have noted down here would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Allocation would increase the size of the Business Park | <p>CYC maintain that minor harm could be caused to characteristic 6 although several amendments</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Comments on Rapid Appraisal | <p>from 10 hectares to over 25 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a large incursion into the open countryside to the north-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York (Character Element 6.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which will be just 250 metres from the southern boundary of this area (Character Element 6.7) | have been made to CYC HIA in relation to 6.4. |
| 4.1 Architectural legacy | <p><u>Impact</u> Given the quality of design on most of the business parks and industrial estates on the northern edge of the City, one would be hard-pressed to describe their design as having a “<i>generally high quality of buildings and craftsmanship</i>”. It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element.</p> <p>However, it is appropriate to try to seek a high quality design given the site’s location in the open countryside.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> It is unclear how the amalgamation of the sites will have any noticeable impact upon this character element.</p> | <p>Agree. CYC HIA has been amended to reflect this and impact on characteristic 4 has been downgraded to neutral-minor harm.</p> <p>Type of development doesn’t lend itself to contribute to the architectural legacy of the city. However, building types could be innovative and sympathetic to the landscape context.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Amalgamation of the sites could enable a more significant landscape structure and associated amenity open space. This is reflected in CYCs assessment.</p> |
| 4.2 Variety | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element.</p> | Agree but there are opportunities for innovative building design. |
| 4.3 Human scale | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element. This is, after all, a business park.</p> | The development should respect the human scale of the existing properties on Moor Lane. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 4.4 Craftsmanship | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element. This is, after all, a business park.</p> | Agree that lack of craftsmanship would not be detrimental to characteristic 4. Business Park use does not necessarily preclude the opportunity for incorporating the use of craftsmanship. |
| 6.1 Views in and out | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon the Key Features identified under this particular Character element.</p> | Disagree - see CYC HIA. |
| 6.4 Open countryside and green belt | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site would cause Serious Harm to the Open Countryside in this part of the City:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Allocation would increase the size of the Business Park from 10 hectares to over 25 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a large incursion into the open countryside to the north-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York. <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact upon this particular Character Element could be mitigated though reducing the size of the proposed allocation • Its impact could also be reduced by having a more compact form – as opposed to the random extensions from the existing business park. | <p>Since EH were sent a draft version of ST19.1 several additions have been made to 6.4 including reference to the rural setting of Moor Lane and setting of the city. However, CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.4 is minor harm.</p> <p>The expansion of the business park would bring development closer to the ring road. The degree of harm is somewhat mitigated by existing vegetation and development.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Agree. However, CYC maintain that other methods of mitigation such as landscaping and design could be used to mitigate against this character element rather than a simple reduction in size.</p> |
| 6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages. | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site in its current form would be likely to result in Serious Harm to this character Element since it will threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which will be just 250 metres from the southern boundary of this area</p> | <p>See CYC HIA. The degree of harm is dependent on master plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Agree. This option has now been added into the HIA.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element is capable of mitigation by deleting the south-eastern block and reducing the southern most extent of the south-western block</p> | |
| <p>ST19.2 Northminster Business Park</p> <p>Comments on Rapid Appraisal</p> | <p>What you have noted down here would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Allocation would increase the size of the Business Park from 10 hectares to over 40 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a large incursion into the open countryside to the north-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York (Character Element 6.4). It will threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which will be just 250 metres from the southern boundary of this area (Character Element 6.7) | <p>CYC maintain that minor harm could be caused to characteristic 6 although several amendments have been made to CYC HIA in relation to 6.4.</p> |
| <p>4.1 Architectural legacy</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Given the quality of design on most of the business parks and industrial estates on the northern edge of the City, one would be hard-pressed to describe their design as having a “<i>generally high quality of buildings and craftsmanship</i>”. It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element.</p> <p>However, it is appropriate to try to seek a high quality design given the site’s location in the open countryside.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> It is unclear how the amalgamation of the sites will have any noticeable impact upon this character element.</p> | <p>Agree. CYC HIA has been amended to reflect this and impact on characteristic 4 has been downgraded to neutral-minor harm.</p> <p>Type of development doesn’t lend itself to contribute to the architectural legacy of the city. However, building types could be innovative and sympathetic to the landscape context.</p> |
| <p>4.2 Variety</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element.</p> | <p>Agree but there are opportunities for innovative building design.</p> |
| <p>4.3 Human scale</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact</p> | <p>The development should respect the human scale</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | upon this particular Character element. This is, after all, a business park. | of the existing properties on Moor Lane. |
| 4.4 Craftsmanship | <u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element. This is, after all, a business park. | Agree that lack of craftsmanship would not be detrimental to characteristic 4. Business Park use does not necessarily preclude the opportunity for incorporating the use of craftsmanship. |
| 6.1 Views in and out | <u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon the Key Features identified under this particular Character element. | Disagree – see CYC HIA. |
| 6.4 Open countryside and green belt | <u>Impact</u> Development of this site would cause Serious Harm to the Open Countryside in this part of the City:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Allocation would increase the size of the Business Park from 10 hectares to over 40 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a large incursion into the open countryside to the north-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York. <u>Mitigation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact upon this particular Character Element could be mitigated though reducing the size of the proposed allocation | Since EH were sent a draft version of ST19.2 several additions have been made to 6.4 including reference to the rural setting of Moor Lane and setting of the city. However, CYC maintain that the impact of development on character element 6.4 is minor harm. The expansion of the business park would bring development closer to the ring road. The degree of harm is somewhat mitigated by existing vegetation and development. <u>Mitigation</u> Agree. However, CYC maintain that other methods of mitigation such as landscaping and design could be used to mitigate against this character element rather than a simple reduction in size. |
| 6.7 Relationship of the historic city of York to the surrounding villages. | <u>Impact</u> Development of this site in its current form would be likely to result in Serious Harm to this character Element since it will threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton | See CYC HIA. The degree of harm is dependent on master plan. <u>Mitigation</u> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>which will be just 250 metres from the southern boundary of this area</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element could be reduced by increasing the gap between the business park and Knapton.</p> | Agree. This option has now been added into the HIA. |
| ST20 | No comments. City centre site. | |
| ST21 Naburn Designer Outlet | No comments received. | |
| ST22, 23 and 24 | No comments. ST 22 and 23 are existing permissions. | |
| ST25 Land south of designer outlet Comments on Rapid Appraisal | <p>This allocation would be likely to result in Serious Harm to Principal Characteristic 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Allocation would increase the area covered by the Designer Outlet from some 20 Hectares to over 35 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a huge incursion into the open countryside to the south-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York (Character Element 6.4(a)). It will bring development to within 270 metres of the boundary of Bishopthorpe Conservation Area potentially harming its setting (Character Element 6.4(d)). <p>It will threaten the separation of the Designer Centre from the village of Bishopthorpe which will be just 440 metres from the southern boundary of this area (Character Element 6.7). .</p> | Agree. HIA assessment of Characteristic 6 has been upgraded to a serious from minor-serious harm. |
| 4.1 Architectural legacy | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character Element. The impact upon the nearby Conservation Area is something which would be addressed under Character Element 6.4(d)</p> | Agree. Downgraded to neutral. Overall the rating for this characteristic has been downgraded from neutral-minor to neutral. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 4.2 Variety | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element.</p> | CYC already assessed the threat to this element as neutral. Overall the rating for this characteristic has been downgraded from neutral-minor to neutral. |
| 4.3 Human Scale | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character element. This is, after all, a large out-of-town retail development.</p> | Disagree. CYC maintain that an element of minor harm may occur to the human scale element of this characteristic if inappropriately scaled buildings were constructed in this location. Despite this, the rating for this characteristic has been downgraded from neutral-minor to neutral. |
| 4.4 Craftsmanship | <p><u>Impact</u> It is unlikely that this development of this site will actually have any impact upon this particular Character Element. This is, after all, a large out-of-town retail development.</p> | CYC already assessed the threat to this element as neutral. Overall the rating for this characteristic has been downgraded from neutral-minor to neutral. |
| 6.4 Open Countryside and Green Belt | <p><u>Impact</u> This development will impact upon a number of the individual elements identified under this Character element:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Allocation would increase the area covered by the Designer Outlet from some 20 Hectares to over 35 hectares. The consolidation of development at this location, therefore, would represent a huge incursion into the open countryside to the south-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York. Therefore, it is likely to result in Serious Harm to Character Element 6.4(a). • It will bring development to within 270 metres of the boundary of Bishopthorpe Conservation Area, potentially harming its setting. This would be likely to have Minor/Serious Harm to Character Element 6.4(d). | <p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>Agree with comments. CYC have also graded 6.4 (a) as serious harm.</p> <p>(c) Agree with comments. CYC have upgraded the HIA to minor-serious harm for this element.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>(a) Agree with comments. This suggestion of mitigation has been added to the HIA.</p> <p>(d) A mention to the setting of the Conservation Area has been added to the landscape appraisal</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The harm to Character Element 6.4(a) could be mitigated by reducing the extent of this allocation. • The way to reduce the harm to Character Element 6.4(d) is to ensure that the rural setting of the Conservation Area is not harmed. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay “<i>special attention</i>” to “<i>the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance</i>” of its Conservation Areas. Consequently, before allocating this area for development there will need to be some evaluation of the contribution which this currently-open area makes to the setting of the Conservation Area and an assessment of what impact its loss and subsequent development might have upon the character of the Conservation Area. | <p>mitigation measure suggested in the HIA.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Relationship of York to surrounding villages</p> | <p><u>Impact</u> Development of this site in its current form would be likely to result in Minor Harm to this character Element since it will reduce the distance between the Designer Outlet and the village of Bishopthorpe.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The impact upon this particular Character Element could be reduced by increasing the gap between the Designer Outlet and Bishopthorpe.</p> | <p>CYC HIA already reflected comments on both impact and mitigation.</p> |
| <p>ST26-30</p> | <p>Site comments received as part of FSC.</p> | |