

# Appendix K

## Policy and Sites Audit Trail

## **Audit Trail Policy Topics**

1. Vision and Outcomes
2. Sustainable Development
3. Drivers of Change
4. Distribution of Growth
5. York City Centre
6. York Central
7. Scale of Employment Growth
8. Location of Employment Growth
9. Retail
10. Scale of Housing Growth
11. Location of Housing Growth
12. General Housing Market
13. Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
14. Affordable Housing
15. Community Facilities
16. Education
17. Universities
18. Design and the Historic Environment
19. Green Infrastructure
20. Development in the Greenbelt
21. Renewable Energy Generation
22. Sustainable Design and Construction
23. Environmental Quality
24. Flood Risk, Groundwater and Surface Water Management
25. Communications Infrastructure
26. Waste and Minerals
27. Transport
28. Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

## Policy Topic: Vision and Outcomes

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision is to create a sustainable city.</li> <li>- Includes spatial planning objectives: To ensure the sustainable location, design and construction of development; To ensure economic wellbeing through sustainable economic growth; To meet community development needs; To maintain a quality environment; To minimise motorised transport and promote sustainable forms of transport.</li> <li>- Vision relates to the City's Community Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a 'sustainable city' is overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- The spatial planning objectives developed from the Community Strategy are generally compatible with the sustainability objectives developed for the sustainability appraisal. The objectives alone will not have an impact on the future sustainability of the York area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision and objectives should reflect the unique character of York, although recognised that vision must be based on the objectives of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).</li> <li>- Spatial planning objectives should be more detailed and should set out which policy areas they refer to, and in some cases should be more ambitious and positively worded.</li> <li>- Objectives should be ordered to reflect priorities.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes further detailed spatial planning objectives, e.g. the greenbelt, York's ecological footprint etc, therefore expanding upon the objectives from the previous plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF objectives are very thorough and cover the majority of sustainability objectives. Additional spatial objectives relating to reducing the need to travel though the location of new development, and ensuring public transport is a viable alternative to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear majority supported option which indicated that to create the vision for the LDF the SCS vision together with other planning issues should be adopted in order to create a unique LDF vision. This should have sustainable development at its heart.</li> <li>- Respondents felt that the vision should set out how we</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>car use need to be considered. Other sustainability objectives not well covered relate to reducing noise impacts and participation.</p>	<p>see York developing over the next 20 years.  - General support for the detailed objectives.  - Objectives should be developed from the vision to provide the broad direction detailed strategy and policies.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less detail included in the spatial planning objectives. Now cover: York’s special historic and built environment, building confident, creative and inclusive communities, a prosperous and thriving economy and a leading environmentally friendly city.</li> <li>- A more detailed vision statement included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF objectives deemed to be very thorough and cover the majority of sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the vision however it is felt further spatial planning objectives to cover aspects like education that are missed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No major change however sustainable development brought to the forefront of the plan to reflect best practice.</li> <li>- Expanded spatial planning objectives to provide further clarity in guiding development.</li> <li>- Inclusion of a ‘high level’ vision statement reflecting the Sustainable Community Strategy and the city’s regional role supported by a fuller descriptive vision provides</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
					more clarity and detail.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy White Paper 2003</li> <li>- Securing the future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision keeps ‘high level’ vision statement supported by a fuller descriptive vision to provide clarity and detail.</li> <li>- An extra spatial planning objective added relating to education: A world class centre for education and learning for all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of all the spatial planning objectives. SA supportive of vision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision needs to be set within a global context not just of opportunity but also of vulnerability.</li> <li>-The Government’s growth agenda isn’t adequately picked up.</li> <li>- Question whether York should be a key driver in the region given its characteristics as a compact historic city.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision now includes a vision statement and four priorities: Create jobs and grow the economy, get York moving, build strong communities and protect the environment. Social inclusion and sustainability cut across all four of these.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Plan priorities are supportive of the SA objectives. No ‘very incompatible’ objectives have been identified during the assessment and all of the SA objectives were considered to be very compatible with one or more of the Local Plan objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the vision however felt that it is not place specific and puts too much emphasis on economic growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes made for better clarification of priorities. No change in general approach.</li> </ul>

**Policy Topic: Sustainable Development**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government emphasised Sustainable Development at the heart of the planning system.</li> <li>- Sustainable vision created for the city covering the importance of sustainable development. Sustainable development the overarching goal that underpins the LDF for York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a 'sustainable city' is the overarching vision for the future of York which is welcomed by the SA. The spatial planning objectives are generally compatible with the Sustainability objectives for the SA. Essential that policy alternatives presented in sufficient detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents were keen that the vision and objectives should reflect the unique character of York</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- UK sustainable development strategy – 'Securing the Future' (2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF Core Strategy is not produced in isolation but is shaped and influenced by national and regional level, including the UK sustainable development strategy – 'Securing the Future'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote Sustainable Development through the better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans.</li> <li>- The Sustainability Appraisal report will be an integral part of the plan making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The vision should have sustainable development at its heart. Respondents felt that the vision should set out how we see York developing over the next 20 years. It should address the key issues identified through the evidence base and have regard to all relevant plans and programmes that will influence the future of York, including RSS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			process.		
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF must embrace the need to ensure sustainable development by taking full account of the aims, objectives and aspirations of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA will identify and evaluate a plan's impacts the three dimensions of sustainable development.</li> <li>- The findings of the SA are then taken on board within the Plan's development and reflected in further drafts of the strategies to ensure it maximises its contribution towards sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach needs to recognise the essential role that revising the Green Belt boundary which ensures sustainable development.</li> <li>- Ensuring there is a good provision of public transport to encourage and promote sustainable development in York.</li> <li>- Over four-fifths (85%) of respondents think that ensuring new development does not add to the flooding and drainage problems in York will be most effective for sustainable development.</li> <li>- Providing alternative means to landfill to dispose of waste including the promotion of more recycling and the need to make it easier would be an effective way of promoting sustainable development in York and addressing issues of climate change.</li> </ul>	No change
<b>Core Strategy Submission –</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> <li>- UK Sustainable Development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National policy influences: The LDF must embrace the need to ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA will identify and evaluate a plan's impacts the three dimensions of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comments received suggested that the description of the LDF set out in the About the Plan</li> </ul>	No change

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>September 2011</b>	Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).	sustainable development by taking full account of the aims, objectives and aspirations of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005). - Most policies and sections detail how the policies will contribute or protect sustainable development.	sustainable development. - The findings of the SA are then taken on board within the Plan’s development and reflected in further drafts of the strategies to ensure it maximises its contribution towards sustainable development.	section is not in conformity with national planning policy as it does not mention sustainable development and the role the Core Strategy has in promoting the objectives of sustainable development.	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF - UK Sustainable Development Strategy – Securing the Future (2005).	- The introduction of a sustainable development section dedicated to highlight how the plan is in aims to deliver sustainable development in planning terms for York.	- The policy would positively define sustainable development for York, enabling growth and development in line with the NPPF whilst balancing environmental and social factors specific to the city.	- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received including that it was an unnecessary policy, should include a definition of sustainable development in the policy and that the policy should be redrafted to include criteria based policies that planning applications can be determined against.	To reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development introduced by the NPPF.



## Policy Topic: Drivers of Change

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging broad options tested.</li> <li>- Land may be needed outside the built up areas of York, but some parcels should be retained as open land.</li> <li>- York identified as part of the Leeds City Region and part of a wider 'York sub area'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating a 'sustainable city' is the overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- Core Strategy should address the role, scale and location of development, and how this can be provided in the most sustainable way.</li> <li>- Analysis focuses on constraints to development rather than opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategy should provide an indication of the scale of new development required and the amount of land which will be needed to meet the need. It should set out how the strategic objectives translate into strategic policies. Issues and options should set out alternative spatial options. The spatial strategy should not use the Local Plan as a basis, but should outline the RSS approach, and should consider potential conflicts between the housing and employment figures and the need to balance the different aspects of the spatial strategy.</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future 2005</li> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brownfield sites first, Greenfield second- no change.</li> <li>- Options presented regarding the location of future development.</li> <li>Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility</li> <li>Option 2: Prioritising existing trends -</li> <li>Option 3: Prioritising housing need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some matters not fully addressed which need further consideration in relation to preferred approaches to development. Lack of detail regarding the proportion of development needed in different settlements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally supportive of directing the majority of growth to within, or adjacent to, York's main urban area in preference to further expansion of villages.</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors.			
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS1 - PPS12	- Strategy articulated through spatial principles rather than a policy. These are: Settlement hierarchy Areas of constraint Brownfield sites first Other options not articulated. - Sieve mapping approach to taking account of primary constraints on development e.g. flood risk. - Areas of search for further land for development identified. - The role of York's main built up area as a Sub-Regional City, providing the primary focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.	- Supportive of settlement hierarchy principles and areas of constraint. Strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy). - support the approach which makes the best use of land by ensuring all development is delivered at appropriate densities to help protect Greenfield land and to support shops, community services and public transport.	- Preservation of the historic character and setting of York was the most significant factor in determining the approach to development. Emphasise the importance of understanding what makes York special, to properly consider the potential impact from development; to balance character against the need for the City to grow, to protect important views, and to distinguish between the different values of each of the historic character and setting categories. - Scale of new development needed to be indicated and the amount of land required should be set out. - Should include the regional or sub-regional picture from the RSS and also should set out how the overall principles might be translated into patterns of development on the ground. The spatial strategy does not set out broad locations for growth.	- Terminology has changed regarding York sub area due to the introduction of the RSS. - Sharpening of policy approach which reflects further work on development of SA and points raised in consultation responses.
<b>Core Strategy</b>	- PPS1 - PPS12	- Spatial principles approach retained. See	- Supports the overall approach taken by the	- Concern with the level of growth and preserving the	- Format changes for better clarity.

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Submission – September 2011</b>	- Draft NPPF	above.	three spatial principles set out in the Spatial Strategy. - SA continues to support this hierarchy and the Core Strategy's focus in supporting development within the Sub-Regional area primarily followed by the Large villages, villages and small villages.	City's special character and setting. Suggested further assessment needed to refine settlement and employment growth. Presumption in favour of Brownfield land not in line with national policy. Criticism of approach and outcome of areas of search for development.	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	- The move to a Local Plan and the combination of NPPF and the revocation of RSS leads to a more specific policy approach to setting out the spatial strategy. Combination of a sub area policy and spatial strategy policies used to set the strategic context.	- The assessment has identified that those preferred options that comprise the spatial strategy would have a positive effect across many of the SA objectives.	- Support for the York sub area policy and for the building of strong, sustainable communities.	- To comply with national policy.

**Policy Topic: Distribution of Growth**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<p>-Securing the Future (2005) - PPS1 - PPS12</p>	<p>- RSS</p> <p>- Development should be focused on Brownfield land. Greenfield land only to be considered after. Development should consider: Preserving the Historic Character and Setting of York, Nature Conservation, and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>- Creating a ‘sustainable city’ is the overarching vision for the future of York, and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal. - Core Strategy to address matters such as the role, scale and location of development, and how this can be provided in the most sustainable way.</p>	<p>- The strategy should provide an indication of the scale of new development required and the amount of land which will be needed. - Should set out how the strategic objectives translate into strategic policies. - Issues and options should set out alternative spatial options. The spatial strategy should not use the Local Plan as a basis, but should outline the RSS approach, and the spatial strategy should consider potential conflicts between the housing and employment figures and the need to balance the different aspects of the spatial strategy.</p>	<p>- N/A</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>-Securing the Future (2005) - PPS1 - PPS12</p>	<p>- RSS</p> <p>- Brownfield sites first, Greenfield second. - Broad Influences: Regional context, relationship between York &amp; its larger villages – accessibility &amp; past market trends, and housing need. - Detailed Influences include</p>	<p>- There is a need to identify Greenfield sites for development in York unless a low growth and high density option is pursued. Analysis focuses on constraints to development rather to opportunities to development.</p>	<p>- Generally supportive of directing the majority of growth to within, or adjacent to, York’s main urban area in preference to further expansion of villages. - Support for the preservation of the historic character and setting of York. - Considered that the correct factors had not been identified</p>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>environmental constraints, historic character and setting of York, nature conservation, Flood risk, Commuting, congestion, City &amp; district centres, and the location of major development sites and opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad locations for growth identified.</li> <li>- Options presented regarding the location of future development.</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility  Option 2: Prioritising existing trends  Option 3: Prioritising housing need  Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors</p>		<p>and that other factors over and above those identified.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A new area added to the major developed opportunities and sites.</li> <li>- Strategy articulated through spatial principles rather than policy. These are: settlement hierarchy, Brownfield sites first. Other options not articulated. Sieve mapping approach to taking account of primary constraints on development e.g. Flood risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of settlement hierarchy principles and areas of constraint. Recommends adding and assessment of access to services to the consideration of constraints.</li> <li>- Recommends strengthening Brownfield first and adding consideration of impact on transport network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An indication of the scale of new development needed and the amount of land required should be set out.</li> <li>- Should include the regional or sub-regional picture from the RSS. The section should also set out how the overall principles might be translated into patterns of development on the ground and how there would be different ways of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes include flood risk as a shaper of development. This reflects best practice.</li> <li>- Further detail regarding the influences for development to provide better clarity. Evolution of the approach</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				addressing the needs that are identified through different spatial options.	to reflect the SA, consultation responses and the refinement of the policy approach required for the preferred options change. - Sharpening of policy approach which reflects further work on development of SA and points raised in consultation responses.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS12</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- Spatial principles approach retained. Further areas added to the major developed opportunities and sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the overall approach taken by the 3 spatial principles set out in the Spatial Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern with the level of growth and preserving the City's special character and setting. Suggested further assessment needed to refine settlement and employment growth</li> <li>- Presumption in favour of Brownfield land not in line with national policy.</li> <li>- Criticism of approach and outcome of areas of search for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Format changes for better clarity.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	The move to a Local Plan and the combination of NPPF and the revocation of RSS leads to a more specific policy approach to setting out the distribution of growth. Combination of policies used to set the strategic context, roles of places patterns of development and the implementation of strategic sites. Policy added regarding the safeguarding of land.	- The assessment has identified that those preferred options that comprise the spatial strategy would have a positive effect across many of the SA objectives.	- A large number of responses were received in relation to the distribution of growth. There were a number of general comments received alongside some support for the policy. There were also a large number of objections received, with the majority of which were concerned with the level of growth being too high and the problems this may create on infrastructure, services and effect on the environment.	- To comply with national policy.

**Policy topic: York City Centre**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS6</li> <li>- Living Life to the Full (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2005).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Regional Spatial Strategy (December 2004)</li> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy (2003)</li> <li>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners, October 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy (CYC 2004)</li> <li>- Making More Use of the Rivers (CYC 2003)</li> <li>- Tourism Strategy (First Stop York Partnership 2005)</li> <li>- Tourism Action Plan (Yorkshire Forward and Yorkshire Tourist Board 2002)</li> <li>- Strategic Framework for the Visitor Economy' (Yorkshire Forward 2005)</li>   <li>- Essential that any proposals for new retail floorspace be of high quality to ensure that the vitality and viability of York City Centre is maintained. Options for the location of retail development include continuing to give priority to York City Centre as the main focus of retailing activity, including the development of a new high profile department store and new format food store and identify areas outside the City Centre for retail growth.</li> <li>- The LDF Core Strategy will provide the opportunity to clearly articulate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Priority for all types of shop must be given to city centre in line with national policy.</li> <li>- Shows a clear compatibility between the desire to improve the cultural performance and quality of central York, and the need to encourage visitors to stay overnight in York to increase tourism revenue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too focused on city centre and fails to acknowledge that York is more than its city centre.</li> <li>- Over half of the respondents to the Festival of Ideas questionnaire (55%) thought that we should not build more shops in the city centre, compared to 35% who felt that we should.</li> <li>- Options for retail growth should not solely relate to the city centre however most respondents supported giving priority to the city centre.</li> <li>- Support for general improvements to the city centre including: improving the means of delivering goods to the shops; improving the overall shopping environment of pedestrian areas and traditional streets; and encouraging a more extensive café culture.</li> <li>- Space around Clifford's Tower supported for a green space in the city centre as well as including city centre green space on sites such as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change to overarching approach</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>the key role of the City Centre across a range of different uses. The LDF City Centre Action Area Plan will provide a strategic planning framework to help deliver the development, transport and environmental priorities required to ensure the City Centre remains a quality place to visit and do business.</p> <p>- It is important that the LDF Core Strategy helps to deliver modern and sustainable tourist and cultural provision. To achieve this a range of improvements and enhancements to the city centre are proposed including improved design and layout of York's public spaces, improved access to the rivers, developing a new hotel, the development of a 'cultural quarter' in the City, contributions to public art from developers and the development of the evening economy.</p>		<p>Hungate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for making more use of the rivers and improving public spaces.</li> <li>- Support for improvement to the evening economy, but should relate to more than simply commercial considerations e.g. social, cultural and educational considerations and that there should be specific mention of the need to protect and promote theatres.</li> <li>- Concerns about managing the impact of visitors with a number of respondents pointing out the effects on other businesses of the 4 million tourists who come to the city.</li> <li>-Should invest in ways of improving and enriching what is currently available within the City rather than increasing the current offer.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<p>- PPS6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners, October 2004)</li> <li>- Independent Strategic Review of the York Economy' (The Future York Group)</li> <li>- Option put forward for city centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City centre focus for retail will ensure accessible shops and not to rely on car travel.</li> <li>- It will be important to ensure that the retail</li> </ul>	<p>See above</p>	<p>- No change to overarching approach</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>focus for retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of priorities put forward in recognition of the important contribution tourism makes to York's Economy including improve the setting of the Minster, developing a cultural quarter, creating better linkages between key attractions and sites, establishing a new visitor centre, developing new attractions and facilities to accommodate additional growth in tourism, developing a new high quality hotel, develop the evening economy, encouraging 'green tourism' and improving access to facilities, both for families and people with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>centre of York is not performing at too an intense a level that causes harm to the city centre, including historic character and the well-being of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvements for visitors can also have a direct benefit to the services and cultural facilities available to York residents and overall improvements of York as a place to live. Although it is likely that these benefits will be concentrated in the city centre. Actions to widen the spread of visitor attractions and accommodation throughout the City of York may help achieve wider benefits.</li> <li>- Improvements to the night time economy will be beneficial for residents of York, although care needs</li> </ul>		

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			to be taken to ensure that over concentration of bars, clubs or restaurants in any one area does not harm the amenity for local residents.		
<b>City Centre AAP Issues and Options - July 2008</b>	PPS1 PPS6 PPG15 PPG16	<p>RSS (2008) Community Strategy Local Transport Plan Emerging Core Strategy Emerging YNW AAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considers what specific measures are needed in the city centre to deliver the objective of the core strategy.</li> <li>- Sets out the issues that are critical to address how to take the city centre forward and options on how these may be tackled.</li> <li>- areas of the city centre selected which are considered to not fulfil their potential but have potential to help deliver the vision for the city centre.</li> <li>- City centre boundary revisions proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The vision objectives seem to be comprehensive in the issues they cover.</li> <li>- There is a gap in the community life vision for an objective addressing safety and perception of the city centre whereby this is aiming to be improved. It may be valuable to highlight this in the vision section as well as including this as an issue in the community life section to highlight the safer York strategic element of York's Community Strategy.</li> <li>- The vision would also benefit from strengthening the participatory role of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would benefit from clearer links to Core Strategy's strategic policies, thus setting limits of AAP. Spatial Vision should flow from Core Strategy but still be locally specific.</li> <li>- Need to establish more detail in strategy and site allocations, e.g. number of houses, scale and mix of commercial development expected to achieve so that AAP can be incorporated into emerging core strategy.</li> <li>- Support for the issues covered</li> <li>- Major issue is sustainable transport. Need to transform poor infrastructure.</li> <li>- Unless plans are economically viable or Government funded they are a waste of time.</li> <li>- Design should be treated as a crosscutting issue.</li> <li>- Whole document could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change but more detail added to core strategy approach.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			visitors to and residents of the city centre in activities and events. The objective “more opportunities and places to express and sample culture from across the city” could be strengthened to include participation as a key objective for city centre events.	stronger on Climate Change and environmental protection	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPS1 PPS6 PPG15 PPG16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain the city centre as the primary focus for new retail, leisure, tourist and office development, as well as reinforcing its role as the cultural and social hub of the sub-region.</li> <li>- The use and quality of public spaces, as well as links between them and to the rivers, will be comprehensively reviewed, and priority areas identified where improvements are needed now.</li> <li>- Areas on the periphery of the city centre (gateway streets) will be subject to audit and review in order to see how they are performing and how they can be lifted in economic, social and environmental terms.</li> <li>- Opportunities will also be taken to provide for new homes within the city centre, and to improve recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy should reference the preparation of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal to help promote a proactive approach to development based upon an understanding of what makes the characteristics of York unique and special.</li> <li>- The City Centre Area Action needs to pick up the issues that focus on the provision of specific sites for development and regeneration, housing,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach should be more positive to ensure that the centre develops its role as the primary focus for retail, leisure, tourism and office development.</li> <li>- Should provide a stronger hook for the AAP with a diagram and mini brief.</li> <li>- should contain more detail as to the scale of development proposed for the city centre; the range and mix of uses; and the infrastructure needed to achieve this.</li> <li>- Should define the city centre boundary should place more emphasis on the evening economy and tourism and cultural opportunities</li> <li>- City centre could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New policy added to reflect consultation responses and the preparation of an AAP.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		and community facilities.	sustainable design and construction, including the prudent use of energy and resources and a framework for decision-making to fully meet sustainable development objectives.	preserved as a tourist and cultural destination with functions such as other economic activities and residential moved out of the centre. - City centre sites in need of regeneration should be the focus of economic development. - Should use all available elements of the city centre, such as space above shops and empty buildings before out of centre locations. - Support for enhancing and extending the public realm, particularly public spaces; gateway streets; and footstreets. - Should emphasise the importance of linking the city centre and York Central highlighting the future role the latter will have in supporting the city centre, particularly though the provision of retail and employment.	
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September</b>	PPS6	- York New City Beautiful: Towards an Economic Vision (2010) - Retail Study (2008) - Preserve and enhance the special	- Overall positive impact across the SA objectives. - The policy no longer references a	- Concern about the feasibility of the provision of the number of dwellings in the city centre and the lack of detail on location, type, tenure and	- The policy wording is more comprehensive detailing the

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
2011		<p>qualities and distinctiveness of the City Centre including its unique legacy of historic assets and its natural environment through revitalising the streets, places and spaces of the centre, whilst delivering key commercial developments, vital to ensuring the continued prosperity of the City as a whole and delivering new homes that promote sustainable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>- To be delivered through the AAP, securing retail, office and residential development at key city centre centres, guiding development through a series of development principles, the enhancement and development of 8 areas of change and promoting accessibility and movement.</p>	<p>framework for decision making, which was originally positive for this. Recommends that this is reinstated in the strategic policy to be carried through into the AAP.</p>	<p>justification for their delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reservations about the scale of comparison retail floor space identified for the York Central site, post 2020 and that the policy conflicts with current council policy to develop out-of-town shopping centres.</li> <li>- Clarification sought on what an area of change is. Others agreed in principle to the proposed areas of change but considered them to be too large or neither properly defined nor justified.</li> <li>- Several respondents offered comments relating to movement and accessibility around the city centre, including comments on street furniture, highway configurations and the effects of (alcohol) licensing and planning, on the city centre environment.</li> </ul> <p>Support for the approach to movement and accessibility, adding that the rivers should be used more as strategic transport links.</p>	<p>plans for the city centre to be delivered by the City Centre Area Action Plan</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Economic and Retail Growth Visioning Study (2013)</li> <li>- Consultation Draft City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance (2013)</li> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper Update (2013)</li> <li>- New City Beautiful: Toward an Economic Vision (2011)</li> <li>- York Visitor Survey 2011 - 2012 (2011)</li> <li>- York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</li> <li>- City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework (2011)</li>   <li>- York City Centre recognised as the economic, social and cultural heart of York and that it is vital to the character and future economic success of the wider city.</li> <li>- Its special qualities and distinctiveness will be conserved whilst helping to achieve economic and social aspirations of the Plan.</li> <li>- The streets, places and spaces of the City Centre will be revitalised and key commercial developments will be delivered.</li> <li>- Proposed revisions to city centre boundary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The preferred policy approach would have positive and significant positive effects on a range of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects in any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- The reasonable alternative was not considered to perform better, in sustainability terms, than the preferred option.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received including no mention of theatres and that the potential for more homes with the conversion of offices/shops to houses should be taken into account, more needs to be done to convert empty properties to residential use as set out in the upper floors study and</li> <li>- There was support for expanding city centre boundary but more information and justification for proposed changes needed</li> <li>- Highlighted that Castle Piccadilly ST20 is not deliverable- all references to it should be excluded from the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference to Areas of Change removed to reflect changes to national guidance and the requirement for proposals to be viable and deliverable.</li> <li>- Quantum of development revised to reflect up to date evidence base.</li> </ul>

**Policy topic: York Central**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selective Review of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG12)(2004)</li> <li>- Emerging RSS</li> <li>- Sub Regional Investment Plan</li> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Planning Brief for York Central (2004)</li>   <li>- Creates an opportunity to allow for the additional development needs of the City to be accommodated in a sustainable location.</li> <li>- A mixed use new neighbourhood underpins the vision including residential, employment and leisure uses and quality civic and open spaces.</li> <li>- Also includes the creation of a modern, central business district, to complement the City Centre and expand and diversify the City's urban economy. It would provide specialist office and business space for Science City York uses and a wider range of</li> </ul>	<p>- York Central, due to the central location and close proximity to the railway station, shops and other services, is likely to have positive benefits against a range of sustainability objectives, particularly by reducing the need to travel, and regenerating an area of central York and therefore bringing improvements to the built environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for acknowledging York Northwest as a major regeneration area and promotion as a mixed-use development site</li> <li>- Recommend that a York Central specific policy is introduced in the Core Strategy</li> <li>- Wish to see York Central prioritised and promoted as a mixed-use or central business district, although the Core Strategy should be realistic about timescales and what the site can accommodate as well as the need for satisfactory infrastructure.</li> <li>- Opportunities for retail expansion into York Central</li> <li>- Need to consider local services requirements arising from new development, particularly major developments such as York Northwest.</li> <li>- School provision for York Northwest should account should be taken of existing school provision in the locality.</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		office and headquarter functions.			
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging RSS for Yorkshire and the Humber (Submission Draft, December 2005)</li> <li>- HMA (June 2007)</li> <li>- The Future York Group Report</li>   <li>- Identified as major development site, as part of York Northwest</li> <li>- Likely to make a significant contribution to York’s housing need, the regional economy and York’s role within the Leeds City Region.</li> <li>- An Area Action Plan is being prepared to ensure the environmental impact and infrastructure requirements are assessed comprehensively and the opportunities from the development of the sites are maximised.</li> <li>- Access York project to include the provision of a new bridge access into the York Central site to provide a public transport (plus non motorised transport) only access to the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area would be the preferred approach to protect the natural environment and make the best use of land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report – November 2007</b>	- PPS1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline report produced alongside issues and options AAP which drew on a range of evidence base documents.</li> <li>- Document covered York Central and British Sugar sites.</li> <li>- Draft vision and range of objectives set out for consultation</li> <li>- Starting point for vision for both sites is to create an exemplar sustainable community, providing innovative, contemporary design of the highest quality – a development which is fully integrated with the city and the wider region, where people want to live and work and business will thrive.</li> <li>- A range of issues and options presented for the wider site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The concept of sustainability and the creation of a sustainable and inclusive community are at the core of the York Northwest draft vision and suggested objectives and this approach is welcomed by the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>- Contains many policy approaches that should help ensure that new development is compatible with the sustainability appraisal objectives.</li> <li>- In determining the preferred options for development at York Northwest, it will be necessary to consider the cumulative impact of policy decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for locating office and light industrial uses (B1) on both York Central and British Sugar sites</li> <li>- Higher density housing was supported at York Central</li> <li>- The most popular option was to provide a range of small scale shopping and community facilities across the site. The second most popular option is providing two local centres one at York Central and one at British Sugar.</li> <li>- There was a high level of support for developing a cultural quarter around the NRM to link with the Museum gardens/Minster.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- PPS6</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	- Identified as major development site, as part of York Northwest	- Provide opportunity for significant employment space	- The section should provide a stronger hook for the Area Action Plan (AAP) with a diagram and a	- Approach to York Central the same as the Local Plan

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Options – June 2009</b></p>		<p>- Economically it will allow York to fulfil its regional and sub regional role. It has the potential to make a significant contribution to meeting the City’s need for homes, within the wider context of creating sustainable neighbourhoods, and could have a role in enhancing York’s retail offer. Given the location of the York Central area, adjacent to the historic core, it could also have a key role in enhancing York’s commercial, leisure and tourism offer as part of a new urban quarter.</p> <p>- This will be progressed through the York Northwest AAP</p>	<p>and new employment opportunities as well as delivering jobs with training and career prospects for those starting with low skills</p> <p>- Potential to create a vibrant mixed community</p> <p>- Potential to conserve or enhance biodiversity through careful design and provision of new green space</p> <p>- Focusing development in urban areas will help to reduce generation of polluting emissions and greenhouse gases</p> <p>- New development provides the opportunity to promote sustainable design and construction, resource efficiency and renewable energy generation</p>	<p>mini brief</p> <p>- The approach needs more justification and the development numbers need to be translated into the broader strategy.</p> <p>- The site is a massive opportunity holding great significance for York and is essential to achieving the Core Strategy vision, but the proposals seemed to show a lack of ambition for the area.</p> <p>- Should define the boundary of the YNW site.</p> <p>- General support for the uses on the sites.</p>	<p>(2005). Approach now indicates the preparation of an AAP for the York Northwest area.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			- Series of recommendations made.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS1	<p>- York New City Beautiful – Towards an Economic Vision (2010)</p> <p>- Site allocated as a strategic allocation.</p> <p>- The aim is to realise a new piece of city that complements and enhances the historic core, retains and promotes the qualities of York and connects and integrates into the surrounding built and natural form.</p> <p>- The delivery of York Central Strategic Allocation as a new piece of City will have important economic benefits for the City and region.</p> <p>- Will enable the City to accommodate a significant part of the physical expansion required for a regionally significant employment location along with making a key contribution to meeting the City's housing needs.</p> <p>- Reflecting the opportunities for highly sustainable development the site is being</p>	<p>- The detail of the new policy has taken on board some of the recommendations made at the Preferred Option stage.</p> <p>- Principles for development which are positive in terms of sustainability</p> <p>- The majority of impacts will be determined upon implementation and through the development of the SDD</p> <p>- Particularly positive for the achieving social objectives and aiming to minimise any environmental impacts</p>	<p>- Support for the recognition given to the York Northwest corridor as the most significant area of regeneration in York, and the distinction made between the two strategic allocations in the corridor.</p> <p>- Supported for the intention to preserve and enhance the heritage assets of the corridor in the delivery of its development and requirement, in Policy CS3, for York Central to be developed as a place outstanding quality and design complementing the city.</p> <p>- Concerns in relation to the deliverability of the York Central site in the timescale indicated in the targets/policy CS3 and given the current economic climate.</p> <p>- Questioned whether York Central could physically accommodate the level of growth in terms of offices, housing and retail specified.</p> <p>- More alternatives should be set out in the Core Strategy, including the release of further land (presumably from the Green Belt).</p>	<p>- New policy added to split up York Northwest site into York Central and British Sugar.</p> <p>- Site to be delivered through an SPD not an AAP as previously.</p> <p>- The policy has significantly changed.</p> <p>- The wording and emphasis of the policy has completely changed to form two policies, one for each strategic site.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>promoted as an Urban Eco Settlement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Series of principles of development set out to guide proposals.</li> </ul>			
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York Northwest Transport Masterplan (2012)</li> <li>- Leeds City Region Housing and Investment Plan 2010 – 2014+ (Leeds City Region and Homes and Community Agency 2010)</li> <li>- York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Baseline Report (2007)</li> <li>- York Northwest Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report (2007)</li> </ul> <p>- York Central is allocated as a Special Policy Area.</p> <p>- This Special Policy Area will enable the creation of a new piece of the city; with exemplar mixed development including a world class urban quarter forming part of the City Centre. This will include; a new central business district, expanded and new cultural and visitor facilities, residential uses and a new vibrant residential community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Likely to maximise long-term positive impacts on the social, environmental and economic objectives given that this approach can remain flexible but comprehensive and respond to changing circumstances on this site over its medium to long-term delivery timescale</li> <li>- Of the Alternatives, the option to provide detailed criteria / site allocations was also considered to have a significant positive effect on the historic environment.</li> <li>- This would be beneficial in the site in the short-term, it would generally lack a mechanism of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall there was support for the policy with a number of general comments received. There were also a number of objections received</li> <li>- Concern about the scale of office provision proposed, in view of the difficulties in bringing the site forward the proposed level of office, provision should not be an excuse for not providing offices elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site now a special policy area with reduced quantum of development, to address the difficulties the Council and its partners have faced in delivering York Central it bringing forward the site as a coherent strategic allocation.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mix of uses set out alongside a series of development principles</li> <li>- Further detail to be set out in an SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>responding to change and issues which may arise or influence the site's development. As such, this alternative was not considered to perform better, in sustainability terms, than the preferred option.</p>		

**Policy Topic: Scale of Employment Growth**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<p>- PPG4</p>	<p>- Employment Land Allocations were based on 19,000 net increase in jobs from 2000-2021 which equated to 55ha for Premier Employment Land, and 28.6ha for Standard Employment Land. - Factors taken into account in relation to future employment sites included: market requirements which were produced by consultants Segal Quince Wicksteed and development constraints.</p>	<p>- Through studies carried out for the City of York Local Plan it was agreed that the economy of York should continue to grow and provide more jobs in the future, but overtime fall in line with the growth levels of a better performing UK economy by 2021. This was identified as the 'medium' growth rate. - Monitoring evidence has shown that the take-up of employment land is not coming forward at the levels expected. The overprovision of employment land was a key issue.. These suggested a review of employment sites and reallocating them where necessary and ensuring employment sites that are more compatible with sustainability objectives are prioritised.</p>	<p>- There was a balance between respondents who felt that the growth figure put forward of 19,000 was too low and those who thought it was too high. Concerns were raised in relation to the capacity of York to accommodate the levels of proposed employment growth and the increase in congestion that would result from more in-commuting. - Some considered it more appropriate that the 19,000 jobs were achieved within the York sub-region rather than just in York. - A number of respondents highlighted the need to balance the number of jobs against the number of homes.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging RSS requirement (Submission draft, 2005) 5447 additional jobs 2006-2016 (545 jobs per year).</li> <li>-- Estimate land requirement of 21ha</li> <li>- Employment Land Review (ELR) produced by Consultants SQW 16,000 additional jobs 2006-2021 (1060 jobs per year) Estimate land requirement of 23ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The amount and location of employment development has a key role to play in securing sustainable development in York.</li> <li>- Concern over too many sites being allocated then there is the risk that those more favoured by the market and not necessarily best in terms of sustainability are developed first</li> <li>- There are also sustainability impacts if too few sites are allocated as this could lead to difficulties delivering the economic growth required in the area, constraining access to jobs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of respondents supported either ELR figures or the higher figures emerging through the RSS.</li> <li>- Whilst it was recognised that the RSS would contain figures on future employment growth, several responses put more weight on the figures expressed in the emerging ELR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment growth figures reflected the emerging RSS and the Employment Land Review.</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG4</li> <li>- Draft PPS4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Land Review 2 produced by consultants Entec indicated a job total growth between 2006-2029 of 25,600. The projection of the annual job growth to 2029 was forecast as 1,113. The total land requirement was 49.6ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A larger amount of land would be required for employment and this would have clear impacts on the take up of greenfield land and consequently biodiversity, landscape and the historic character. It would also</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 43% of respondents agreed with the number of predicted jobs.</li> <li>- 48% of the sample believed the number of predicted jobs should be lower.</li> <li>- The remaining 9% of respondents said that the number should be higher.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment growth figures reflect Employment Land Review 2.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			achieve a higher number of jobs than the workforce available, which would lead to in-commuting and the impacts on the ecological footprint of the city, which could lead to negative social impacts.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS4</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Topic Paper (2011) included re-evaluated projections of the two Employment Land Reviews due to the global financial crisis.</li> <li>- Stated that around 960 additional jobs per annum was a realistic average figure for the LDF period.</li> <li>- Conclusions based on a slightly lower employment levels compared with the previous figures however a larger margin of choice to be adopted when converting employee numbers into a land requirement for these sectors which results in a position very similar in land requirement to the earlier Employment Land ReviewStage 2 (2009).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy remains positive in achieving the economic objectives set out in the SA.</li> <li>- Central to the policy is the need to provide sufficient land to meet the requirements for job and business growth in the future. This relates to the target to achieve a job growth of 1000 jobs per annum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some respondents felt that 1000 jobs a year is too high in terms of the environmental capacity of York and unrealistic given the current economic climate, others felt that 1000 jobs is inadequate and should be amended (increased) to cover a wider skills range and to include reference to the wider role York has in the region.</li> <li>- Several respondents supported the conclusion that York can support a growth level of 1000 jobs per year and to identify land for employment development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due to the global financial crisis Arup consultants recalculated the employment growth figures and this new evidence base has been reflected.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	<p>Oxford Economic Forecasting (OEF) produced a series of projections for York for the period 2012 to 2030 as part of the City of York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (2013). Scenario 2 represented a 'policy-on' scenario based on faster growth in the following sectors for York: advanced manufacturing, science and research, financial and professional services, and tourism and leisure. This gave an employment growth forecast between 2012 and 2030 16,169.</p> <p>- Scenario 2 reflects the Council's ambitions as set out in the York Economic Strategy. Felt to be the most realistic in terms of reflecting the national economy.</p>	<p>- The preferred policy approach would deliver an estimated 16,169 jobs over the plan period, facilitating faster growth in advanced manufacturing, science and research, financial and professional services, and tourism and leisure sectors.</p> <p>- This is expected to support the realisation of the York Economic Strategy, helping the City fulfil its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region</p> <p>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant negative effects on any of the SA</p>	<p>- The plan is unrealistic and over ambitious in the current economic climate.</p> <p>- Growth must be controlled and sustainable and take account of falls in employment.</p> <p>-- Concern over 1000 jobs per year figure and how these jobs will be created.</p> <p>- No data clarifying the amount of empty employment space, there is no way of predicting extra floor levels if this isn't taken into account.</p> <p>- Co-location of start-up social enterprises linked to the need for more small office space should be added.</p>	<p>- Changes made to reflect new evidence base.</p>

## Policy Topic: Location of Employment Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Securing the Future' (2005)</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites identified to meet the projected demand for 55ha premier employment land, and 28.6ha standard employment land.</li> <li>- Major employment allocations are reserved for business (B1), general industrial (B2) and storage or distribution (B8) uses, in addition to several smaller allocations (0.5ha or less).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The location of employment land can have a substantial impact on establishing travel patterns in the area and reducing peoples' need to travel. As reducing the length and amount of trips people make to meet everyday needs is a key component of delivering more sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents agree with a new office quarter at York Central. 58% of the sample agree with office development as part of the redevelopment at Terry's, whilst 56% said as part of the redevelopment at Nestle. Just over half (51%) of respondents think office development should be at Monks Cross, whilst 48% said as part of the redevelopment of Layerthorpe.</li> <li>- Respondents were least likely to agree that office development should be in York city centre (37%).</li> <li>- Development should be located where employees can access the site using methods of transport other than the private car, however public transport infrastructure needs to be improved to accommodate new job growth.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three options put forward that could guide the identification of sites</li> <li>Option 1: Apply the following site criteria:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) use of previously developed land (ii)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area would be the preferred approach to protect the natural environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was considered locations near good public transport that would result in the reduced use of the private car would make jobs more accessible.</li> <li>- The majority of employment should be focused in York itself. In</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>promote city and district centre locations, followed by sites within the main urban area before considering other options; (iii) Market demand; (iv) Site accessibility by: public transport; the rail network; and walking and cycling; (v) Proximity to University and other institutions; and (vi) Other factors.</p> <p>Option 2: Apply the criteria shown in Option 1, but prioritise market demands.</p> <p>Option 3: Apply the criteria as shown in Option 1, but prioritise other factors identified</p>	<p>and make the best use of land. The SA supports an approach that sees accessibility by public transport as key consideration in the location of new employment sites.</p> <p>- Where employment land choice is left for developers to decide they may prefer greenfield locations with lower development costs. This may be to the detriment of attempts to regenerate previously developed sites within the urban area with impacts on the opportunities to improve the built environment, as well as resulting in the inefficient use of land.</p>	<p>contrast some felt that due to the historic value of the city centre, its more appropriate to develop satellite employment parks on the periphery. Some sites in the green belt might be more sustainable in accessibility terms and should therefore be considered.</p> <p>- Broadly, respondents supported making use of brownfield land and promoting a hierarchy of locations, with a priority for city and district centres before considering other options.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<p>- Five options for how the LDF could respond to the changing character of York's economy</p> <p>Option 1: Support the continued development of Science City York and other knowledge-led</p>	<p>- Important that the core strategy pursue an approach that delivers equal access to employment that matches the skills of the residents.</p> <p>- Concern that jobs</p>	<p>- Locating offices near the train station will encourage inward commuting.</p> <p>- Public transport infrastructure needs to be improved to accommodate new job growth.</p> <p>- Sites in need of regeneration should be the focus for economic</p>	<p>- The priority of location of employment growth remains the city centre, with need in smaller, rural locations</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>businesses.</p> <p>Option 2: Promote financial and professional service activities.</p> <p>Option 3: Attempt through the provision of sites to readdress the decline in the manufacturing sector.</p> <p>Option 4: Promote creative industries</p> <p>Option 5: Support and promote other sectors of the economy .</p> <p>- Three options for guiding the identification of employment sites</p> <p>Option 1: Apply the site criteria.</p> <p>Option 2: Apply the criteria but prioritise market demand.</p> <p>Option 3: Apply the criteria but prioritise other factors identified.</p>	<p>promoted though high tech industries and Science City York would only be suitable for certain highly qualified people.</p> <p>Supporting this type of business however, is acknowledged to have potentially significant beneficial impacts for economic growth and the stability of York's economy.</p> <p>- Support for prioritising economic development on previously developed land in the urban area.</p>	<p>development before Green Belt sites.</p> <p>- The strategy should include small scale employment for local needs through reinvestment in declining areas.</p> <p>- Question why some of the B1a offices are proposed out of centre when Sub Regional City Centres like York should be the focus for offices.</p>	<p>acknowledged for diversification of employment.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<p>- Will support sustainable economic growth delivering increased prosperity whilst respecting the City's special built and natural environment and addressing the challenges posed by climate change. -</p>	<p>- The SA supports that the majority of sites to be delivered are located within the subregional centre which is positive in terms of accessibility and connectivity across the city but also for</p>	<p>- Some respondents felt that the supply of land for 'B' Class uses is inadequate and the Core Strategy fails to address current deficiencies let alone make provision for future growth in these sectors.</p> <p>- Others felt that the policy criteria will not ensure there is a supply of appropriate sites to meet the full</p>	<p>- The former policy has been split into two with the overarching principles.</p> <p>- The general policy approach remains the same with more detail to</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of employment land for the period 2011–2031 will be made, through the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and City Centre AAP, to accommodate the levels of growth. This will be in conformity with Spatial Principles 1, 2 and 3.</li> </ul>	<p>businesses. The SA is cautious however, over the delivery of employment site on the periphery of the sub-regional area as this may increase car trips.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supports the policy’s approach to rural industry and diversification in addition to other stated industries</li> </ul>	<p>range of market and employment demand during the plan period, and does not provide support for expansion of existing employment sites.</p>	<p>include more information relating to the retention of existing sites within York.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council will support development proposals in appropriate highly accessible locations, which attract commercial investment, maintain economic competitiveness and provide employment opportunities for the local community.</li> <li>- In order to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy, the Local Plan will make appropriate provision to allow the city to reach its economic growth aspirations.</li> <li>- A number of employment locations are priority areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment has identified that criteria and site allocations should ensure that economic development is in locations that: Reduce the need to travel and/or encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Avoid adverse impacts on the City’s built and natural environmental assets. Are appropriate for specific uses, avoiding adverse impacts on health. Make best use of previously developed land and are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that the policy is not ambitious enough and is responding to forecasts rather than reflecting local conditions.</li> <li>- Employment allocations unevenly spread across the City;</li> <li>- Existing employment sites should be fully occupied before further development takes place.</li> <li>- Critical shortage of small industrial uses.</li> <li>- Fails to meet the quality and location requirements for knowledge and bio-based industries;</li> <li>- Infrastructure is nearing capacity in areas suggested for employment expansion;</li> <li>- No mention of well connected and designed Green Infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broadly, the steer of allocations remains the same, in the urban area in the first instance with employment uses elsewhere responding to identified need.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		for development or redevelopment and infrastructure funding to support growth in key economic sectors:	accessible to areas of employment deprivation.	- There is no real provision for tourism and leisure uses.	

**Policy topic: Approach to Retail**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<p>- PPS6</p>	<p>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners 2004)</p> <p>- Retail growth scenarios given including static market share, rising market share and falling market share.</p> <p>- Options given on the location and distribution of new retail development including continuing priority to York City Centre as the main focus of retailing activity, encourage new retail development in edge of centre sites, concentrate on district centre retailing, identify areas outside the City Centre for retail growth and assess deficiencies in the provision of local convenience shopping and identify opportunities for remediation.</p>	<p>- Overall, the approaches put forward for retail in the Issues and Options document are compatible with sustainable development.</p> <p>- The overall growth of retail and new floorspace should be based on needs, and the ability for York to accommodate these facilities sustainably without the need for unnecessary use of greenfield land, or development in locations only easily accessible by private transport modes.</p> <p>- Priority for all types of shop must be given to city centre in line with national policy.</p>	<p>- Options for retail growth should not solely relate to the city centre, but should consider all retail in York. Should consider the impact on York’s historic character and be dependent on traffic impacts.</p> <p>- No need to compete with other shopping destinations because York offers something different</p> <p>- Should focus on unique character, protection of existing shops and qualitative aspects more than growth per se.</p> <p>- Should develop flexible retailing policies and seek to continually review retailing capacity, demand and viability.</p> <p>- Most respondents supported giving priority to the city centre with possible extensions rather than identifying areas outside the city centre for retail growth.</p> <p>- Respondents supported maintaining the diversity of shops with support for more specialist and independent shops and for making more of the current market facilities, as well as suggesting the development of a permanent</p>	<p>- N/A</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				<p>indoor farmers market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Widespread support for more food stores in the city centre and the provision of local convenience shops in district and local shopping centres.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The York Retail Study (Roger Tym and Partners 2004)</li> <li>- Two approaches put forward for growth: York continues to hold onto its share of the regional market; or York increases its share of the regional retail market.</li> <li>- Three options put forward for key areas of retail growth: Direct growth first to York City Centre, then to Acomb and Haxby district centres; or as above and also identify an additional centre/centres to provide for the new need likely to be generated by the City's major development opportunities, such as York Northwest. Final option as first option and also recognise Monks Cross or Clifton Moor as district centres.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would be most suitable to see retail growth in York grow to a level that was effective in retaining as large as possible share of spend of York and existing catchment area residents, without encouraging visits for further away where needs can be met more locally.</li> <li>- Will be important to ensure that the retail centre of York is not performing at too an intense a level that causes harm to the city centre, including historic character and the well-being of residents. This includes discouraging traffic congestion throughout York.</li> <li>- Any new shopping areas need to be provided on a good public transport access route into the city centre this could help overcome some adverse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			impacts of either increased pressure on the old centre or inaccessible out-of-town centres.		
<b>Allocations DPD Issues and Options - March 2008</b>	- PPS6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Retail Study (2004)</li> <li>- Will identify sites to reflect the approach in the Core Strategy and consider all types of retail including food and non food and different retail locations including the city centre, local and district centres and out of centre locations.</li> <li>- Two sites put forward and stated that City Centre retail issues will also be considered through work on the City Centre AAP.</li> <li>- A number of options put forward as follows.</li> <li>- Is Castle Piccadilly an appropriate site retail expansion of the city centre.</li> <li>- Is Land West of Hungate (R/002) appropriate for retail development?</li> <li>- Are there any other sites that would appropriate for retail development?</li> <li>- Should sites be allocated for particular types of</li> </ul>	- Two retail sites (Castle Piccadilly and Hungate) put forward for consideration in the DPD assessed against the indicators and sustainability criteria and scored favourably.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of up to date evidence relating to retail capacity and retail need</li> <li>- York Central is a suitable site to accommodate additional retail floorspace in the context of the findings of the 2004 Retail Study</li> <li>- Provision of enhanced facilities on land at Monks Cross and adjacent to Designer Outlet, Naburn would be complementary to and support existing town centre facilities.</li> <li>- Mixed response to two proposed allocations at Castle Piccadilly and Hungate</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		shops? If so, what types of shops and where?			
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS6	<p>- Regional Spatial Strategy (2008)</p> <p>- York's Retail Study (GVA Grimley LLP 2008)</p> <p>Strengthening the role of York as a sub-regional shopping centre. Decline in the city centre market share is halted and then increased to a 34% share in order to maintain York's position in the wider regional retail hierarchy.</p> <p>- Significant capacity identified for additional retail floorspace up to 2029. In accordance with the spatial strategy, the priority for this additional floorspace will be within, or adjacent to, the central shopping area of the city centre (i.e. Castle Piccadilly and the Stonebow</p> <p>- The preferred approach is to also consider whether additional retail capacity, over and above that which can be achieved within the city centre, could and should be delivered on York Central (part of York Northwest Area Action Plan). Further work has been</p>	<p>- The best solution for York would be to see growth at a level that was effective in retaining its market share without encouraging visits further away where needs can be met locally.</p> <p>- Increasing the market share may encourage travelling to York for services and impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from traffic.</p> <p>- The provision of retail would have a positive relationship with social sustainability objectives of accessibility and equity of access as well as some economic objectives. However, the SA also recognised the potential impacts on the historic environment need to be mitigated to ensure no adverse impacts on the historic environment and related sectors of the economy.</p> <p>- Focussing development within the city centre and</p>	<p>- It is essential to the economic well being of York that retail in the city centre continues to thrive</p> <p>- York does not need to strengthen its role as a sub-regional shopping and entertainment centre.</p> <p>- There is a need for further analysis and assessment of York's retail issues, including diversion of high valued goods to out-of-town locations; accessibility by car for high value goods and ancillary social and cultural needs; improved town centre management; and key anchors for expanded retail offer.</p> <p>- Support for increase market share, others thought it was too high</p> <p>- Range of comments on location of retail.</p>	- No changes from approach in Local Plan 2005, albeit market share figures have been updated in light of evidence base

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		commissioned to consider potential options for retail on York Central.	two district centres would help to encourage accessible retail via sustainable transport. However, it also recognised that limiting retail to just these areas may not help to achieve or maintain its role in the region in terms of market share and that there should be access to smaller shopping areas within new development.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retail Supporting Paper (2011)</li> <li>- York Retail Study (2008)</li> <li>- To deliver new shopping provision to support the vitality and viability of the City Centre and meet local shopping needs.</li> <li>- Prioritising new retail development in the City Centre;</li> <li>- Meeting identified local needs for modern units; an enhanced department store offer; and further convenience floorspace in the City Centre. As well as further convenience floorspace in other smaller centres, including a new local centre on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will help to secure retail provision with the city centre as a primary consideration whilst also developing new retail provision in the future subject to further impact testing.</li> <li>- Welcomes the new policy's strengthened approach for the sequential development of retail in York prioritising the city centre primarily over other development.</li> <li>- The inclusion for York to achieve 34% market share has been removed from the policy. This is considered to have taken pressure off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the approach taken, in particular the increased commitment to sequential development was welcomed and the recognition that out of centre retail development is appropriate where it satisfies the sequential approach. Another respondent welcomed most of the targets and in particular the target to increase convenience floorspace.</li> <li>- Should set out the Council's approach to future growth at out of centre destinations; this should be more restrictive for the Designer Outlet than for Clifton Moor and Monks Cross due to its location in the Green Belt and outside of the Ring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach however the structure has changed to reflect a hierarchical approach to the provision of retail in the future. This has been captured through structuring the policy to support the city centre, identify needs for comparison and</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>the Former British Sugar/Manor School Strategic Allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capturing as much of the available retail expenditure in the catchment as possible (as identified in latest retail study) in highly accessible locations that will not have an unacceptable impact on the City Centre.</li> </ul>	<p>York to achieve a certain share but rather more aim at retaining its market share through the protection of the city and through the identification of 2 strategic sites for retail.</p>	<p>Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of York Designer Outlet as an out of centre retail destination welcomed. Suggested it can contribute to additional comparison floorspace.</li> <li>- Monks Cross should be given greater recognition in this section.</li> <li>- Policy does not provide sufficient flexibility. Several respondents suggested that the policy should not prescribe floorspace levels.</li> <li>- Several comments about the deliverability of specific retail schemes, including Castle Piccadilly and York Central and what the strategy would be if they cannot be delivered.</li> <li>- Concern was raised about the impact of the community stadium proposals currently going through the planning application procedure on the retail objectives and policy approach.</li> </ul>	<p>convenience retail and stating a sequential assessment approach to any other retail schemes put forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy has put the city centre at the forefront of the policy and objectives and aims to support its vitality and viability. This is an addition from the previous policy and is significant in highlighting and reinforcing that the city centre is the priority to be maintained in the future.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options –</b>	- NPPF	- City of York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (2013)	- The preferred approach is considered likely to have significant positive effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the preferred policy approach.</li> <li>- Preference should be given to</li> </ul>	- No change, retains existing retail hierarchy

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
June 2013		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retail Supporting Paper (2011)</li> <li>- York Retail Study (2008)</li>   <li>-The vitality and viability of the City Centre, district and local centres will be maintained and enhanced through the retail hierarchy</li> <li>- The focus for major new retail development and investment will be the City Centre.</li> <li>- Proposals for main town centre uses will be directed sequentially to the Primary Shopping Area in the city centre and subsequently to the wider City Centre as a whole.</li> <li>- The creation of further floorspace or changes to the type of retail at these locations will only be permitted if the proposal is small in nature (less than 200 m2) and will not impact upon the city centre vitality and viability.</li> <li>- All retail (convenience and comparison) over 100 m2 in out of centre locations will be required to be supported by an impact and sequential assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>on the economy (SA Objective 4) as well as positive effects on equality and accessibility (SA Objective 5), transport (SA Objective 6), land use (SA Objective 9), cultural heritage (SA Objective 14) and landscape (SA Objective 15).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- None of the reasonable alternatives identified and assessed were considered to perform better than the preferred options against any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>out of centre locations in light of city centre schemes becoming unviable (Castle Piccadilly)</p> <p>Concern regarding the viability of the former British Sugar Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whinthorpe should be afforded district centre status within the retail hierarchy in order to be a sustainable location</li> <li>- There is a need for a detailed assessment of food retailing arising from anticipated growth</li> <li>- Concern the policy is already undermined with Monks Cross 2</li> <li>- Concern over a lack of ‘good quality/useful shops’ in the city centre. A need for further encouragement and promotion of this.</li> <li>- The Designer Outlet performs a wider tourism and specialist retail function and should not be constrained like other out of centre retail parks</li> <li>- The restriction of 200sq.m on new retail development in out of centre locations is inconsistent with the NPPF.</li> <li>- A lack of evidence to support the adoption of sequential and impact assessment requirement for retail over 100sq.m.</li> </ul>	



## Policy Topic: Scale of Housing Growth

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPS3	- Work still ongoing but proposed housing requirements for York are broadly similar to those in the Structure Plan and Local Plan, being 640(net) new units per annum in the period from 2004 to 2016 and 620(net) per annum in the period 2016-21.	- Determining the development of housing in the City of York is one of the key areas that the LDF can have an impact, and help to achieve more sustainable development.	- Concerns about the fact that no overall housing figures were included and that this meant it was difficult to assess what impact the figures would have on issues such as market demand, commuting and the special character of the city.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS3	- Range from 630 to 982 dwellings - Drawing of demographic and market demand - Other factors taken into consideration include development constraints and forecast economic growth	- Balance between jobs and homes needs to be found to achieve more self-containment. - Likely increase in RSS housing target and limited opportunity to depart from the RSS is a major influence.	- Core strategy should reflect most up to date RSS figures. (RSS not finalised at time of consultation) - Flexibility required to accommodate higher figures should need arise	- Reflects the most up to date figures in the adopted RSS
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS3	- RSS defined the requirement as 640 dwellings between 2004-8 and 850 dwellings 2008-26	- The level of provision for housing needs to ensure there are sufficient homes to accommodate the growth of the current population given the predicted drop in household size in the forthcoming years. The strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming	- 33% supported 850 figure and said the recession shouldn't be used to justify a lower figure - 59% preferred a lower figure which they felt better reflected the need for housing	- Reflects outgoing RSS and more recent national and local evidence



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy).		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS3 - Draft NPPF	- RSS provides start point - More recent national and local evidence refines this leading to proposal for 635 dwellings between 2011/12 to 2015/16 and 850 dwellings between 2016/17 to 2030/31	- Policy will help to deliver enough housing to meet need and demand for housing	- Targets should be higher and reflect 2008 DCLG projection. - There should not be a lower figure for early part of plan period - Others thought growth would not materialise and targets should be lower	- RSS revoked and its housing evidence base is outdated
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	- Review of evidence that underpins objectively assessed need. Options considered between 850 dwellings per annum and 2,060 - Preferred option was 1,090 dwellings per annum.	- Preferred approach will not have significant negative effects and will support the forecast job growth. It will not meet the SHMA target for affordable housing	- Provide local level policy to guide phasing of development and provide an allowance for windfall sites - 2011 household projections will lead to an undersupply of homes. The Council should plan more positively and aspire to the higher housing figures of Option 3 (1,500 dwellings) or Option 4 (2,060 dwellings) to meet economic and affordable housing needs. - Provision should be lower – below 850 per yr and give priority to brownfield sites. - The persistent record of under delivery of housing means the Council should be looking at a 20% buffer.	- Changes made to reflect new evidence base.

**Policy Topic: Location of Housing Growth**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPG3 - Emerging PPS3	- Primary focus for development is in the main built up area of York. - Outside urban areas urban extensions should be considered in the first instance followed by non urban sites.	- Determining the distribution and development of housing in the City of York is one of the key areas that the LDF can have an impact, and help to achieve more sustainable development.	- A number of respondents considered that the correct factors had not been identified and that other factors over and above those identified should be considered such as highway capacity, Green Belt boundary, access to a wider range of facilities, access to non-car transport modes, drainage, infrastructure quality, pollution, air quality, market demand, global environment change and limited natural resources. - Respondents considered that all the factors identified should be applied to both urban and non-urban sites and that the employment criteria should be applied to all types of development.	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS3	- Four options put forward: Option 1: Prioritising settlement accessibility Option 2: Prioritising existing trends Option 3: Prioritising housing need Option 4: A combination of the above broad factors	- Considering which villages and peripheral areas of York's main urban area have the capacity to accommodate growth is also of great significance to the spatial strategy.	- The majority of respondents to this issue supported Option 1.	N/A
<b>Core Strategy</b>	- PPS3	- It is not anticipated that housing land will be required	- The level of provision for housing	- Two-thirds (67%) of respondents agree that areas A and B are	- Move away from the reliance on

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Preferred Options – June 2009</b>		for the expansion until beyond 2021. The location of potential areas for these expansions are shown as 'Areas of Search' A and B. - Strategic growth will be concentrated on the urban York , limited small scale expansion of local services centres, villages and rural villages may be considered appropriate to address specific local needs such as affordable housing. This will be considered through the Allocations Development Plan Document.	needs to ensure there are sufficient homes to accommodate the growth of the current population given the predicted drop in household size in the forthcoming years. - The strategic approach will need to limit the amount of unsustainable sites coming forward through identifying planned growth areas (as per the spatial strategy).	suitable locations for building new homes. The remaining third (33%) do not agree. Half of these did not suggest an alternative, of those that did the main areas identified were: - Area E - Area F - Area D - Brownfield sites only - The areas of search should be brought forward earlier in the plan period, potentially for specific uses, to help deliver the aspirations for priority housing development.	windfall sites, in accordance with national policy and identification of areas of search for housing in the first instance.. - Reflect findings of HMA which will influence the mix, tenure and affordability of housing provided in the district over the next 20 years. - Reflect findings in the urban potential study.
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	- PPS3 - Draft NPPF	- Will meet future housing need and situate new housing in locations that support the Spatial Strategy. - The focus for new housing development will be the main urban area of York, with around 87% of new housing in the identified supply being within the main urban area and the remainder in the large villages and villages. York's LDF will identify broad	- Developments will be subject to the requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including the spatial strategy for their location. - Areas of search for urban extension will play a crucial role in delivering housing and new sustainable communities.	- It was suggested that safeguarded land over and above the areas of search should be identified. - Several respondents suggesting there is not enough justification and that the approach to housing growth is not based on a robust and credible evidence base. - Housing delivery has been set at a level that protects the Green Belt which is politically acceptable rather than meeting housing needs. - Housing growth proposed will	- The Spatial Principles have been reappraised against the SA framework given their overarching importance for this document and their revised wording in this edition of the Core Strategy.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing over the LDF period to achieve the housing target.		challenge infrastructure. Policy should be about how the City is going to accommodate this level of growth to ensure there is sufficient capacity to absorb, and cope with additional growth.	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An important part of the Plan’s vision is to ensure sustainable growth patterns. Growth is shaped by the character and setting of the city, environmental assets, flood risk, location sustainability and settlement capacity.</li> <li>- All sites subject to a detailed site selection methodology</li> <li>- Sites that passed the criteria in the methodology proposed for allocation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment has identified that criteria and site allocations should ensure that new housing development is directed to locations that reduce the need to travel and/or encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, avoid adverse impacts on the City’s built and natural environmental assets, avoid locations that could exacerbate existing health issues (e.g. AQMAs), make best use of previously developed land and incorporate service provision where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More small and medium sized developments should be allocated to allow development to come forward in the beginning of the plan period.</li> <li>- No trajectory to indicate delivery timescales from individual sites. It should be left to the market to bring forward sites as required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed allocated housing sites are identified in the housing chapter to meet need and to reflect NPPF policy.</li> </ul>

**Policy Topic: General Housing Market**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG13 PPG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Housing Needs Study will be updated in 2006 as part of the wider York Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- To provide sustainable new housing development, the LDF must provide for housing types and tenures that address local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New residential sites should be encouraged to contain a mix of house sizes and types, to accommodate diverse types of households to help encourage community cohesion.</li> <li>- There should be a range of other housing types.</li> <li>- Addressing the needs of other housing types, including students, the elderly, those with disabilities, and gypsies and travellers can help to achieve housing related sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents suggested that new housing development should in particular support the needs of specific groups (albeit through differing means).</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered that greater priority should be given to housing for vulnerable people as well as different needs.</li> <li>- The Core Strategy should seek to provide a more balanced mix of new housing. There should be no more flatted development.</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Housing Market Assessment considers the mix and type of housing that is likely to be needed in York. Whilst the main requirement in both the market and affordable housing sectors is for two bedroom properties, over 40% of the market demand and 25% of the affordable housing demand is for 3/4+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing homes to meet the varied needs of residents will be important in helping to provide a home for all that need it. There is a need to balance with a greater focus on family homes.</li> <li>- It may be necessary for the LDF to have greater intervention. In some instances it is not clear how the LDF policy will be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A broader mix of housing types should be provided across the city to meet the needs of all special needs groups, such as housing for families (rather than flats), younger people (perhaps with a youth warden), those who require wheelchair access or have visual or auditory handicaps, first time buyers, single people and young professionals, key workers,</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>bedroom properties. Broadly demand is for houses rather than flats, which falls in line with wider Government objectives to create mixed and balanced communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing should be provided to meet the needs of specialist groups. These groups have also been identified through the HMA.</li> <li>- The University of York's planned expansion will have extensive on-site accommodation to provide for the increase in student numbers.</li> </ul>	<p>effective in meeting specific requirements of certain groups.</p>	<p>and the needs of people who will work from home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently, sites developed for student accommodation are not required to contribute towards affordable housing. Some felt this should be addressed, and additionally that sites should also be allocated specifically for student housing, to avoid concentrations in certain areas of the city.</li> </ul>	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council will identify sites through the Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans to deliver the spatial strategy, in order to address York's locally identified housing needs, guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- In order to create a better balance across York's housing market, an overall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supported an approach to develop more family homes. The SA noted it may be suitable to continue to build flats in addition to more houses, albeit ones with more bedrooms, reception room space and high quality shared or private outside space.</li> <li>- There will be social benefits through more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF should support the level, type and mix of housing set out in RSS and an approach to student housing which includes local guidelines, objectives and allocations.</li> <li>- Over four-fifths (83%) of the sample agree that we should build more houses (around two thirds) than flats (around a third). 17% of respondents disagree that we should build</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar in ensuring that there is enough housing for the current and future residents and to allocate a range of housing sites to meet need.</li> <li>- Student housing now comes under the Aiding Choice in the Housing Market</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>mix of 70% houses:30% flats will need to be achieved. Site-specific mix standards will be developed through the Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans.</p>	<p>access to facilities as well as training and in supporting students through sufficient and designated dwellings.</p>	<p>houses rather than flats. - Around two-thirds (68%) of the sample agree that towards the end of the plan period there should be an increase to a greater number of smaller properties if this reflects the changing needs of York. The remaining third (32%) did not agree.</p>	<p>rather than separately under education.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>PPS1 PPS3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals for residential development must respond to the current evidence base, this will be achieved through the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Area Action Plan (AAP).</li> <li>- Delivering an overall mix of 70% houses:30% flats.</li> <li>- Higher Education Institutions address the need for any additional student accommodation which arises because of their future expansion.</li> <li>- Issues relating to student housing will be addressed both through the control of concentrations of HMOs and the provision of additional 'onsite' student accommodation to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy aim should enable different accommodation development to satisfy the needs identified through the evidence base as well as aiding social inclusion and the creation of vibrant communities.</li> <li>- Recommended that the policy includes specific information for the higher educational establishments that any future expansions should also include for accommodation for the corresponding amount of students anticipated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several comments pointed to the need for an updated Housing Market Assessment.</li> <li>- Further comments noted that the policy's stance that all new homes are built to 'Lifetime Homes' standard came in advance of the national requirement (2013 at the earliest), and was not justified by local evidence.</li> <li>- There was recognition that the needs of various groups in the city cannot be met with a 'one size fits all' approach, and that different groups (including older people, students, families with children) need housing which helps accommodate their specific needs and lifestyles. Furthermore, housing schemes should be diverse and adaptable, to</li> </ul>	<p>The most significant changes have included: Acknowledging the evidence base; More inclusion for specialist and housing and lifetime homes scheme; an approach to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and requiring the universities to meet student housing need.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		accommodate future expansion		<p>provide for people's changing needs throughout their lifetimes.</p> <p>- Some felt that specific allocations should be identified to provide for older people (including bungalows/sheltered housing) and students. Issues relating to student housing will be addressed both through the control of concentrations of HMOs and the provision of additional 'onsite' student accommodation to accommodate future expansion.</p>	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Local Plan will support housing development which helps to balance York's housing market, address local housing need and ensure that housing is adaptable to the needs of all of York's residents throughout their lives.</li> <li>- The Council will aim to deliver an overall mix of 70% houses to 30% flats over the plan period.</li> <li>- Any increases in higher education student numbers through any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach would help to guide housing mixes which reflect local circumstances and needs, whilst recognising the specialist needs of the population and responding to these accordingly. The evidence base identifies an increasingly complex housing market spatially and sectorally which demands policy can respond positively and flexibly to evolving needs. This approach would allow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All the conditions of policy seem inflexible and onerous as national policy does not require Lifetime Homes It should be voluntary, not compulsory</li> <li>It is the responsibility of the local authority to assess for the need for appropriate accommodation for those with severe learning disabilities, physical disabilities and dementia and integrate provision within the development.</li> <li>- Increase of facilities at universities should be met with</li> </ul>	Production of Draft Controlling the Concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and introduction of an article 4 direction means a threshold approach to HMOs is included in the policy approach to the housing market.



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>future expansion should be matched by increases in student accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Threshold approach to HMOs.</li> </ul>	<p>the Local Plan to set local requirement in meeting this overall need and mix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evidence base identifies an increasingly complex housing market spatially and sectorally which demands policy which can respond positively and flexibly to evolving needs.</li> </ul>	<p>specific accommodation proposals on campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for increased control of HMOs</li> <li>- The plan should provide design principles to ensure good quality accommodation.</li> </ul>	

**Policy Topic: Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	Planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites (2004)  PPG3 Housing	- Previous local plan approach of a criteria based policy for any sites put forward during the plan period.	- Addressing the needs gypsies and travellers through the LDF can help to achieve housing related sustainability objectives, though there are limits to the extent to which these issues can and should be addressed by the Core Strategy	- Provision for gypsy and travellers should be based on robust evidence to properly establish need. - York's LDF should plan for the provision of enough decent gypsy and traveller sites for York and that the core strategy should set out criteria for the location of gypsy and traveller sites.	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- Circular 01/06 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (2006). - Circular 04/2007 Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004) - PPG3 Housing	- At the time of publication a sub-regional needs assessment was being drafted to assess the likely need for Gypsy and Travellers.	- Providing homes to meet the varied needs of residents will be important in helping to provide a home for all that need it. For some types of homes it may be necessary for the LDF to have greater intervention, this includes Gypsy and Traveller sites. In some instances it is not clear how the LDF policy will be effective in meeting specific requirements of certain groups.	- Providing housing for this groups was identified as a key issue. Three key messages came to light through the consultation and emerging government guidance concerning Gypsy and Traveller housing needs. - Should meet at least the numbers of additional pitches identified by local assessments of housing need, allocate sites in Development Plan Documents and reduce the number of unauthorised encampments/developments.	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred</b>	- PPG 3: Housing - Circular 01/06	- Regional Spatial Strategy – The Yorkshire and Humber	- The policy could refer to addressing social inclusion and the need to	- The approach to gypsy, traveller and showperson's accommodation is not entirely in	- Approach broadly similar by including a criteria based

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Options – June 2009</b>	<p>Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (2006).</p> <p>- Circular 04/2007 Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004)</p>	<p>Plan to 2026 (2008)</p> <p>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008)</p> <p>- The LDF should meet at least the numbers of additional pitches identified by local assessments of housing need, allocate sites in Development Plan Documents and reduce the number of unauthorised encampments/developments.</p>	<p>improve relations between these groups and the surrounding communities.</p> <p>- The policy could make specific reference to enabling decent, appropriate, affordable housing for the Gypsy and Traveller community, consideration of the historic character and setting of York, recycling and reducing waste, opportunities to encourage water efficiency, the use of permeable surfaces as well as the incorporation of green space and need to avoid unacceptable flood risk when considering locations for sites.</p>	<p>accordance with Circular 1/2006, because the LDF does not state that all provision can definitely be met through identified provision.</p> <p>- Underestimation of need. Interim targets should be set to encourage site provision earlier in the plan period. Through an Allocations DPD or strategic sites in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>- Locations for new sites have the need for access to facilities and services as housing.</p>	<p>policy but no allocations.</p> <p>- Publication of the North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008) provides a known shortfall of pitches and plots for the York authority.</p>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<p>- PPS 3: Housing</p> <p>- Circular 01/06 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (2006).</p> <p>- Circular 04/2007</p>	<p>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008)</p> <p>North Yorkshire Accommodation Requirements of Showmen (2009)</p>	<p>- New separate reference to 'Showpeople'.</p> <p>This policy responds well to the need detailed in the evidence base to increase the number of temporary and permanent locations</p>	<p>Common themes relating to Gypsy, Traveller and Showmen's site shortages included evidencing need through appropriate appraisals, urgently providing more allocated sites and reducing the number of unauthorised encampments.</p>	<p>Introduction of a criteria based policy to guide development as a result of a specific accommodation need of sites.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Planning for Travelling Showpeople (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify sites through the Allocations DPD and AAP for at least 36 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches, and land to accommodate at least 13 permanent plots for Showpeople by 2019.</li> <li>- Criteria based Policy CS8 to judge any applications over the plan period.</li> </ul>	where Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople can live in a way to which they are accustomed. The SA welcomes this policy as it will allow these communities to develop and should aid social inclusion.		
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gypsy, Travellers and Showpeople Accommodation Needs Supporting Paper (2013)</li> <li>- North Yorkshire Accommodation Requirements of Showmen (2009)</li> <li>- Inequalities Experienced by Gypsy and Traveller Communities (2009)</li> <li>- North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2008)</li> <li>- The Local Plan will make provision for 59</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evidence base shows that there is a shortfall of accommodation. In specifying accommodation provision requirements over the Local Plan period and including policy to guide provision, the approach would help meet this need, in accordance with the Government's 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites'.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having any significant negative effects on any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst the majority of comments received were made in relation to a specific site the objections were similar. Questioning robustness of the evidence base, level of need, suggestion of alternative sites and brownfield sites, no sites should be on the greenbelt or in a floodzone, proximity and potential damage to open spaces, development would impact on the visual amenity of the village, increase in traffic from heavy vehicles in roads and junction in and out of the village, compromising safety of pedestrians, proximity to settled community, the devaluation and impact on the outlook of existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New national policy means that LPA now must evidence every effort has been made to allocate sufficient land for a 5 year supply of pitches and plots to meet need.</li> <li>- Updated evidence base has resulted in a change of estimated need over the plan period.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>pitches for Gypsy and Travellers in the first 5 years. Further sites to meet 5 year need and years 6 – 10 will be identified.</p> <p>- The Local Plan will make provision for 21 plots for Showpeople in the first 10 years of the plan.</p>	<p>of the SA objectives.</p>	<p>properties, increase pressure on the existing infrastructure, including the schools and medical practices, Previous Planning applications have been turned down; there should be some level on consistency.</p>	

## Policy Topic: Affordable Housing

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG3</li> <li>- Circular 6/98</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are 'localised shortages of affordable housing in high demand areas which includes York'.</li> <li>- In the emerging RSS York is identified as having high levels of affordable housing need.</li> <li>- Draft Policy H3 advises Local Authorities to seek over 40% affordable housing on developments of more than 15 homes in areas of high need,</li> <li>- Affordable housing will include both housing for rent and shared ownership, overwhelming priority housing need in York is for affordable rented homes, for those households on very low incomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing one and two bedrooms could also help to provide affordable market housing in the City.</li> <li>- The provision of affordable housing is also a key component of meeting sustainable objectives in relation to housing.</li> <li>- The RSS submission version January 2006 states that 40% of new homes on sites of over 15 dwellings (or over 0.5ha) should be built as affordable. It may be suitable to set higher targets given the lack of affordable homes in the area, provided justification can be provided from the evidence base, and this would help meet relevant sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The level of affordable housing should match the percentage advocated in the Regional Spatial Strategy (40%).</li> <li>- Views were expressed regarding the council's current 50% target, claiming that it undermines the viability of many schemes and concerns were that the Council had not adequately demonstrated local need to justify the 50% figure.</li> <li>- Strengthening policy by specifying a number of bedrooms, a certain floor area or that applications with the highest level of affordable housing should be prioritised for consent in order to reach annual targets.</li> <li>- Policy approach needed to be more flexible in order to facilitate development on certain sites.</li> <li>- The proportion of affordable housing on a site should be related to demonstrable need in that specific area and a range of affordable types and tenures</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and</b>	PPG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of affordable housing sought: Option 1: Continue the Local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence clearly shows that existing provision of affordable housing is well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most respondents supported a mix of social rented and discount for sale and recognised</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>		<p>Plan approach or Option 2: Introduce an affordable housing target closer to the Regional Spatial Strategy target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Threshold at which affordable housing will be sought:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Continue in line with the current Local Plan approach or Option 2: Lower the site threshold to less than 15 dwellings/0.3ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York’s future approach to delivering affordable housing in York’s rural areas:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: To continue with the Local Plan approach or Option 2: Reconsider the threshold/proportion of affordable housing being sought onsite or Option 3: Specifically identify rural sites, where 100% of housing on site would be affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach to providing affordable housing:</li> </ul> <p>Option 1: Provide a mix of social rented and discount for sale or Option 2: Provide all affordable housing as social rented.</p>	<p>below that required to meet the identified needs, with the rural area in particular in need of affordable homes and overall demand significantly outstripping supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a clear need for the most affordable type of housing, which is social rented.</li> </ul>	<p>the need for a range of affordable types and tenures although a few were specifically mentioned, namely, affordable housing ‘to buy’ rather than ‘to rent’, shared equity schemes, targeted at specific groups.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further options on approach put forward:</li> <li>Option 1 – Implement existing policy.</li> <li>Option 2 – Sliding scale requiring varying % levels from 1 dwelling increasing to 50% at 28 dwellings with different requirements for urban and rural settlements.</li> <li>Option 3 – Sliding scale requiring varying % levels from 1 dwelling increasing to 40% over 30 dwellings. No distinction between urban and rural.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supported at the Preferred Options stage</li> <li>Option 2 as it was considered that this option would help to maximise affordable housing provision whilst also spreading them across the city through capturing their development in all sites above 2 or more dwelling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a need for a viability assessment to be undertaken.</li> <li>- Delivery of affordable housing against the 43% (or 50%) target is challenging, regardless of the current economic climate.</li> <li>- More weight given to providing the appropriate type of housing in the right locations.</li> <li>- Significant support for the 'sliding scale' approach to policy, but much debate as to the appropriate levels and thresholds described in the options. Lack of support for the existing Local Plan style policy.</li> <li>- Support for considering rural exception sites.</li> <li>- Support for supplying affordable housing through off-site contributions, particularly on smaller sites.</li> <li>- The policy should test proposals at a level of 40% (re RSS), on a site by site basis.</li> <li>- The approach should allow for a greater proportion of affordable homes to buy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September</b>	PPS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHMA (2007)</li> <li>- Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010)</li> <li>- To improve affordability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised policy is a refined version of an amalgamation between Preferred Options 2 and 3. It has therefore been</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several responses stated that affordable housing targets would be overly onerous and would undermine the potential to deliver low cost market housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sliding scale approach is still applicable (options 2 and 3 previously) but</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>2011</b>		<p>across the housing market, in order to enable York's current and future residents and employees to have access to a home they can afford in a community where they want to live, throughout their lifetime.</p> <p>- The Local Development Framework will also ensure high quality housing options for those who cannot afford market housing, in particular those who are vulnerable or in need, by ensuring that new development proposals respond to the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007)</p>	<p>subject to full SA analysis.</p> <p>- In implementing this policy, the housing mix and tenure requirements should not be compromised to an extent which will not meet the requirements set out by the latest SHMA through any negotiation from developers due to viability. This will involve a commitment to the provision of suitable dwelling types and monitoring of the provision.</p>	<p>- Alternatively, the starting viability target was felt by many to be much too low, noting that the level of need in York is even greater than the annual level of housebuilding.</p> <p>- The nature of a dynamic target was felt to introduce further uncertainty, making it difficult to assess the viability of schemes going forward.</p> <p>- Inadequate evidence exists to justify 20% levels on smaller sites; assumptions around land values and build costs are inaccurate.</p>	<p>has been refined based upon the Affordable Housing Viability Study evidence base. The policy now includes strategy for an annual target refined through matrices to base the approach on realistic viability.</p>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<p>- North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011)</p> <p>- City of York Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010) and Annex 1 (2011)</p> <p>- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007)</p> <p>- Affordable housing will be provided in line with current annual dynamic targets and thresholds; should reflect tenure split in terms of social</p>	<p>- The preferred approach is likely to maximise the delivery of affordable housing through creating more certainty in terms of York's affordable housing requirements and ensuring that delivery would be higher in response to better economic circumstances. This would be positive for the economy by ensuring the targets respond to the</p>	<p>- Should base affordable tenure mix on an objectively assessed need approach rather than a policy based requirement or market should be allowed to determine the amount of provision on a site.</p> <p>- Proper and full regard must be had to the overall viability of schemes in setting any requirements in the current economic circumstances.</p> <p>- The policy is not based on credible evidence.</p>	<p>- The policy approach remains broadly the same, however now reflects an updated evidence base.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>rented and intermediate housing, and fully integrate affordable with market housing on a pro-rata basis by pepper potting.</p> <p>- Where the above criteria can not be met, developers have the flexibility through open book appraisal to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development would not be viable based on the current affordable housing dynamic targets.</p>	<p>changing economy to ensure viability of sites.</p>	<p>- The Affordable Housing Viability Study is out of date and does not take into account of all policy requirements, obligations and the viability implications of these.</p> <p>- Main focus of affordable housing growth in the lifetime of the plan should come from direct building from the Council and Housing Associations.</p>	

## Policy Topic: Community Facilities

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Spatial Strategy (2004)</li> <li>- Sport and Active Leisure Strategy for York (2003);</li> <li>- Without Walls Community Strategy</li> <li>- Close to Home Care Strategy (2005)</li> <li>- York's Older People Housing Strategy</li>   <li>- Community facilities taken to cover a broad range of facilities including leisure, education, health care and emergency services. Important that the LDF Core Strategy helps to deliver accessible, and sustainable community facilities in York, which meets the needs of the residents of the City.</li> <li>- Range of options put forward for policy approach including raising quality and protecting existing facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should take into account the need for new facilities of these types in making allocations and choosing a policy approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General concern that needs of older people had not been addressed and there was minimal reference to the provision for younger people.</li> <li>- Modern Libraries should also be recognised as a community facility.</li> <li>- Respondents were critical of the current swimming provision in the City, and the closure of the Barbican Centre;</li> <li>- Location of any new social, educational, health and emergency facilities needs careful consideration in terms of flood risk</li> <li>- A green corridor strategy should be carried out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sports and Active Leisure Strategy</li> <li>- York City Vision and Community Strategy (2004-2024)</li> <li>- Close to Home Care Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wherever built sport facilities are located they should be accessible to all and be on key public transport routes / interchanges and be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Priorities suggested by respondents were to build a permanent ice rink, the need for a new state of the art sports stadium, the provision of an athletics track, a public sports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further options provided in responses to consultation at Issues and Options 1 stage.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>(2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further options provided on some community facilities</li> <li>- To assist in addressing built sporting deficiencies a range of options set out to influence the approach. Option 1 : Seek to deliver provision relating to the deficiencies, Option 2: Prioritise particular deficiencies or Option 3: Prioritise other built sport facilities</li> <li>- Three policy approaches to healthcare facilities: Option 1: Large scale facilities provided centrally, in locations with good access by public transport, Option 2: Smaller scale local facilities, dispersed across York, within easy walking distance from large residential areas; and /or Option 3: Smaller scale local facilities, dispersed across York, accessible from large residential areas by public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>easily accessed by walking or cycling. This should be a consideration for public and private health and sports clubs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Must be accommodating to the health needs of the residents and it is hoped that the strategic approach will promote more accessible facilities throughout York. New facilities should be easily accessed by high quality public transport links that provide a real alternative to car use. Facilities aimed at local needs should also be accessible by foot wherever possible by being integrated into residential neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>	<p>centre and more flexible indoor space provision across the City which could include climbing walls and similar facilities for young people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents emphasised that provision should be based on the needs of the community.</li> <li>- Respondents also highlighted the need for more specialist sporting activities. York Central would be an ideal location.</li> <li>- Respondents were supportive of the need to provide facilities in accessible locations, especially for the elderly.</li> <li>- Many respondents emphasised the need for all facilities to be accessible by public transport.</li> <li>- The requirements linked to major developments such as York Northwest should be considered.</li> <li>- Raising the profile of preventative healthcare, through the promotion of healthier lifestyles should be important.</li> </ul>	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<p>- In order to deliver the vision of sustainable neighbourhoods the LDF will seek to provide accessible local services for all communities. In most</p>	<p>- Providing community and neighbourhood services will help to ensure access to local shops, schools,</p>	<p>- The approach should be strengthened by including more specific measures and targets and should be supported by a SPD;</p>	<p>- No change</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>circumstances these services will be best provided at a neighbourhood level. However some services will cover a wider catchment or even operate at a city wide level such as hospitals or a new stadium. -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New development should have access to a range of local services including healthcare, schools, local shops, other community facilities and public transport. Existing communities will be supported by seeking to ensure that current local services are not lost. All services should be accessible to the communities that they serve by walking, cycling and public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>community and health facilities which is important for local provision as well as helping to provide conditions for business success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing more built sports facilities will promote healthier lifestyles and well-being.</li> <li>- The support shown for the emergency services framework within York is also positive for the well-being, safety and security of residents.</li> <li>- It is recommended that through new development in Local Service Centres and Villages emphasis is given to increasing accessibility.</li> <li>-- To avoid pressure on existing services it will be important for the Council to ensure that new facilities do not 'lag behind' new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Areas should have good local amenities to cope with any new development;</li> <li>- The section should be split into a number of different policies;</li> <li>- Need for places where people of all ages can meet formally and informally;</li> <li>- Community involvement in facilities is a key element of a sustainable community;</li> <li>- LDF should ensure access to affordable leisure facilities;</li> <li>- The approach should include a 'showground' site in York;</li> <li>- The proposed stadium is a suitable location for new swimming facilities;</li> <li>- People should be able to walk to key services;</li> <li>- The approach should be split into 3 tiers – identifying city wide facilities, district facilities, and local facilities;</li> <li>- The strategy should protect existing facilities. Before loss is permitted, developers should have to show that a facility has no community value and that there are other accessible facilities available in the area.</li> </ul>	
<b>Core Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG17</li> <li>- PPS1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will create sustainable, low carbon neighbourhoods which</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised policy for community facilities is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be a presumption in favour of community facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst more prominence is</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Submission – September 2011</b>		<p>are accessible to a range of new and existing quality community facilities and healthcare and emergency services to meet the needs of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing services must be protected as much as possible however it is also important to get the most out of existing facilities in making sure they are 'fit for purpose'.</li> <li>- Service provision must keep pace with new development so that communities have satisfactory access to community facilities. Appropriate developer contributions will be important in delivering this</li> <li>- Any new community facilities must be accessible to the communities they serve by walking, cycling and public transport .</li> </ul>	<p>not location specific as per the recommendation and needs to be enforced before any effect can be measured. The implementation of this part of the policy however, should ensure that any new development has appropriate service level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implications of the revised policy are positive in terms of sustainability.</li> <li>- Provision of new facilities must not lag behind any major development to make sure they facilities are set up ready for the community to use.</li> </ul>	<p>sited within a walking distance of local neighbourhoods;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the explanation of what a community facilities can include however one respondent suggested that the definition of community facilities should be expanded.</li> <li>- It was considered that the policy should set out the site size or dwelling thresholds for which contributions for off site infrastructure, such as community facilities, will be required.</li> <li>- Access to cycle routes and outdoor play spaces for children and young people should be included.</li> </ul>	<p>given to the different types of community facilities by a change in presentation and addition of three policies in relation to community facilities, there is no change in the approach.</p>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Childcare Act (2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consultation Draft Built Sports Facilities Strategy (2013)</li> <li>- York Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (2012 Refresh)</li> <li>- Health and Well Being in York: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2012)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of responses were received in relation to the approach to community facilities. Overall the majority of responses supported the approach, however there were several objections and a number</li> </ul>	<p>Also able to have criteria based policies to guide planning application decisions under new local plan</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion of community cohesion and the development of strong, supportive and durable communities through the creation of sustainable, low carbon neighbourhoods where every community has access to quality community facilities to meet day to day needs.</li> <li>- Extension and expansion of existing high quality sustainable built sports facilities. New facilities will be supported that meet an identified gap in provision, are accessible to all and suitable infrastructure exists or can be created to manage and maintain the facility.</li> <li>- New, high quality, childcare facilities will be supported where there is an identified need for the additional provision.</li> <li>- To contribute to residents living long, healthy and independent lives in sustainable neighbourhoods the Local Plan will support new primary healthcare services in accessible locations.</li> </ul>	<p>health and equality and accessibility. This principally reflects the potential for this approach to maximise the provision of new services and facilities by requiring contributions from all development to meet newly arising need which, allied with local criteria to guide the location of community facilities, would help enhance accessibility for both existing and prospective residents.</p> <p>– It is considered that local level policy would enable a robust policy stance to protecting existing community facilities, maintaining accessibility.</p>	<p>of general comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision should be based on need and only be necessary where there is a deficiency. The requirement has not been tested against any cumulative viability assessment.</li> <li>- Sport England considered that the policy on built sports facilities needs to be more clearly expressed</li> <li>- The approach to childcare provision was supported by a number of the city’s nurseries.</li> <li>- The St Leonard’s Hospice site should be allocated to meet the future needs for health care facilities in York.</li> </ul>	<p>development plan in accordance with the NPPF however general approach remains unchanged.</p>

**Policy topic: Education**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<p>PPS1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li>   <li>- Links between education and skills and employment made.</li> <li>- Covered under community facilities. Policy approach could be developed based on the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Helping to facilitate the reduction of surplus capacity and help to ensure additional places are made available if there are areas of deficit, and take account of any demographic change over the lifetime of the LDF.</li> <li>- Seek new users and new uses for school buildings through implementation of the Extended Schools Initiative (including community use of school facilities, dual use of playing facilities etc).</li> <li>- Ensure that, where new education facilities are proposed, they are sited</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May be desirable in terms of sustainability to retain some community or open space use on redundant school sites.</li> <li>- Extending the use of school buildings for community uses at times when schools are not in use should ensure the more efficient use of land by combining the use of sites.</li> <li>- Supporting higher and further education facilities in the City, should help to achieve sustainability objectives relating to skills, as well as those relating to the economy. However, any such proposals for new development will need to take into account sustainability objectives relating to the protection of the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A variety of issues were raised in connection with education and training and employment growth.</li> <li>- There should be investment in education and training so that local people can fill the new jobs.</li> <li>- Developers should be encouraged to use local labour skills in the construction of new buildings and that the education sector, particularly the universities need to recognise the links to economic growth and find ways of supporting that growth, particularly with regard to Science City York.</li> <li>- Dual use of school facilities welcomed and considered that this should be secured through community use agreements.</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>appropriately, well designed and well related to neighbourhood services and amenities (including further and higher education).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that new developments contribute appropriately to meeting education needs they generate.</li> <li>- Help to facilitate the continued success of the University of York and other Further and Higher Education establishments in the City.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- Building Schools for the Future (2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> </ul> <p>- Two options for provision of schools: provide sites for new schools where need has been identified or consolidate facilities on existing sites, providing for expansion of existing buildings where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several options put forward for further and higher education including combining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many of the decisions relating to educational and training needs will be controlled by matters largely beyond the role of the LDF and be up to individual funding and expansion schemes by these institutions and the Local Education Authority</li> <li>- Sustainability implications of the provision of schools include ensuring good accessibility to new facilities, and ensuring the efficient use of land and other resources by avoiding building new facilities where</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>new development with current or identified further and higher educational, providing student housing in line with the expansion of student numbers, the need to ensure a sustainable transport system and promote public access to sporting, cultural and social facilities connected to the education institution.</p>	<p>upgraded facilities or more efficient use of available land would be more suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the approach to further and higher education should ensure the most efficient use of land, without overdeveloping sites</li> <li>- Should ensure students have an affordable place to live in locations that allow good access</li> <li>- Should ensure that where suitable, facilities are open for public use to ensure proper integration into communities</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (2008)</li> <li>- RSS Sustainable Settlement Study (2004)</li> <li>- Covered under ‘access to services’ in Policy CS8</li> <li>- Preferred approach is to provide accessible local services, including schools.</li> <li>- As required, new or improved education facilities will be provided to support new development. The Council will require new development to contribute towards ensuring there are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach supports sustainability objective EC2 ‘Good education and training opportunities for all which build the skills capacity of the population’ through providing and supporting an education, skills and training framework within the city.</li> <li>- Recommended that the Council re-word policy CS8 to emphasise that new development in Local Service Centres and Villages should be premised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ambitions of all educational institutions in city need to be recognised and supported, including ongoing development of York College.</li> <li>- The approach should acknowledge the significance of Askham Bryan College as it provides specialist land-based education and training of national and regional importance.</li> <li>- The approach should be strengthened to support increased levels of training and development for the current,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar but now comes under the community facilities and access to services theme rather than separately under education.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>sufficient facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will seek to secure community access to new sports and cultural facilities which are developed on education sites in order to increase the resources available to local communities</li> <li>- Will facilitate the continued success of higher and further education establishments in the city, in particular through supporting the development of the additional university campus 'Heslington East' and the potential expansion of further education establishments.</li> </ul>	<p>on increasing accessibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To avoid pressure on existing services it will be important for the Council to ensure that new facilities do not 'lag behind' new development.</li> </ul>	<p>and future, workforce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning agreements should be used to secure training facilities for disadvantaged groups and to improve access to buildings and IT.</li> <li>- Developments and construction sites should have a real benefit to those in learning through apprenticeships, work experience for 14 -19 year olds, and undergraduate and graduate internships.</li> <li>- Access to services should be split into a number of different policies.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>Schools White Paper (November 2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS(2008)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Local Area Statement of Need for the Provision of Learning for Young People aged 16–19 (October 2010)</li> <li>- Adult Learning and Skills Strategy (2007) and the 14-19 Plan (2009)</li> <li>- 14-19 Plan (2009)</li> <li>- Support for the promotion of the City as both a nationally and internationally recognised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The inclusion of this policy has bridged a gap from the Preferred Options document to recognise the need and importance of education, skills and training within York.</li> <li>- Evidence suggests that the high skills base and links to educational establishments within the city has supported the economy through the recession and made the area a key economic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too permissive and unconstrained which is not sustainable.</li> <li>- Should support the creation of sufficient jobs across the skill base to provide York's school and college leavers and graduates with local employment.</li> <li>- Policy approach to targeted recruitment and training should be deleted, it does not comply with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and it is not a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education now covered in its own section in response to consultation representations.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>centre of excellence for education and learning, with a commitment to lifelong learning and a culture of enterprise, innovation and creativity.</p> <p>- Will ensure the whole community in York have the education and skills that will enable them to play an active part in society and contribute to the life of the City and will utilise the planning process to target recruitment and training in construction and other related industries.</p>	<p>competitor within the region.</p> <p>- The policy aims to continue and improve this role and has been appraised as positive in terms of economic and social objectives.</p> <p>- Will support the learning of skills for all in York, provide a competent and educated workforce to support the wider economy and to support the role of higher educational establishments including the universities.</p> <p>- Increasing community access to educational sites will also aid community participation in sports and recreational activities across the city. In the wider sense, this will also enable improved health and well-being for the population.</p> <p>- Requirement for future expansions to include for accommodation for the corresponding amount of students anticipated should support the students in the educational system with suitable accommodation throughout their studies.</p>	<p>matter for the LDF or planning policy.</p> <p>- Reference should be added to apprenticeship opportunities.</p> <p>- Suggested that there should be framework for green infrastructure/ecosystem services training to link new skills training using University, Colleges and Schools to learn about the countryside.</p> <p>- The informal system for the development of skills for personal development and fulfilment in life should be referenced.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>- Targeted recruitment and training whilst aimed at the construction industry could be more valuable if the scope of its application be broadened to all roles within this type of industry. For example, it is not only construction which is associated to development, there is also practical applications for archaeology and landscaping which may be able to contribute to skills building and training on site.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<p>NPPF Schools White Paper</p>	<p>- Dream Again: York's Strategic Plan for Children, Young People and Their Families 2013-2016 (2012) – York Local Area Statement of Need September 2012: For the Provision of learning for young people aged 14-19 or aged up to 25 subject to a learning difficulty assessment (2012) – School Playing Fields Assessment Technical Paper (2010)</p> <p>- Approach is to facilitate the provision of sufficient modern education facilities for the</p>	<p>- Positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect of health (SA Objective 2), education (SA Objective 3), economy (SA Objective 4) and equality and accessibility (SA Objective 5).</p> <p>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</p> <p>- The preferred approach is considered to out-perform, in sustainability terms, the</p>	<p>- Support for the policy. - Envisage a policy for Askham Bryan College similar to that for the University which would guide the type, form and location of new development within the settlement limit. - The Council should rely on the NPPF to guide development of Education facilities.</p>	<p>- No change in approach, however, higher education now covered in a separate section in response to consultation outcomes.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>delivery of preschool, primary and secondary school education to meet an identified need and address deficiencies in existing facilities. This includes new provision, where required, to support strategic housing allocations and any future developments of Academies and Free Schools which reflect the aspirations of local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local criteria set out to guide education provision and accessibility</li> <li>- The continued success of all further and higher education institutions is supported, including any further expansion of their teaching and research operations, other facilities and student accommodation at their existing sites and campuses</li> <li>- Developments with a construction cost of £1million or more are required to provide skills and training opportunities, on or off site.</li> </ul>	<p>reasonable alternatives and none of the alternatives were assessed as performing better than the preferred approach against any of the SA objectives.</p>		

**Policy topic: Universities**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<p>- PPS1</p>	<p>- Regional Economic Strategy                      - Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).                      - RSS (December 2004)                      - Community Strategy</p> <p>- Access to university one of four criteria in selection employment of sites. Evidence base indicates that development of business clusters in the region will also depend on good links with higher education facilities</p> <p>- Important that the Core Strategy recognises the Council's continuing support for the growth of Further and Higher Education in the City, especially the University of York.</p> <p>- Covered under community facilities. Policy approach could be developed based on helping to facilitate the continued success of the University of York and other Higher Education</p>	<p>- Supporting higher education facilities in the City should help to achieve sustainability objectives relating to skills, as well as those relating to the economy. However, any such proposals for new development will need to take into account sustainability objectives relating to the protection of the environment.</p>	<p>- A variety of issues were raised in connection with education and training and employment growth.</p> <p>- There should be investment in education and training so that local people can fill the new jobs.</p> <p>- Developers should be encouraged to use local labour skills in the construction of new buildings and that the education sector, particularly the universities need to recognise the links to economic growth and find ways of supporting that growth, particularly with regard to Science City York.</p> <p>- Suggested that York University needs to be better integrated into the City</p> <p>- The Core Strategy should refer to York St John University.</p>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		establishments in the City.			
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- PPS1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Economic Strategy</li> <li>- Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action' (2003).</li> <li>- RSS (December 2004)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> <li>- Future York Group Report</li>   <li>- Approaches to the University of York include providing for Science City York and Research and Development uses; and/or maintain or enhance the parkland setting, views and ecology of the campuses.</li> <li>- Heslington East identified as a major development opportunity.</li> <li>- Proximity to university and other institutions one of six criteria in selection employment of sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the approach to further and higher education should ensure the most efficient use of land, without overdeveloping sites</li> <li>- Should ensure students have an affordable place to live in locations that allow good access</li> <li>- Should ensure that where suitable, facilities are open for public use to ensure proper integration into communities</li> <li>- For York University, maintaining the parkland setting and ecological value of the area will be the most positive in terms of environmental protection and enhancement.</li> <li>- Enhancing Science City York role at this site will have advantages for the communities of York</li> <li>- Clear economic advantages to York of developing R&amp;D industries as part of Science City York.</li> </ul>	- See above	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS1 - PPS4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (2008)</li> <li>- RSS Sustainable Settlement Study (2004)</li> <li>- Employment Land Review 1 and 2</li>   <li>- Covered under 'access to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach supports sustainability objective EC2</li> <li>'Good education and training opportunities for all which build the skills capacity of the population' through providing and supporting an education,</li> </ul>	- Too much emphasis is placed on the expansion of the University of York at the expense of other establishments, such as York St John University, which make a significant	- Approach broadly similar but now comes under the community facilities and access to



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>services' and the employment section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Will seek to secure community access to new sports and cultural facilities which are developed on education sites in order to increase the resources available to local communities</li> <li>- Will facilitate the continued success of higher and further education establishments in the city, in particular through supporting the development of the additional university campus 'Heslington East' and the potential expansion of further education establishments.</li> <li>- Heslington East, the University of York's new campus extension can accommodate all of the City's anticipated demand for free standing B1 (b) Research and Development uses.</li> </ul>	<p>skills and training framework within the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The research and development (use class B1(b)) role offered in association with the new University of York Campus will strengthen links between the existing science park and the University potentially offering further training and educational opportunities for students.</li> </ul>	<p>contribution to the educational needs of the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern over the 'studentification' of parts of the City, which can damage communities. The strategy should address concerns about the impacts of additional students and the University expansion.</li> <li>- Need to introduce a policy to ensure students are retained in the city.</li> <li>- Developments and construction sites should have a real benefit to those in learning through apprenticeships, work experience for 14 -19 year olds, and undergraduate and graduate internships.</li> <li>- Access to services should be split into a number of different policies.</li> </ul>	<p>services theme rather than separately under education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition of economic role of University of York maintained.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission</b> -</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment Land Review 1 and 2</li> <li>- RSS(2008)</li> <li>- Community Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The inclusion of this policy has bridged a gap from the Preferred Options document to recognise the need and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too permissive and unconstrained which is not sustainable.</li> <li>- Consideration should be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education now covered in its own section in response to</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
September 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the promotion of the City as both a nationally and internationally recognised centre of excellence for education and learning, with a commitment to lifelong learning and a culture of enterprise, innovation and creativity.</li> <li>- Will ensure the whole community in York have the education and skills that will enable them to play an active part in society and contribute to the life of the City and will utilise the planning process to target recruitment and training in construction and other related industries.</li> <li>- Will ensure that Higher Education Institutions address the need for any additional student accommodation which arises because of their future expansion. Provision will be expected to be made on campus where possible.</li> <li>- Premises for Research &amp; Development (B1(b)) will be</li> </ul>	<p>importance of education, skills and training within York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence suggests that the high skills base and links to educational establishments within the city has supported the economy through the recession and made the area a key economic competitor within the region.</li> <li>- The policy aims to continue and improve this role and has been appraised as positive in terms of economic and social objectives.</li> <li>- Will support the learning of skills for all in York, provide a competent and educated workforce to support the wider economy and to support the role of higher educational establishments including the universities.</li> <li>- Increasing community access to educational sites will also aid community participation in sports and recreational activities across the city. In the wider sense, this will also enable improved health and well-being for the population.</li> <li>- Requirement for future expansions to include for accommodation for the</li> </ul>	<p>given to the allocation of suitable sites for purpose built student housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of student housing should not be required to be on campus.</li> <li>- Should support the expansion of the Heslington West campus in addition to Heslington East.</li> <li>- Should support the creation of sufficient jobs across the skill base to provide York's school and college leavers and graduates with local employment.</li> <li>- Policy approach to targeted recruitment and training should be deleted, it does not comply with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and it is not a matter for the LDF or planning policy.</li> <li>- Reference should be added to apprenticeship opportunities.</li> <li>- Suggested that there should be framework for green infrastructure/ecosystem services training to link new skills training using University, Colleges and</li> </ul>	<p>consultation representations.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>provided through maximising the economic benefits of the city's education establishments, this includes up to 25ha of land at the University of York Heslington East Campus.</p>	<p>corresponding amount of students anticipated should support the students in the educational system with suitable accommodation throughout their studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targeted recruitment and training whilst aimed at the construction industry could be more valuable if the scope of its application be broadened to all roles within this type of industry. For example, it is not only construction which is associated to development, there is also practical applications for archaeology and landscaping which may be able to contribute to skills building and training on site.</li> </ul>	<p>Schools to learn about the countryside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The informal system for the development of skills for personal development and fulfilment in life should be referenced.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- York St. John University Strategy for Sport 2012-2015 (2012)</li> <li>- York St. John University: Our Strategy 2012-2015 (2012)</li> <li>- 2008/00005/OUT: Heslington East Outline Planning Consent, as implemented</li> <li>- Development Brief: Heslington East University of York Campus (2004)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect across several SA objectives with those effects being significant in respect education (SA Objective 3).</li> <li>- The provision of local criteria is also expected to generate wider benefits in respect of the environmental SA objectives (although not to a level considered to be significant) for example, by ensuring that new</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the provision of detailed local criteria to guide form and location of university development.</li> <li>- Policy will help to retain the distinctive character of the campus and its landscape setting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach, however, higher education now covered in a separate section in response to consultation outcomes.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- University of York Heslington Campus Development Brief for Future Expansion (1999)</li> <li>- Detailed local criteria provided to guide form and location of university development</li> </ul>	<p>development is accessible and does not adversely affect the City's special character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- Overall, the preferred approach is considered to out-perform, in sustainability terms, the reasonable alternatives and none of the Alternatives were assessed as performing better than the preferred approach against any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>		

**Policy topic: Design and the Historic Environment**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG15</li> <li>- PPG16</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Evidence base provides basis for understanding City's special characteristics, and informing strategic policy context.</li> <li>- Discusses key issues relevant to design and the historic environment, with the aim of delivering a single strategic policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plan's approach seeks to retain historic character in order to protect city's attractiveness, economic prosperity and ensure high quality new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should restate duty to preserve and enhance historic character</li> <li>- Suggested we seek a higher standard of design quality through the LDF;</li> <li>- support for CABE based design principles bolstered by local evidence (including VDSs, CAAs and further SPDs);</li> <li>- Support for producing Local List</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPS1</li> <li>PPG15</li> <li>PPG16</li> <li>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Draft RSS (Dec 2005)</li> <li>- Restates design principles, but offers more debate around York's specific characteristics, and the potential for further local character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserving the quality of York's historic environment is key to its economic success, and liveability</li> <li>- The Plan should promote specific design approaches for site allocations.</li> <li>- Should give particular care to protect unlisted as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should restate duty to preserve and enhance historic character.</li> <li>- The plan should seek a 'visionary approach' to design quality;</li> <li>- Support for CABE based design principles bolstered by local evidence (including VDSs, CACAs and further SPDs)</li> <li>- Support producing Local List</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Overall these advise putting in place policies to preserve and enhance the historic environment, including policies for protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest.	appraisal work to be carried out, in response to consultation comments.	well as listed buildings and structures.	- Should assess impact of level of growth proposed on historic environment	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPG15</li> <li>- PPG16</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> </ul>	<p>RSS (May 2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gives substantial weight to the need to appraise local character alongside establishing a series of guiding design principles.</li> <li>- It is specific in its targets to prepare a CACA for the City's central historic core, and characterisation studies for strategic sites.</li> <li>- Detailed polices are included for the city</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supportive of general design approach, which aims to preserve the quality of York's historic environment. This is key to its economic success, and liveability.</li> <li>- Plan should give particular care to protect unlisted as well as listed buildings and structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for commitment to further appraising and understanding the city's special character, in particular VDS and the Local List.</li> <li>- Some support for further design guidelines for strategic sites</li> </ul>	No change in general approach from Local Plan (2005)

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		centre and York Northwest strategic site.			
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS5</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</li> <li>- Draft NPPF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Heritage Topic Paper (CYC, 2011):</li> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper, to defines those assets of strategic importance to the special character and setting of York which are included within the policy.</li> <li>- Widens the scope of the approach to allow for impact on non-designated assets to be appraised.</li> <li>- Targets also allow for the completion of site specific heritage statements and design briefs for major sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcomes scope of policy, and clear requirements set out for development industry.</li> <li>- Establishes common baseline for heritage appraisal.</li> <li>- Supportive of general design approach, which aims to preserve the quality of York’s historic environment. This is key to its economic success, and liveability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- English Heritage supportive of approach to include 6 principal ‘special characteristics’;</li> <li>- Need for more weight to be given to existing SPDs, including VDSs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responds to SA and consultation comments evidence base undertaken to understand better York’s characteristics. This is the basis for the revised approach which focuses on protecting and enhancing these characteristics.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</li> <li>- Ancient Monuments and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Heritage Topic Paper (CYC, update 2013)</li> <li>- Approach recognises the outstanding quality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed policy approach would restrict development which would affect designated and non-designated assets. This is likely to have</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of general design/amenity policy.</li> <li>- Include references to existing evidence, including VDS, and commitment to Local List.</li> <li>- Refer to all assets, not just</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach but more detailed policies provided.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Archaeological Areas Act (1979)	<p>of the historic environment, its inherent value to the city and the central role it plays in York's economic success.</p> <p>- York's special qualities are key considerations in determining the design implications of development</p>	positive outcomes in sustainability terms.	<p>those 'designated'.</p> <p>- Clearer guidance on level of detail to be submitted in support of planning applications;</p>	



**Policy Topic: Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Recreation**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS9</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Protect and enhance the region's biodiversity and landscape</li> <li>- Increase regional tree cover</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy should seek to conserve and enhance existing resource rather than identify new sites and landscapes;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for policy approach to protect and enhance species, landscape and rivers and increase woodland/tree cover.</li> <li>- Need for biodiversity action plan asap, and EIA to appraise impacts of development on natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Infrastructure not covered in I+O 1 as term was in its infancy. I+O 2 doc introduced the overarching concept;</li> <li>- Policy should reflect progress on Biodiversity Action Plan and SINC assessment</li> <li>- Open space to be covered separately, dealing with quantity, quality and accessibility.</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PPS1</li> <li>-PPS9</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RSS (selective review of RPG12, Dec 2004)</li> <li>- Draft RSS (Dec 2005)</li> <li>- Protect and enhance the region's biodiversity and landscape</li> <li>- Increase regional tree cover</li> <li>- Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study advocates an increased emphasis on the value and contribution of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive impact on biodiversity.</li> <li>- Consider identifying key routes and green wedges as green infrastructure network</li> <li>- Take care not to prioritise protection of landscape character over biodiversity;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for policy approach to protect and enhance species, landscape and rivers and increase woodland/tree cover.</li> <li>- Need for biodiversity action plan asap, and EIA to appraise impacts of development on natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>existing sites rather than the identification of new sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emerging Biodiversity Action Plan and SINC assessment</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS9</li> <li>- PPG17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS (May 2008)</li> <li>- protect and enhance the region's biodiversity and landscape</li> <li>- increase regional tree cover</li> <li>- Emerging Biodiversity Audit and Action Plan and SINC assessment</li> <li>- Sets out policy approach to Open Space i.e. improving quality of existing open space and improving access.</li> <li>- PPG17 assessment and adoption of ANGSt standards to inform Core Strategy and other emerging DPDs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive impacts from improved access to existing open space, and approach to address deficiencies where they exist.</li> <li>- Generally positive impacts through managing biodiversity and green space</li> <li>- Potential conflict through recreation/biodiversity management as access and therefore use improves. Policy should explicitly mention intention to manage recreational space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support for policy approach</li> <li>- Broad range of comments covering biodiversity, recreational open space, green space, trees and woodland.</li> <li>- Make more reference to overarching benefits of green in economic/environmental terms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Move to Preferred Options necessitates full wording of policy objectives and criteria;</li> <li>- Separate consideration given to 'Open Space', outside of green infrastructure;</li> <li>- To allow for outcomes of emerging work mapping green corridors</li> <li>- Commitment to producing Green Infrastructure SPD</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- PPS9</li> <li>- PPG17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity Audit and Action Plan, 2011</li> <li>- Leeds City Region GI Strategy, 2010</li> <li>- Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, 2008</li> <li>- Green Corridor Technical Paper, 2011</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall impact is likely to be positive</li> <li>- Approach includes commitment to produce Green Inf. Strategy</li> <li>- Gives greater clarity to developers on what will be expected in support of/to inform a planning application</li> <li>- Policy is more comprehensive in its approach to maintain, enhance and protect areas of biodiversity across its many functions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General support, including from Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency;</li> <li>- Include additional targets linked to Biodiversity Action Plan;</li> <li>- Commit to Playing Pitch Strategy;</li> <li>- Need for further masterplanning in relation to identified Areas of Search for development, to ensure appropriate green space provision/management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Green Infrastructure objective reworded to recognise GI benefits across the themes of sustainability.</li> <li>- To improve clarity, policy makes distinction between ongoing GI strategy, which includes studies to appraise extent and quality of existing GI, and Dev management style ‘criteria based policy’ approach.</li> <li>- Removal of ANGSt as an indicator – reference instead to targets in Open Space Study</li> </ul>
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity Audit, 2011 and Action Plan, 2013</li> <li>- Leeds City Region GI Strategy, 2010</li> <li>- Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, 2008 (note emerging 2014 update)</li> <li>- Consultation Draft Playing Pitch Strategy, 2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive impact on SA objectives.</li> <li>- The preferred approach is expected to help protect and enhance the City’s existing green infrastructure assets including all biodiversity resources, areas of landscape value and open space. By</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for Green infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>- Need for Tree Strategy</li> <li>- Need to reassess green spaces for biodiversity value</li> <li>- Biodiversity policy should be more detailed to inform development decision making</li> <li>- CIL requirement is overly onerous, particularly on smaller sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Move to Local Plan necessitated full range of strategic policies contained within a single document.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>- Green Infrastructure section includes policies on Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity, Trees, Open Space/Playing Pitches, New Open Space, Green Corridors and Access to Nature.</p>	<p>prioritising the protection of functional green infrastructure, the approach would also help to conserve and enhance York's special character and landscape and may encourage the best use of land. Green infrastructure in York has an important flood water storage role.</p> <p>- the preferred approach would also require major development to provide open space provision on/off site thereby helping to ensure that newly arising need for open space is met.</p>		

**Policy Topic: Approach to Development in the Green Belt**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- PPG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Purpose of Green Belt should be to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. List of categories detailed which identify their contribution to preserving the historic character and setting of York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of green belt policy, as a strategic policy tool, and with the need under current policy for a boundary to be defined for the plan period and beyond need to be addressed as part of the selection of strategic spatial alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt is vital and as such not adequately addressed and should have its own separate section.</li> <li>- The role of the Green Belt in preserving the historic character and setting of York is a key factor in determining the location of future development.</li> </ul>	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Creating a permanent Green Belt for York that preserves its special character and setting, whilst ensuring sustainable development part of the spatial objectives of the plan.</li> <li>- Whole section now dedicated to York's Green Belt to provide greater</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When considering which areas are most suitable for expansion and most suitable for exclusion from the Green Belt, may be necessary to apply different tests to different circumstances.</li> <li>- May not be suitable to pursue Option 1 as this is not in keeping with national policy set by the PPG. It may be that a single 'primary' purpose is not the most suitable way of designating Green Belt in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserving the historic character and setting of York is a key influence that should be considered when refining the approach to the location of development.</li> <li>- Supported option to run the Green Belt until 2029.</li> <li>- Primary purpose of Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of York.</li> <li>- More emphasis to be placed on the protection of the Green belt from development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach still not determined but greater clarity and importance placed on the Green Belt with the inclusion of a dedicated chapter.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>emphasis on improving and understanding its role for York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two options as to the lifespan of York's Green Belt: Option 1: To 2029, this is longer than the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy period which runs to 2021, or Option 2: Another date.</li> <li>- Two options as to the primary purpose of the green belt: Option 1: To preserve the setting and special character of York; or Option 2: One or more of the following; to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; -to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; -to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and/or to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban</li> </ul>	<p>York and the test needed may vary depending on the specifics of any particular location.</p>		

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		land.			
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- To create a permanent green belt for York that will endure until at least 2030. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- To maintain and preserve the historic setting of York;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- To retain and protect special features such as the strays, green wedges and views of the Minster; and</li> <li>- To reflect the other purposes set out in PPG2.</li> <li>- Role of York Green Belt now articulated through policy rather than strategy.</li> <li>- Boundaries of Green Belt and Major Developed Sites to be defined in Allocations DPD. When setting Green Belt boundaries it must be ensured that the development needs of York can be met until at least 2030 outside the proposed Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acknowledges importance of the Green Belt helping to protect the most important sites in terms of quality landscape, biodiversity and historic interest. Green belt is also needing to allow appropriate growth within the city and that in order to designate it, different tests should be applied where applicable.</li> <li>- Would be beneficial for the core strategy to encourage the use of land designated as Greenbelt in line with PPG2 to reinforce the designated land as an asset of the city. These uses could include rural diversification and the use of natural environment for recreational activity as well as supporting measures which address climate change in York and which would meet reducing York's ecological footprint.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Numerous comments on the section as a whole. Generally felt that there needs to be further clarity on the role of the York's historic character and setting and the green belt. Differing views on the life span of the green belt.</li> </ul>	Introduction of policy to provide greater strength and emphasis to the role of the Green Belt.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>They must be in line with the Core Strategy Spatial Principles taking account of the levels of growth set out in the RSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft proposals map included in Allocations DPD with all options for sites included.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG2</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper (2011)</li> <li>- RSS</li> <li>- Refined policy, general policy approach retained from preferred options.</li> <li>- Confirmation that the Greenbelt boundary will endure until 2031 has been stated.</li> <li>- Land outside the Sub Regional City, Large Villages and Villages, will be included within the general extent of York's Green Belt, with designated Small Villages being washed over.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised Greenbelt policy in York has been appraised as having mostly a positive impact on the economic, social and environmental objectives within the SA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern in relation to the permanence of the Green Belt and proposed Areas of Search.</li> <li>- Support for Policy CS1 and the intention to establish a permanent Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach but revised policy has been made more concise and tighter in specification for greater clarity. This is in line with national policy.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only very restricted types of development appropriate to the purposes of the Green Belt will be permitted.</li> <li>- Boundaries to be defined in Allocations DPD.</li> <li>-Draft proposals map included in Allocations DPD with all options for sites included.</li> <li>- Will also address, within the York context, the other purposes of Green Belts set out in PPG2.</li> </ul>			
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Approach to the Green Belt Appraisal (2003)</li> <li>- Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper (2011)</li> <li>- Saved policies of otherwise revoked RSS</li> <li>- Role of York’s Green Belt defined as policy in the Spatial Strategy.</li> <li>- Whole section now dedicated to development in the green belt and villages washed over by the Green Belt.</li> <li>- Policies included on what</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preferred policy approach is considered to have a positive effect across all the relevant economic, social and environmental SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixture of objections to the wording of the policy</li> <li>- Support to the general direction of the policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in approach but greater clarity in terms of the role of the Green Belt and what types of development are appropriate. This is in line with national guidance.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>is appropriate development in the green belt, what is permitted in areas washed over by the greenbelt, reuse of buildings in the green belt, exception sites for affordable housing and major developed sites in the green belt.</p>			

**Policy Topic: Renewable Energy and Sustainable Design and Construction**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> <li>- Securing the Future: delivering the UK Sustainable Development Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sub-regional Renewable Energy Assessments and Targets Study 2004</li> <li>- Delivering Renewable Energy in North Yorkshire (2005)</li> <li>- Above studies led to a target-based approach for the city to achieve using renewable energy schemes.</li> <li>- It is recommended that the energy hierarchy should be adopted as the overarching framework for energy policy within the Core Strategy.</li> <li>- Options include Onshore wind, Biomass (wood and other), Hydro electricity, Ground source heat pumps, photo-voltaics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach to Renewable Energy put forward is compatible with the aim of achieving a greater level of sustainable development in the City of York.</li> <li>- It may also be suitable for the LDF and the Core Strategy to consider how buildings can be designed to take into account the effects of climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The main priority suggested by respondents was to reduce consumption.</li> <li>- It was suggested that information within this chapter is misleading and ambitious.</li> <li>- Should focus on what York can do best.</li> <li>- Some talked about encouraging community based energy schemes which should be encouraged by working with other local bodies.</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Four options given on how to deliver 10% energy needs through on site renewable energy generation on: Option 1: All sites. Option 2: Sites of 500sqm commercial or 5 or more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further consideration of a more ambitious target than the 10%, setting a variable target, as to whether targets should be expressed in terms of renewable energy generation or carbon dioxide reduction,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None of the options received majority support.</li> <li>- Most respondents (81%) thought we should set a more ambitious target for renewable energy.</li> <li>- Whilst most types of renewable energy</li> </ul>	N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>residential units. Option 3: Sites of 1000sqm commercial or 10 or more residential units. Option 4: One of the three options outlined above but incorporating an alternative approach for buildings in conservation areas and listed buildings, in recognition of their special character. - The Core Strategy needs to consider how the Council will assess the impact of stand-alone renewable energy generators.</p>	<p>consideration of whether energy reduction will be in terms of regulated emissions or unregulated also. - It will be important to consider the long-term need and benefits of renewable energy generation against other more localised or small scale effects. - Securing renewable energy technology that serves the National Grid could make an important contribution to York's economy. Depending on the scheme it could help in diversification of the rural economy.</p>	<p>generators were supported some questioned the suitability of different types and commented on appropriate scales. Some respondents suggested that York should not have any wind turbines. - Suggestions included that the most appropriate renewable energy requirement was for 10% to be produced on-site up to 2012 rising to 15% by 2015 and 20% by 2020. - Respondents suggested that the development of stand alone renewable energy generators should not compromise the openness of green belt, nor the integrity of international and nationally designated areas and features or their settings, flood risk nor where they would increase risk elsewhere.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- The Climate Change Act (2008)</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The City of York Council will seek to help reduce York's eco and carbon footprint through the promotion of sustainable design and construction,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate change is a key issue facing the city. The main source of carbon dioxide is from combustion of fossil fuels is through electricity generation or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 64% agree with promoting renewable energy on site.</li> <li>- Respondents were least likely to agree that promoting renewable energy off site will be most</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach is much more detailed as to how renewable energy will be collected and included targets as</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>'Meeting the Energy Challenge' (May 2007)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy Act (2008)</li> </ul>	<p>energy efficiency and renewable energy, thereby reducing overall energy use and help in the fight against Climate Change.</p>	<p>vehicle emissions. Encouraging the use of renewable energy and sustainable design and construction techniques will be key.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA supported an approach which would make the highest carbon dioxide reductions and therefore, more stringent targets as the technology improves. There is also a possible adverse impact on incorporating energy schemes in buildings in conservation areas or listed buildings but the SA suggests not totally excluding these from the policy.</li> </ul>	<p>effective for York (33%).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'Other' suggestions included to encourage additional methods of renewable energy.</li> </ul>	<p>set by national policy.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper: Meeting the Energy Challenge (2007)</li> <li>- Energy Act (2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate Change Framework and Action Plan (2010)</li> <li>- The LDF will play a key role in helping to deliver the Climate Change Framework and Action Plan through contributing to a reduction of York's carbon and eco-footprint and helping the City to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The emerging Renewable Energy Study should also set out technologies and suitable areas for implementing renewable energy in York This should form part of the baseline evidence and be taken into consideration when it is available.</li> <li>- The SA also welcomes the ambition to exceed the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were a mixture of views over the targets in this chapter not being ambitious enough whereas others felt targets were unrealistically high.</li> <li>- Respondents felt that the policy went beyond what was required by regulations and guidance at a national level. Some of the respondents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The emphasis of the policy hasn't changed in terms of its remit for renewable energy but the wording has been significantly amended to include specific targets which need to be achieved. The policy now also includes</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>adapt to, and mitigate against climate change. This will be achieved through the application of the Energy Hierarchy by ensuring York's renewable energy/low carbon potential is realised and high standards of sustainable design and construction are adopted,</p>	<p>targets referring to renewable energy generation.</p>	<p>simply felt that policy duplicated matters covered by other statutory codes and building regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some respondents felt that all planning applications for new build or refurbishments should incorporate on-site renewable / low carbon energy generation equipment to reduce predicted carbon emissions by at least 10%.</li> <li>- Several respondents felt strongly that the use of wind turbines is not justified within the Green Belt.</li> <li>- There was a need to provide more spatial guidance across York which identifies suitable locations for on shore wind developments.</li> </ul>	<p>more substantial information on sustainable design and construction.</p>
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- The Climate Change Act (2008)</li> <li>- The Energy White Paper: Meeting the Energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Local Plan will support and encourage the generation of renewable and low carbon energy through development proposals that meet the following requirements:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No significant positive effects were identified however, the options were assessed as having positive effects across the majority of the SA objectives.</li> <li>- In general, the reasonable alternatives assessed were</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the areas of search are close to the boundaries of neighbouring authorities – would welcome joint working in the future.</li> <li>- Some areas are inappropriate for turbine</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes reflect national policy direction.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	<p>Challenge (2007)</p> <p><i>Energy Act (2008)</i></p>	<p>Respond positively to the opportunities identified in The Renewable Energy Strategic Viability Study for York (2010) and as shown as potential areas of search for renewable electricity generation on the proposals map;</p> <p>Are in accordance with the Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse impacts on landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets and Green Belt objectives.</p> <p>Demonstrate benefits for local communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only focuses on stand alone renewable technologies and does not include district heating and combined heat and power networks. These are seen as being an integral part of creating sustainable new developments and this is dealt with in the approach to Sustainable Design and Construction.</li> </ul>	<p>considered to perform similar to, or worse than, the preferred approach. The exception is in relation to renewable and low carbon energy development where Option 2 (Rely on NPPF to guide renewable and low carbon energy development) was assessed as having a positive effect on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In order to avoid any potentially adverse effects from renewable and low carbon energy development, it is therefore recommended that generic local criteria includes appropriate safeguards for the environment.</li> </ul>	<p>installation due to the potential impact on wildlife, for example internationally important bird populations. Many objections regarding the damage to views into and out of York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Substantial objection to the size and scale of the areas of search.</li> <li>- Objections stating that any benefit for the environment would be outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the setting and special character of the City.</li> </ul>	





**Policy Topic: Sustainable Design and Construction**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS22</li> <li>- Energy White Paper (2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure sustainable, high quality design and construction there are a number of options for the LDF.</li> <li>- The approach taken could be based on the following factors                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The production of local and village design statements for areas across the City.</li> <li>The establishment of city-wide design principles</li> <li>The promotion of measures to reduce energy consumption in buildings through total refurbishment aiming for zero emissions</li> <li>A requirement that a certain percentage of energy to be used in new developments will be provided through renewable energy sources.</li> <li>The promotion of measures to implement energy efficiency measures in new development and construction practices.</li> <li>Ensuring sustainable waste management of materials in construction practices.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach is appropriate in helping to set policy to achieve a high standard of design and sustainable construction.</li> <li>- It may be suitable for the LDF to consider including policy that requires that new development meet defined sustainable construction standards, such as those defined by Eco-Homes and BREEAM tools. It may also be suitable for the LDF and the Core Strategy to consider how buildings can be designed to take into account the effects of climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall respondents felt that the Local Development Framework (LDF) should be seeking a higher standard of design across the City.</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered that this section should be strengthened in terms of requiring developers to incorporate certain sustainable design measures and to introduce targets and minimum standards.</li> <li>- A number of respondents considered the LDF should require developers to incorporate certain sustainable design measures and to introduce targets and minimum standards specific to York.</li> <li>- The introduction of a blanket requirement would be unreasonable and fails to take account of individual site circumstances and constraints outside the developer's control.</li> <li>- Requirements should be flexible because sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
				design is a rapidly evolving area and some suggested that developers should be encouraged to 'do more' than just the minimum requirement.	
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two options put forward that could underpin the design policies for the LDF               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1: Establish a set of city-wide principles based on those set out in CABE's 'By Design';</li> <li>Option 2: Use the CABE principles but supplement these with other standards, for example by including principles which are specific to York</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Three options put forward for the scale of new development that should require a Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM assessment               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1: A York-specific threshold..</li> <li>Option 2: As per the government guidance definition of a 'major' development</li> <li>Option 3: All development sites.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The desire to see more efficient buildings is supported by the SA.</li> <li>- Other options that could be considered are whether it is suitable to widen the requirements for buildings beyond those required by the Code and BREEAM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of respondents to this issue suggested that all development sites should be covered by environmental assessment methods such as BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes, and there should be clear sanctions if levels are not achieved.</li> </ul>	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>- Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>- PPS1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All new developments and conversions to be built to the highest quality design using innovative construction and energy and water efficient methods based on targets set out in the forthcoming Sustainable Design and Construction SPD;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LDF could consider whether it is suitable to widen the requirements for building beyond those required by Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM such as water efficiency measures or sustainably sourced materials.</li> <li>- Consider requiring certain types of development to achieve better than 'very good' rating or increasing stringency of the standards over time, for e.g. after 2015 all developments should achieve 'excellent' rating or five stars on the Code ranking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two-thirds (67%) of the sample agree with promoting sustainable design and construction techniques.</li> <li>- The approach should not duplicate codes and guidance enforced through building regulations.</li> <li>- 'Innovative construction techniques' should only be applicable where appropriate and viable to do so.</li> <li>- Reference to 'high standards' should be expanded and defined in the Core Strategy, as well as in an SPD to provide clarity.</li> <li>- The policy should comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2005 Local Plan just contained a General policy on Renewable Energy which just set out the Council's intention to encourage renewable energy facilities provided there are no significant adverse effects. This approach sets out specific requirements for all new developments to incorporate a range of sustainable design and construction methods.</li> </ul>
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology)</li> <li>Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>- Building a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All new developments will need to demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design and construction. For development proposals of 10 dwellings or more or non-residential schemes over 1000m2 the minimum Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards will apply.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SA welcomes the inclusion of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM as well as a stipulation for carbon neutral development from 2016 and 2019.</li> <li>- Recognises that there are costs implication for businesses, developers and residents who choose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents felt that the policy went beyond what was required by regulations and guidance at a national level.</li> <li>- Prescribing how developers comply with government targets to achieve zero carbon homes from 2016 onwards was contrary to building regulations and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach now includes more substantial information on sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Green Future Policy Statement (2007) - PPS1		to build and need to implement the measures set out in this policy. However, the environmental benefits are clear and it should also have a long-term positive impact in costs saving for energy which offset the cost of its implementation.	national policy. - felt by others that requiring developers to meet specified Code for Sustainable Homes targets must be justified with a local evidence base. - Some felt that requiring Sustainable Energy Statements should be deleted as it is contrary to national guidance whereas others felt it should be it should be extended to all developments.	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF - BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology) - Code for Sustainable Homes	- All new development will be expected to make carbon savings through reducing energy demand, using energy and other resources efficiently and by generating low carbon / renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy. The key areas the Council will seek to address this through the Local Plan are Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development, Consequential Improvements to Existing dwellings and District Heating and Combined	- The options were assessed as having positive effects across the majority of the SA objectives which principally reflects the expectation that the preferred approach would both encourage the provision of renewable energy and low carbon energy development and help deliver energy efficient/low carbon, sustainably constructed homes and business premises. This in-turn may help to reduce emissions to air, minimise resource use, create employment and	- Some feel the policy should be more ambitious; others suggest that since the policy is already more onerous than national standards it is likely to cause significant viability and deliverability issues, without justification for its thresholds and requirements. - Several consultees felt that the policy is overly focused on energy demand, and that additional efficiency measures including green roofs, rain water harvesting and SUDS should be promoted both in relation to new build and the existing	- Changes made to reflect the proposed changes to building regulations. - A Sustainable Design and Construction SPD will be developed to support and help achieve the requirements of this chapter covering renewable energy generation, sustainable design and construction, climate resilience good practice and

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Heat and Power Networks	training opportunities within the renewables sector and help to alleviate climate change impacts.	<p>housing stock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for greater clarity in policy wording, particularly regarding 'technical feasibility' and 'allowable solutions'.</li> <li>- Development Management raise a question around the reasonableness and consistent application of the policy's requirements in relation to house extensions, particularly since PD rights allow for a significant level of development to take place without planning permission.</li> </ul>	also consequential improvements and other relevant issues to ensure that the local plan meets the challenges of climate change.

**Policy Topic: Environmental Quality**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC;</li> <li>- PPS23;</li> <li>- Framework Directive 96/62/EC;</li> <li>- Environment Act 1995;</li> <li>- Air Quality Regulations 2000;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Without Walls Community Strategy;</li> <li>- CYC Air Quality Management Order No. 1 (July 2004)</li> <li>- Air Quality Action Plan (July 2004)</li> <li>- Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2)</li> <li>- The overall approach is to protect and improve the quality of the environment in York, especially in terms of noise and air pollution, by implementing a zoning system on a city wide basis to control levels of noise pollution, targeting specific areas with existing pollution problems, identifying areas that may not yet pose pollution problems but potentially could, and control development to minimise impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach may prove useful in ensuring new polluting development is kept away from sensitive receptors such as hospital or schools, but also important that areas outside zones not adversely affected by polluting development. Preventing pollution in these areas would be better than reducing effects of pollution once occurred.</li> <li>- AQMA and sustainable transport policies should reduce impacts in such areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pollution problems should be identified and future developments should be limited, to reduce impacts;</li> <li>- Emphasis should be placed on reducing air pollution, especially from traffic;</li> <li>- City wide Air Quality zoning, with accessible data to help inform travel choices;</li> <li>- Supporting development near Park &amp; Ride sites to reduce pollution;</li> <li>- Zoning could reduce tourism;</li> <li>- Need for overall traffic plan;</li> <li>- No mention of PPS23, or to use brownfield sites for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific section on Environmental Quality, but issues of air quality considered as an efficient low emission public transport network will</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Option 4 in the Transport and Accessibility Section considers that although Park and Ride sites can reduce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
	Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC; - PPS23; - Framework Directive 96/62/EC; - Environment Act 1995; - Air Quality Regulations 2000;	assist in reducing pollution.	air quality issues locally, they still rely on car use for part of the journey.		
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS1; - PPG24; - Circular 10/73; - European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC; - PPS23; - Framework Directive 96/62/EC; - Environment Act 1995; - Air Quality Regulations 2000;	- Spatial Principle 2 (Areas of Constraint) considers the identification of sites in sustainable locations which don't lead to unacceptable levels of pollution or air quality.	- Policies CS13 and CS14 will both help to achieve the improvement of air quality. Policy CS2 also refers to air quality as a key objective, whilst CS3 aims to make York Central an exemplar sustainable development which should incorporate many measures to improve air quality. - Many other policies will help in improving air quality by directing development to areas to reduce	- Concern that planning for excessive growth will have a negative impact due to increased levels of traffic and air pollution; - Air quality is not adequately addressed at a strategic level; - Development on the scale discussed in the LDF should consider the overall impact on pollution and air quality.	- Only strategic approach can be taken in the Core Strategy which is different to the detailed approach taken in the Local Plan 2005. Still aiming to protect environmental quality however.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			dependence on the car, through increasing public transport and improved cycle / pedestrian access.		
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS1;</li> <li>- PPG24;</li> <li>- Circular 10/73;</li> <li>- European Commission Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC;</li> <li>- PPS23;</li> <li>- Framework Directive 96/62/EC;</li> <li>- Environment Act 1995;</li> <li>- Air Quality Regulations 2000</li> <li>- Draft NPPF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spatial Principle 2: Refers to the identification of sites in sustainable locations that would not lead to unacceptable levels of pollution or air quality.</li> <li>- The approach is to deliver improvements to air quality and the implementation of a Low Emissions Strategy by supporting measures to help reduce the emissions of nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), particulate (PM<sub>10</sub>) and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Areas of poor air quality are generally associated with high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as both types of emission arise from combustion sources. In most cases, air quality improvement measures will also reduce carbon emissions. However, some air quality improvement measures and carbon reduction policies can have conflicting outcomes so must be carefully managed.</li> <li>- Monitoring of air quality around the city will continue for the foreseeable future and other AQMAs may be designated should other areas of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objective to reduce emissions to air and improve air quality will not be achievable given employment and housing growth proposed.</li> <li>- Approach to air quality will perpetuate illegal levels of air pollution and that the strategic objectives and targets should be strengthened.</li> <li>- Objectives and targets should refer to early compliance with European Directives on air quality.</li> <li>- Air quality will worsen if the approach is not strengthened.</li> <li>- Radical measures need to be implemented to tackle air quality;</li> <li>- Policy should only apply to specific developments which fall within Air Quality Management Areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section on Air Quality included to reflect its importance as a key challenge for the city.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			air quality exceedance be identified.		
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2012 Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment for City of York Council: In Fulfilment of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management (2012)</li> <li>- Low Emission Strategy (2012)</li> <li>- Contaminated Land Strategy (2001, revised 2010)</li> <li>- 2011 Air Quality Progress Report for City of York Council: In Fulfilment of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management (2011)</li> <li>- Air Quality Action Plan 2 (2006)</li> <li><u>Air Quality</u></li> <li>- Development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and reduce further exposure to poor air</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant positive effects on health, land use, as well as positive effects in relation to climate change, water, air quality and cultural heritage. It provides a flexible approach to managing environmental quality issues, is considered to offer the most positive long-term approach.</li> <li>- The preferred approach has not been assessed as having significant (or minor) negative effects on any of the SA objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposes no firm or objective criteria for determining whether impacts on air quality in Air Quality Management Areas are acceptable or not;</li> <li>- Lack of emphasis on the importance of air quality in rural villages;</li> <li>- The green infrastructure and tree strategy should be in mitigation and adaptation to air quality, noise and vibration, pollution and other benefits. It has not been introduced into key evidence base and into policies;</li> <li>- Should only apply to specific development proposals which fall within an Air Quality Management Area;</li> <li>- Water quality is not specifically referred to;</li> <li>- Add sources of electromagnetic radiation from electricity distribution networks;</li> <li>- Add section on local food here;</li> <li>- Support for limits to light pollution;</li> <li>- Support for the Policy and consideration of Land Contamination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Topic area known as 'Environmental Quality' to reflect wider key issues such as land contamination. Also able to have criteria based policies to guide planning application decisions under new local plan development plan in accordance with the NPPF.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>quality.</p> <p><u>Managing Environmental Quality</u></p> <p>- Development will not be permitted where future occupiers would be subject to significant adverse environmental impacts due to noise, vibration, odour, fumes/emissions, dust and light pollution without effective mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Land Contamination</u></p> <p>- Development will not be permitted where a contamination assessment does not fully assess the possible contamination risks, or where the proposed remedial measures will not deal effectively with the levels of contamination.</p>			

**Policy Topic: Flood Risk, Groundwater and Surface Water Management**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG25	- Flooding is a key issue, shaper and driver of development focused in the Spatial Portrait and Spatial Strategy. Also covered in the sustainable vision for York and is a recurring theme through most sections of the plan.	- Many policy approaches that should help ensure that new development is compatible with the objectives of greater sustainability. With regard to design and construction, it may be suitable to consider how buildings should be designed in areas that may be at risk of flooding, as climate change is likely to cause more storm events, and higher winter rainfall, that may contribute to this risk.	- More detail needed on particular issues such as the opportunity for rivers, floodplains and strays to be utilised for recreation and biodiversity; outlining of measures to protect from flooding. - Further emphasis should be placed on protecting and preventing areas from flooding, and that greater analysis of flood risk areas should be undertaken.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPG25	- Flood risk one of the spatial planning objectives within the vision. - Separate flood risk section in the plan detailing key issues centred around locating new development in areas at low risk of flooding and balancing flood risk and sustainability issues.	- The risk to property, people and the economy of York posed by flooding is quite severe. However, a large quantity of the previously developed land suitable for development in York is found within areas at risk of flood. This means in some instances developing in flood prone areas may be necessary subject to suitable controls. Weighing up the	- Responses evenly split between the two options. - Considered that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be used to inform the allocation of sites for new development, with the priority given to sites which are not within the flood plain; although also argued that it should not be the sole driver for directing development within the city.	- N/A

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>- Key issues: when locating development in high flood risk areas how should the LDF seek to balance flood risk and sustainability issues?  Option 1: Prioritise sustainable locations, and seek to mitigate potential flood risk through technical solutions; or  Option 2: Given that flood risk is likely to intensify through Global Warming seek to identify sites in non high flood risk areas regardless of site sustainability.</p>	<p>differing sustainability implications of the two proposed options is a difficult task as both could have significant yet different positive and adverse effects relating to sustainable development objectives.</p>	<p>- Core Strategy should better reflect the approach set out in PPS25 and the RSS Policy ENV1 in relation to managing flood risk. It should refer to avoiding risk to people and managing flood risk elsewhere.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>PPG25</p>	<p>- Flood risk is identified as a key constraint in the overall spatial strategy and has been used to inform the location of future housing and employment growth  - Both the sequential and Exception Tests set out in the SFRA will be applied to</p>	<p>- SA suggests that the policy is strengthened to reflect and take full account of likely future impacts of climate change and other recommendations suggested to make policy stronger.</p>	<p>- Over four-fifths (85%) of respondents think that ensuring new development does not add to the flooding and drainage problems in York will be most effective for sustainable development.  - As a result of climate change, the increased risks of flooding were highlighted, and it was emphasised that</p>	<p>- No change, general direction of the policy remains the same in reducing flood risk through avoiding development on flood plains and mitigation measures.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>development proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will seek to ensure that new development is not subject to, nor contributes to, inappropriate levels of flood risk from the Rivers Ouse, Foss and Derwent and other sources, taking into account the full likely future impacts of climate change.</li> </ul>		<p>there is a need for urgent technical solutions as well as employing mitigation measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</p>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<p>PPG25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will ensure that new development is not subject to flooding, does not contribute to flooding and is designed in a way that takes account of both existing and future flood risk.</li> <li>- Will use the 'Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification' and 'Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility Classification' tables from the Strategic Flood Risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised policy is clearer in its policy direction for implementing flood risk strategies to reduce risk and mitigate risk in the future and the SA considers it to be stronger in direction compared to the previous version.</li> <li>- Welcomes the added detail included within the revised policy to help set an understanding of what implementation measures are required in different circumstances as well as what will be used to assess the determination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixture of views over the whether the flood risk policy was inline with national guidance.</li> <li>- The Environment Agency specifically stressed that the wording in the section failed to explain that the Sequential Test should be applied first and passed before the Exception Test is undertaken</li> <li>- York's flooding history, high water table and climate change projections paragraph means that all watercourses should be referenced.</li> </ul>	<p>More detail has been given setting out the requirements for developers. However the approach to flood risk remains the same.</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Assessment (2011) and any subsequent updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All new development will be required to include the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems unless it can be demonstrated that it is not technically feasible or viable</li> <li>- The design and construction of new development will take account of existing and future flood risk particularly given the implications of climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>of if a site can be progressed through the planning system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wider strategic issues regarding flood management and implementation of defences in York is recognised to be under the remit of the EA.</li> </ul>		
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<p>The Local Plan will ensure that new development is not subject to flood risk and is designed and constructed in such a way that it mitigates against current and future flood events, taking into account flood risk considerations in the NPPF and the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would have positive effects across several of the SA objectives with significant positive effects identified in respect of SA Objective 13 (Flood Risk).</li> <li>- It is assumed that the preferred approach would seek to restrict development in the floodplain which, alongside requiring all new development to adopt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of actions of relevance to planning in regard to catchment flood management plans have been omitted.</li> <li>- The sequential approach should be included in the policy rather than in the reasoned justification text. Policy should be reviewed with the aim of requiring more 'Exception Testing' in Flood Zones 1 and 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst more detail is provided and the evidence base has been updated the approach remains broadly the same.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Technical Guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will ensure that new development incorporates sustainable drainage measures and, where practicable, reduces surface water flows, irrespective of which flood zone it lays in.</li> <li>- New development will not be permitted to allow outflow from ground water and/or land drainage to enter public sewers.</li> </ul>	<p>specific measures to mitigate flooding, would serve to minimise flood risk to both existing and new development in the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A requirement for project Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) to include assessments of the potential impacts of changes in flood risk and associated management measures on the Lower Derwent Valley's statutory conservation designations should be identified along with appropriate mitigation measures where necessary.</li> <li>- Should be taking a more positive stance and seek betterment from developers to mitigate against future flood risk.</li> </ul>	

**Policy topic: Communications Infrastructure**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	PPG8	- Not covered.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	PPG8	- Not covered.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	PPG8	Within Section 7 (York’s Special Historic and Built Environment), the Preferred Approach is considered to provide the context for policy and guidance on a range of planning matters concerned with design, landscape and the historic environment, including telecommunications equipment, by restating the authority’s duty to protect, conserve or enhance all of York’s heritage assets and enable the highest quality of design which responds to what is unique and distinct in York.	- Not referred to	- No comments	- Development Management policy included in the Local Plan (2005) however too detailed for a Core Strategy. Overarching approach set out in relation to design.
<b>Core Strategy Submission –</b>	PPG8 -	Within Section 13 (Sustainable Economic Growth) consideration is given to the future growth of the telecommunications industry	- Not referred to	- No comments	- Reference to telecommunications removed from the approach to



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>September 2011</b>		through Science City York, and how the LDF could explore ways in which the Council could support the start up and growth of facilities for creative and IT / digital sectors.			design and the historic environment.
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	- NPPF -Planning Practice Guidance 2014.	- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2013)  - Policy approach supports the enhancement of communications infrastructure whilst at the same time seeking to ensure that the visual and environmental impacts are minimised. - Given the special character of York the siting, appearance and visual impact of any telecommunications infrastructure is key - Preference and encouragement to be given to mast and site sharing where this is technically possible. However the cumulative impact of additional infrastructure being added to an existing site will need to be taken into account - Will seek the removal of the visually intrusive masts in the	- Not assessed as having a significant positive effect on any of the SA objectives. - Would have a positive effect on socioeconomic SA objectives through supporting high quality communications infrastructure to improve York's connectivity to wider markets, widening the workforce catchment area through home-working and enabling access to services and facilities including education and training. Also expected that local policy would help to protect York's built and natural	- Support for the proposed approach - Support for the approach which seeks to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city. - Removal of old communications infrastructure is supported. - York needs to have a world class communications network to support the Universities and business sector.	- Detailed, development management policy now added to reflect production of local plan in accordance with government guidance.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		City Centre, such as those masts on the BT Hungate and Cedar Court Hotel buildings as when the opportunity arises.	environmental assets from adverse impacts associated with communications infrastructure development. - The preferred option was not assessed as having a significant (or minor) negative effect on any of the SA objectives.		

**Policy Topic: Approach to Waste and Minerals**

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS10</li> <li>- MPS1</li> <li>- MPG6</li> </ul>	<p>- Waste Strategy (2001)</p> <p>- Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Autumn 2005)</p> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed approach to waste includes the following options:</li> <li>- Maximising the potential contribution to waste minimisation, re-use and recycling</li> <li>- Providing sufficient waste sites;</li> <li>- Identifying the location of new facilities and waste policies through locating facilities:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. wherever possible on previously developed land;</li> <li>2. close to waste arisings;</li> <li>3. in areas that are relatively unconstrained by sensitive environmental or cultural designations.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed approach to Minerals includes the following options:</li> <li>- Proposals for the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of minerals and aggregates will only be permitted where it can be shown that there is a</li> </ul>	<p>Proposals should help to deliver the following sustainability objectives in relation to the prudent and efficient use of energy, water and other natural Resources and reducing pollution and waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling.</p> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction waste should be kept to a minimum through construction planning,</li> <li>- Could also take an approach that the refurbishment of buildings should be prioritised over demolition and redevelopment where practicable in order to save primary resources.</li> <li>- No indication in the document what the need for waste sites will be in the LDF area, and no real options can be drawn up for the location of these</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local recycling targets should be stronger and should exceed government targets</li> <li>- Reduction in waste generation supported</li> <li>- The approach to waste should include seeking the reuse of buildings to avoid demolition and consequently reducing the amount of construction waste.</li> <li>- The following should be factors in determining the location of new waste management facilities: flood risk; impact on the green belt; reduction of vehicle trips; whether the site is previously developed land and close to existing facilities; and consideration of the type of waste site proposed.</li> <li>- Should encourage the development of existing waste plants rather than creating new ones.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The level of response to the minerals section was low and no strong message emerged</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>demonstrable need and market demand for the resource</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals for the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of minerals and aggregates will only be permitted where it can be shown that there is a national requirement/shortfall for the resource.</li> </ul>	<p>facilities. Without more detail on the need it is not possible to say, with any certainty, the effectiveness of policy.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is hoped that policies on the reuse of construction and demolition wastes should help reduce the demand for primary mineral resources.</li> </ul>	<p>from respondents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should actively reduce demand for non-renewable mineral resources by requiring all developments to maximise recycling of building waste and aggregates.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS10</li> <li>- MPS1</li> <li>- MPG6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ‘Let’s Talk Less Rubbish’, A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (May 2006)</li> <li>- ‘City of York Council – Waste Management Strategy: 2002 – 2020’ (Nov 2002 / Amended Nov 2004)</li> <li>- Regional Sand and Gravel Study for Yorkshire and the Humber Region</li> </ul> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options put forward for which factors should be used to direct the approach to identifying future waste sites. As follows: Option 1: Environmentally sensitive areas Option 2: Environmental impacts</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The options and questions presented under this Issue may not be suitable in determining this Core Strategy issue as choices will depend on the locations available, the needs of a particular waste stream and partly be dependent on waste management decisions of the Council and others. Finding the Best Practicable Environmental Option will often be the way that suitable locations and technologies for waste management are found and care needs to be taken to be realistic in what this will</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Option 1 (avoiding environmentally sensitive areas e.g. SSSI’s), option 2 (where environmental impact would be unacceptable e.g. noise, dust, litter) and option 5 (which would be guided by the type of waste being dealt with e.g. industrial or household) were the most favoured options.</li> <li>- Some respondents supported all the options and suggested all should influence future locations.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extraction based on local demand and need was the favoured option, with priority given to supplying the local</li> </ul>	<p>- N/A</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>Option 3: Location in regard to Green Belt</p> <p>Option 4: Brownfield land</p> <p>Option 5: The waste stream</p> <p>(Option 6: Technology and design of waste facility</p> <p>Option 7: Co-location with existing facilities</p> <p>Option 8: The total distance from waste generator to new waste facility</p> <p>Option 9: Waste transportation modes</p> <p>Option10: Access networks ( <u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Two options put forward for the approach to the exploration, appraisal, winning and working of sand and gravel as follows:</p> <p>Option 1: It can be shown that there is a regional requirement</p> <p>Option 2: It can be shown that there is both a regional requirement and a demonstrable need and market demand for the resource arising in the York area based on proximity and other local factors (i.e. building rates).</p>	<p>be in each circumstance based on sound science and precautionary approaches.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Mining mineral resources could have an impact on protection of the natural environment and will impact on land take.</p> <p>- Development management policies of the LDF should ensure that reduction in need through re-use and recycling of primary mineral resources and building materials is a priority. Thereby reducing the overall mineral demand in York.</p> <p>- Consideration of cumulative impacts on local communities should be considered, without inequitably disadvantaging any one community.</p> <p>- Overly constraining the supply of local minerals may adversely impact costs to the local building industry.</p>	<p>market. Other respondents emphasised that which ever option was taken forward control over extraction was vital and extraction should only be permitted where there will be minimal impact on the surrounding area, natural environment and local communities.</p>	
<b>Core Strategy</b>	<p>- PPS10</p> <p>- Waste</p>	<p>- RSS (2008)</p> <p>- Let's Talk Less Rubbish', A</p>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <p>- The continued screening</p>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <p>- Should provide alternative</p>	<p>- No change in approach</p>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<p><b>Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<p>Strategy for England (2007) - MSP1</p>	<p>Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (May 2006) - ‘City of York Council – Waste Management Strategy: 2002 – 2020’ (Nov 2002 / Amended Nov 2004) - Waste Strategy Refresh for the period 2008-2014 (Executive September 2008). - Regional Sand and Gravel Study for Yorkshire and the Humber Region</p> <p><u>Waste</u> - Maximise the extent to which waste is reduced, reused and recycled, and provide appropriate sites for waste management - To be achieved through: 1 Supporting and encouraging waste minimisation 2 Supporting and promoting reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting of waste 3 Providing adequate household recycling facilities across the city. 4 Allocating sufficient, appropriate and accessible land within York that is capable of accommodating a range of strategic waste management and treatment</p>	<p>and scoping of proposals is recommended to assess the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment. As is the continued protection of European Sites through the Appropriate Assessment procedures – Could be reworded to make specific reference to protecting York’s natural environment and open spaces and noise and air quality issues – Reference is made to protecting the historic character and setting of the City when considering proposals but does not set out specifically how this would be controlled or how the policy will be implemented to prove these matters have been thoroughly assessed (particularly by developers). – Could be re-worded to consider an assessment of the cumulative impact on local communities of these types of operation – More detail could be given</p>	<p>means to landfill to dispose of waste including the promotion of more recycling and the need to make it easier - Should be made clear that waste sites are subject to Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. - Wherever possible waste transfer should avoid the use of the Strategic Road Network. - Approach is significantly lacking in terms of types of waste management facilities required and the requirements for different waste streams. - Pays insufficient attention to commercial and construction and demolition waste. - Should include waste strategies and policies unless they are being addressed in other DPD’s being prepared jointly with other local authorities or separately by the Unitary Authority. Otherwise there would be a need for a more comprehensive policy required by RSS and PPS10. <u>Minerals</u> - Support for the principle of reducing the dependency on</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>facilities, including facilities in relation to the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI).</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>- Will seek to safeguard mineral deposits and reduce the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources by encouraging re-use and recycling of construction and demolition waste, whilst contributing to meeting the RSS, Sand and Gravel and Brick Clay Study requirements.</p>	<p>on the strategic location of waste facilities so that these are delivered through the Allocations DPD in locations that will meet projected waste production and that reduce the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <p>– Recommended that planning conditions are used to protect the environment and the amenity of communities</p> <p>- Should continue screening and scoping of proposals to assess the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment and continued protection of European Sites through the Appropriate Assessment procedures</p> <p>– The use of the word ‘significant’ is not defined. Queried whether this offers enough protection to locally significant rural landscapes, public open spaces and important historic features.</p> <p>– Could specifically refer to noise pollution.</p> <p>– Could be re-worded to</p>	<p>primary extraction.</p> <p>- Avoidance of environmental impacts should be the primary requirement.</p> <p>- Transfer of minerals should avoid the Strategic Road Network.</p>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>consider an assessment of the cumulative impact on local communities of these types of operation</p> <p>– Potential for new mineral extraction to result in adverse impacts on air quality. The policy should set out the need to take this into account in considering proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS10</li> <li>- Waste Strategy for England (2007)</li> <li>- MSP1</li> <li>- National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England (June 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Let's Talk Less Rubbish: A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026 (2006)</li> <li>- Waste Management Strategy 2002 – 2020 (2002/amended 2004).</li> <li>- Waste Management Strategy – refresh for the period 2008 – 2014 (2008)</li> <li>- The Sand and Gravel Study Phase 1 (2001)</li> </ul> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximise the extent to which waste is prevented, reused, recycled and recovered, alongside providing appropriate sites for waste management in accordance with both the sub-regional and local waste</li> </ul>	<p><u>Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Including further factors for consideration when identifying new location for development enhances the environmental sustainability of this policy.</li> <li>- Reservations about the transportation of waste outside of the authority area in terms of environmental impacts suggests that this could be offset through using environmentally friendly vehicles.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The overall emphasis of the policy now follows a more sustainable approach</li> <li>- Welcomes the reference to the spatial principles if considering any mineral</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns in relation to construction and demolition waste</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy approach remains the same but more detail is provided, including on the location of any new facilities and what factors will need to be considered for these. It also details the type of processes which will be employed to treat waste in the waste hierarchy.</li> </ul>



Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>management strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working jointly with North Yorkshire County Council to identify the Waste Private Finance Initiative facilities for residual municipal waste</li> <li>- Safeguarding existing facilities</li> <li>- Identifying through an appropriate Development Plan Document, suitable alternatives for municipal waste</li> <li>- Requiring the integration of facilities for waste prevention, re-use, recycling composting and recovery in association with the planning, construction and occupation of new development for housing, retail and other commercial site</li> <li>- promoting opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises at retail, industrial and commercial locations, particularly in the main urban area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources and safeguard mineral deposits.</li> <li>- minimising the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources in major developments by requiring developers to demonstrate good practice in the</li> </ul>	<p>extraction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall, the changes to the policy are positive in terms of sustainability.</li> <li>- Noted that there is a lack of evidence base with regards to specific Minerals in York aside from Coalbed Methane.</li> <li>- Currently no information regarding apportionments for the authority as this information is only dealt with at the Yorkshire and Humber level. In taking this policy forward more information will be needed as to the likely potential for extraction.</li> <li>- Issues regarding the cumulative impact of mineral extraction has not been covered. However, the policy aims to reduce the impact of extraction overall and it is acknowledged that the cumulative impact will be influenced by the scale and location of any proposed extraction.</li> <li>- Inclusion of air quality matters have not been</li> </ul>		<p>More detail is also provided on the factors to be considered for any new developments to include the natural environment and openspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- References to new waste locations being allocated in the Allocations DPD have been removed but issues will be taken forward in a Waste DPD to be prepared.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>use, reuse, recycling and disposal of construction materials;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safeguarding sand and gravel and coalbed methane mineral resources, through ensuring other forms of development do not prejudice future mineral extraction;</li> <li>- If a proven need exists, identifying sites of sufficient quality for mineral extraction, inline with agreed apportionments and guidelines, through an appropriate DPD.</li> </ul>	<p>included within the revised policy but this issue has been superseded by the inclusion of the Air Quality Policy.</p>		
<p><b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>– National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 (2009).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A detailed range of evidence base documents informed the preferred approach.</li> <li>- Joint Waste and Minerals Plan being prepared that will provide a mechanism for formally addressing strategic crossboundary issues and will also contain detailed policies for waste and minerals.</li> <li>- It is not appropriate to duplicate these policies in the Local Plan but necessary to provide the strategic context for these policies.</li> <li>- Sustainable waste management will be promoted by encouraging</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a positive effect on the majority of the SA objectives although no effects were considered to be significant</li> <li>- The preferred approach was considered to perform better than the reasonable alternatives identified and assessed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several responses objecting to the proposed waste treatment facility at Allerton Park. Incineration is unsustainable, and expensive, Localised management of recycling and disposal is likely to create more jobs and still be cheaper than Allerton Park</li> <li>- More detailed needed on approach.</li> <li>- Policy should deal with Shale Gas/Fracking. Should say no fracking in York.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed considerations now to be covered in a Joint Waste and Minerals Plan.</li> <li>- Role of York Local Plan to provide strategic context for this Joint Plan.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<p>waste prevention, reuse, recycling, composting and energy recovery in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy and effectively managing all of York's waste streams and their associated waste arisings.</p> <p>- Mineral resources will be safeguarded, the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources will be reduced by encouraging re-use and recycling of construction and demolition waste and any new provision of mineral resource will be carefully controlled.</p>			

**Policy topic: Transport**

<b>Plan stage</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	<b>Evidence and Approach</b>	<b>SA/SEA</b>	<b>Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Reasons for Change</b>
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- PPG23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of York Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2) identified congestion as a key concern.</li> <li>- A number of measures suggested to help reduce car usage which including demand management, public transport, walking and cycling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing a ‘connected’ LDF area in terms of public transport accessibility is one of the key ways in which it can have a positive impact on achieving more sustainable development.</li> <li>- With all new high trip generating development of this type it is vital that public transport accessibility, walking and cycling is taken into account from the outset</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A key issue in determining location is the need to locate housing in areas with good transport links and access to employment, services and facilities.</li> <li>- Employment locations should reduce the need to travel and reduce dependence on the car.</li> <li>- The Core Strategy should recognise that some visitors will always choose to arrive by car.</li> <li>- Many respondents suggested that we need a bus station close to the train Station and Park and ride schemes need strengthening.</li> <li>- The document should ultimately reflect the Regional Transport Strategy</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- PPG23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes more detail on the measures within City of York Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2)</li> <li>- Consideration of issues emerging since the publication of LTP2 e.g. Tram-Train scheme, Dualling the A1237 York outer ring road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Influence over achieving sustainable development through changing travel patterns, both through controlling the demand for travel and the distance travelled, by providing for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to non-car transport modes suggested as a factor for considering the location of new development.</li> <li>- Access to public transport should feature more heavily in the Spatial Strategy.</li> <li>- General support for increasing use of public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach broadly similar, but with more emphasis on regional influences rather than national policy. Contains more information on the interdependency</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lists eight options for reducing the impacts of traffic including using those measures in the Local Transport Plan that can be delivered through the LDF, include the Tram-Train proposal being investigated for the Leeds, Harrogate, Knaresborough, York line and identifying additional opportunities to improve rail facilities above the Haxby proposal set out in the Local Transport Plan 2.</li> </ul>	<p>peoples' needs as locally as possible. The other factor of importance is reducing car use through encouraging people to use more sustainable modes.</p>	<p>transport as an alternative to the car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was some support for investigating the Tram-Train proposal and generally improving rail facilities and better use of the rivers as a transport route were suggested.</li> </ul>	<p>between LDF and LTP.</p>
<p><b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- Successive Government White Papers. All to encourage the most sustainable forms of transport and discourage the least sustainable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Themes for Transport Planning cover tackling congestion, Improving accessibility for all, safety, improving air quality, improving quality of life and supporting the local economy</li> <li>- the approach to transport will enable appropriate development to take place that not only widens transport choice, particularly for the more sustainable forms of transport such as public transport including buses, walking and cycling, thereby reducing the use of the private</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A gap in the LDFs objectives included the need to reduce travel through the location of development, in addition to ensuring public transport is a viable alternative to car use.</li> <li>- Plans for a shift in travel patterns to more sustainable methods of transport together with an integrated network which reduces the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport infrastructure should be one of the main drivers of the spatial strategy and not retro-fitted.</li> <li>- Good provision of public transport was a regular comment.</li> <li>- The public should be able to walk to key services and have access to frequent public transport routes.</li> <li>- The strategy should encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport as well as improving access to services.</li> <li>- The approach should support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy direction is broadly the same, with policies regarding minimising travel and traffic generation, promoting sustainable transport and reduce pollution and noise created by vehicles.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		car and improving access to services and facilities, but also, minimises the need to travel.	need for car transport.	proposals to improve highway or transport infrastructure in association with development proposals which have not been anticipated within LTP2.	
<b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPG13</li> <li>- Successive Government White Papers. All to encourage the most sustainable forms of transport and discourage the least sustainable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach is to address the City's transport issues and deliver transport infrastructure and measures which ensure sustainable growth and development</li> <li>- The revised has been restructured into 5 separate streams. The first is location of development. The second structures the phasing of strategic infrastructure improvements, similarly to the previous policy, but groups each aspect under the timescale rather than in transport modes. The third section sets out the Council's intention for behavioural change delivered through a range of interventions. The fourth area concentrates on residential amenity and possible outcomes as well as referring to the role of the City Centre Area Action Plan. Section five relates to the Strategic Allocations and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In terms of improving and mitigating traffic congestion an overarching theme for York needed to become more sustainable through the use of different transport modes.</li> <li>- Development across York for housing and employment purposes was seen to increase the need for alternative modes of transport to the car to reduce the amount of overall trips.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In order to have a public transport system which adequately supports development, a fundamental re-envisioning of the city's transport system should be undertaken which would ultimately result in the City's core being car free.</li> <li>- The rivers should be used more as strategic transport links.</li> <li>- Many respondents stressed the importance of investment in transport infrastructure limited support was given to the general approach of this chapter. Several respondents expressed concern about the ability of the strategic road network, particularly the outer ring road, to facilitate economic well being.</li> <li>- Concern was expressed to the lack of consideration of the existing capacity and constraints of the Outer Ring Road on the feasibility of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change in general approach.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		Future Areas of Search for Urban Extensions setting out the overall requirements for these sites should they come forward for development.		growth rates assumed in the Core Strategy.	
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed key evidence base informs the approach to deliver a fundamental shift in travel patterns through promoting sustainable connectivity through ensuring that new development is located with good access to high quality public transport and to the strategic cycling and walking network. The need to travel will be reduced by ensuring that new development is located with good access to services.</li> <li>- New stations will be provided at Haxby and potentially Strensall; and</li> <li>- Infrastructure will be provided to support sustainable travel; including the provision of safe new cycle and walking routes as part of a complete city wide network, high quality well located bus stops and secure cycle parking facilities, new rail and park and ride facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The preferred policy approach has been assessed as having a significant positive effect on transport (SA Objective 6) and climate change (SA Objective 7). Positive effects were also identified across the majority of the SA objectives which seek a re-balancing of the modal split by encouraging public transport, cycling and walking, discouraging car-based travel and increase accessibility. It is recommended that transport policy includes mitigation to address the uncertainties with regard to conserving the natural environment, using land resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of responses related to the A1237 outer ring road.</li> <li>- Whilst there was some support for the expansion and improvements of Park &amp; Ride facilities at Designer Outlet there was also some opposition to this, with extending its hours of operation suggested as an alternative.</li> <li>- Opposition and support to new rail stations at Haxby and Strensall.</li> <li>- Opposition to the joining of Manor Lane / Hurricane Way, as it would be detrimental to the quality of life for residents in the vicinity, being heavily used as a rat-run.</li> <li>- There is a need for a central bus (and coach) station at or near to York Railway station.</li> <li>- Should make considerably more off-road cycling provision between the outlying towns and the centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The section now has extra policies to reflect the strategic nature of the plan and the importance of the rail network in York.</li> <li>- The general approach is broadly the same.</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			efficiently and the potential for adverse impacts on the historic environment and the natural and built heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objection to a reduction in the provision of long stay parking in the city centre because it will have a detrimental impact on trade and visitor numbers.</li> <li>- The thresholds for what is classed as a major development differ from those set out in the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessments.</li> <li>- There is no evidence to date to indicate that measure in place or proposed will reduce air pollution levels to within health based legal limits.</li> <li>- The proposal to extend the footstreets to include Fossgate makes no reference to consultation or working with the businesses and residents.</li> <li>- The whole of the city centre should be a 20mph limit and one-way systems returned to two way, where possible to naturally calm vehicles and make city centre streets less attractive as a vehicular short-cut.</li> </ul>	



## Policy Topic: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 1 – June 2006</b>	- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act	- Increasing tree cover as part of new development through section 106 contributions for tree planting, and protecting existing tree cover by increasing the number of Tree Preservation Orders in the City and surrounding area.	- N/A	- One respondent was concerned that financial contributions required from developers will inhibit the provision of student housing.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Issues and Options 2 – September 2007</b>	- N/A	- N/A	- N/A	- Suitable contributions will also be needed to ensure local services are not overstretched by new development.	- N/A
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options – June 2009</b>	- PPS12 - Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act	- New development will be supported by appropriate physical, social and economic infrastructure provision. - The Council will work with infrastructure providers and other delivery agencies to determine the appropriate level of provision and will seek contributions from developers to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support development. - Prepare a Supplementary Planning Document which will set out the mechanism through which developer contributions	- It would be worth also including information on how the Council will work to address existing needs or gaps of infrastructure delivery across the authority within this policy.	- The Core Strategy should have an overarching policy on developer contributions and infrastructure provision, with the detail set out in an SPD. - This should be prepared in consultation with developers and test the various mechanisms for typical development scenarios to ensure that they meet circular 05/05. - CIL may result in developers not bringing land forward until the levy is removed or infrastructure has	- No change in approach. The Local Plan 2005 also sought infrastructure and developer contributions through the development process.

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
		will be sought. This could include the use of planning obligations, tariffs, standard charges or a Levy.		<p>already been paid for by other developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CIL is not a suitable method to recover drainage and flood risk contributions.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure providers are unlikely to fund infrastructure for development if they may not recover full costs for 15-20 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach should combine CIL with the continued use of planning Obligations. This would meet concerns about mitigating impacts in the immediate locality of the development and retain the flexibility to negotiate obligations regarding specific sites.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Core Strategy Submission – September 2011</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS12</li> <li>- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To deliver sustainable growth by ensuring that all development is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure provision.</li> <li>- The Council will prepare a further planning document which will set out the mechanism through which developer contributions will be sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The recommendation to address gaps in infrastructure should be progressed alongside any development. However, this issue is not fully addressed.</li> <li>- The SPD to be prepared to give more detail for this policy should include further</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many other respondents felt that approach is not founded on a sufficiently robust and credible evidence base as it is not considered to be based on a sound Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as the IDP does not demonstrate whether a viability assessment has been undertaken or if developers/funding sources can finance infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy is stronger and more comprehensive in prescribing what is expected of developers..</li> </ul>

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
			<p>information with regards to redressing any gaps which exist in provision.</p>	<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is considered unreasonable by some respondents to expect developers to contribute to strategic infrastructure if likely costs are not established. It was also suggested that a site size or dwelling threshold for which contributions for off site infrastructure should be included, alongside a schedule of costs.</li> <li>- Several respondents suggested that specific types of infrastructure should be added to the list, such as sports facilities and the Strategic Road Network.</li> <li>- General comments include the need to include reference to emerging national biodiversity offsetting pilots as an alternative method to Section 106 and the need to plan for a transition to an economy that is not reliant on fossil fuels, including a city wide approach to renewable energy.</li> </ul>	

Plan stage	National Policy	Evidence and Approach	SA/SEA	Consultation Responses	Reasons for Change
<b>Local Plan Preferred Options – June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NPPF</li> <li>- Section 106 1990 Town and Country Planning Act</li> <li>- Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008</li> <li>- Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is critical that new development is supported by appropriate infrastructure to ensure the creation of sustainable communities. A key element of delivery will be to ensure that the infrastructure needed to support development is provided and funded.</li> <li>- Infrastructure will be funded from a mix of sources including Council budgets, national Government funding, funding from other public bodies and agencies, as well as developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an expectation that the approach would generate significant levels of funding toward delivering the strategic infrastructure necessary to support growth and that this infrastructure would be in place prior to development. This would deliver benefits in respect of social, the economy and the environment</li> <li>- There are high costs implications to delivering transport infrastructure that is critical to enabling the development to be viable and deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should make specific reference to developers being required to provide contributions towards new flood alleviation schemes, the long term maintenance of existing defences and habitat creation though CIL.</li> <li>- Should ensure that a significant proportion of funds raised by S106 obligations and CIL are used to benefit community facilities in the local areas affected by development.</li> <li>- Policy IDC1 should be amended to refer to phasing.</li> <li>- Concern that Policy IDC1 makes no reference to viability considerations in setting out the requirement for infrastructure and developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The primary thrust of the policy and section remain the same however small changes have been made to take into account changes in CIL regulations.</li> </ul>