

Notice of a public meeting of

Local Plan Working Group

- To:** Councillors Ayre (Chair), Carr (Vice-Chair), N Barnes, D'Agorne, Derbyshire, Lisle, Looker, Mercer, Orrell, Reid, Steward, Warters and Williams
- Date:** Tuesday, 23 January 2018
- Time:** 6.00 pm
- Venue:** The George Hudson Board Room - 1st Floor West Offices (F045)

AGENDA

1. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

2. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 16)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group held on 10 July 2017 and 12 October 2017.

3. **Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak, regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the remit of the Working Group, may do so. The deadline for registering is 5.00pm on Monday 22 January 2017.

Filming or Recording Meetings

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be filmed and webcast, or recorded, including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. This broadcast can be viewed at <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts>.

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This includes the use of social media reporting e.g. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officer (whose contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council's protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at http://www.york.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11406/protocol_for_webcasting_filming_and_recording_of_council_meetings_20160809.pdf

4. **City of York Local Plan** (Pages 17 - 502)

This report will:

- provide a background summary of the previous iterations of draft policies and the circumstances which led to the rationale of the Executive decision to approve the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan for consultation;
- provide a summary of the present national policy and legislative context, including the “soundness” requirement and potential for Government intervention;

- report responses to the Autumn 2017 Pre Publication Draft Local Plan Consultation;
- provide Officers' advice regarding appropriate responses to the Consultation outcomes; and
- seek Member approval of the next steps in the York Local Plan making process.

5. Urgent Business

Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer:

Name: Angela Bielby

Contact Details:

- Telephone – (01904) 552599
- E-mail – a.bielby@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

This information can be provided in your own language.

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

Meeting	Local Plan Working Group
Date	10 July 2017
Present	Councillors Ayre (Chair), Carr (Vice-Chair), N Barnes, Lisle, Looker, Mercer, Reid, Steward, Warters, Kramm (Substitute), Williams, Pavlovic (Substitute) and Cuthbertson (Substitute)
Apologies	Councillors Derbyshire, D'Agorne and Orrell

6. Declarations of Interest

Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests which they might have in respect of business on the agenda. No further declarations were declared.

7. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 June be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

8. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been seven registrations to speak on item 4, City of York Local Plan, under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Jane Wright from the Rufforth Neighbourhood Plan Group spoke on the emerging Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan. She stated that the Plan reflected the views of their whole community and it recommended a maximum of 40 extra houses in the Local Plan. She expressed their concerns over the additional housing allocation, which would increase the size of Rufforth by 50%, without services and infrastructure to support this development. These sites had been rejected by the Group and she asked the Council to reconsider the proposals and to respect the power granted to Parishes in the Localism Act.

Edie Jones, Chair of Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Group, spoke on Brownfield development. She expressed the Groups views on why the use of Green Belt for housing and employment would encourage Brownfield sites to become less appealing to developers. She expressed concerns on four sites, the former Civil Service ground, the Poppleton Garden Centre and the two areas around Northminster Business Park and suggested development on Brownfield Sites should be a priority.

Richard France, the Managing Director of the Oakgate Group, spoke on the employment land element, in particular land east to the Designer Outlet. He confirmed that the 40 acre site had substantial infrastructure so could accommodate further development and that the land they also owned around the A64/A19 junctions could also be upgraded as necessary. He felt the site would complement city centre developments and could be deliverable very quickly and early in the Plan period. He confirmed their proposal was fully supported by a range of businesses and he requested the Committee consider this site as it could offer a sustainable employment location that would have little or no visual impact.

Derek Bowen, the Chair of Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Group, confirmed their Plan was prepared in accordance with the rights granted to ensure that any development was inline with the wishes of a local community and reflected the opinions of residents, contained policies protecting the Green Belt and identified two sites for housing development. He asked Members not to amend present provisions in the draft Local Plan, which would directly affect the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.

Dave Merrett spoke on social and overall housing provision and transport implications. He expressed his disappointment on proposals to address the affordable housing crisis in the city. He confirmed that the strategic Housing Market Assessment report made very clear the scale of this issue and he highlighted the problems with house prices and private sector rents in York. He felt the overall housing numbers should be increased, to ensure sufficient affordable housing was available. He raised concerns with the traffic congestion and the transport infrastructure.

Tony Fisher, spoke on behalf of Strensall Parish Council, regarding allocation of the barracks and land around Strensall. He confirmed the Parish Council felt the MOD site should be developed as soon as practically possible and not left to deteriorate. They hoped the development of 623 dwellings would obliterate the need to develop Green Belt within the Parish. The Parish welcomed the proposal for a new primary school on the MOD site, development of much needed social housing and Towthorpe Lines for business and employment opportunities. He also addressed concerns to some wording in Annex 3 Table 1, the transport infrastructure and the sewage flow at site ST9.

Ronald Clayton, Chair of Heworth Without Parish Council, spoke on two points. He raised issues regarding developing on Green Belt and the strategy of the Local Plan. He requested the Council consider the number of houses needed before they urbanised areas of York.

9. City of York Local Plan

Members considered a report that

- provided an update on the work undertaken on the Ministry of Defence (MOD) sites highlighted in previous reports to LPWG and Executive;
- sought their views on the methodology and studies carried out to inform the housing and employment that the City was tasked with accommodating;
- sought their views on the most appropriate way of accommodating this future growth;
- sought their approval of non-housing and employment site specific policies; and
- requested the approval for officers to undertake the necessary work to produce a draft plan based on the recommendations of the Executive for the purposes of consultation along with associated technical papers.

Officers gave an update and confirmed the report and appendices made up the Local Plan for York. It included the responses from the preferred sites consultation and also highlighted officers and various external organisations

responses to the future housing and employment needs, including the suitability of sites for future development.

In answer to some Members questions officers confirmed:

- a composite draft Local Plan would be opened for city wide consultation around September 2017 for six weeks. The comments raised would then be considered by the Local Plan Working Group and Executive around January 2018 before submitting it to the Planning Inspectorate around spring 2018, where the examination would take between 6 to 9 months.
- the Plan could be adopted around early 2019 and would set out the Green Belt boundaries for the next 20 years.
- the MOD sites identified for housing would be delivered from 2021 and 2031 and the transport infrastructure would continue to be considered in consultation with Strensall Parish Council.
- they would continue to receive clarity from the MOD regarding their properties being included in the housing stock for York.
- Neighbourhood Plans had to be produced in accordance with an adopted Local Plan.
- Local Plans could be subject to a review every 5 years.

In answer to Members questions regarding site H56, St John's Playing Fields on Windmill Lane the Head of Strategic Planning stated that the site was included in the site selection because Sport England had confirmed that the Haxby Road site provided a replacement for the recreational facilities provided by site H56. The officer felt that this meant the site was acceptable to be included in the Local Plan site selection.

The Assistant Director for Planning and Public Protection also clarified that site H56 would not be removed from the site selection regardless of any negative response received during the Regulation 18 consultation because the site already had planning permission and it would be perverse to remove a site from the Local Plan if it had a planning permission approved.

Following questions the Chair highlighted each recommendation and opened each one for debate where GL

Hearn's draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the housing allocation figures were discussed in great detail with all Members putting forward their views. Some Members stated their dissatisfaction to reject the evidence put forward and felt the housing allocation was underestimated. Further discussions took place around the economic needs for the city and the evidence base to ensure deliverability of the housing allocation of 867 dwellings per year and the desirability to produce a balanced Plan.

The Preferred Sites Consultation was then considered and during debate some Members made the following comments:

- Remove from Table 5 (page 22 of the report), Victoria Farm, Maythorpe and land rear of Rufforth Primary School.
- Consideration to be given to the transport infrastructure around the Boroughbridge Road area when the Civil Service and British Sugar sites were developed.
- Concerns over the size of the development land proposed at ST7.
- Business Parks and employment land should be explored more in the consultation
- Land to the west of Wigginton Road should not be developed.

Members noted that Executive could only delegate to officers and a detail discussion took place regarding delegation of powers to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection, the Leader and Deputy Leader.

The Committee thanked those officers who had worked on the Local Plan and agreed it was a long and complex exercise. Further appreciation was shown to the Head of Strategic Planning and his team.

Resolved: That the LPWG recommend to Executive:

- (i) That on the basis of the housing analysis set out in paragraphs 82 - 92 of the report, the increased figure of 867 dwellings per annum, based on the latest revised sub national population and household projections published by the Office for National Statistics and the Department of

Communities and Local Government, be accepted.

That the recommendation prepared by GL Hearn in the draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment, to apply a further 10% to the above figure for market signals (to 953 dwellings per annum), be not accepted on the basis that Hearn's conclusions were speculative and arbitrary, rely too heavily on recent short-term unrepresentative trends and attach little or no weight to the special character and setting of York and other environmental considerations.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (ii) That the employment land requirement included, arising from the draft ELR Addendum (Annex 2), be considered and agreed as the evidence base upon which the Local Plan should be progressed.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (iii) That the increased figure to 867 dwellings per annum, be met by the changes to sites within Table 4 (page 21 of the report) and by the following changes to sites from Table 5 (page 22 of the report), the inclusion of Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Imphal Barracks, Nestle South, Grove House and the former Clifton Without Primary School, the deletion of Heworth Green North (H25) and Whiteland Field, Haxby (H54) and the change from a housing site to an employment site of Poppleton Garden Centre. The rest of the changes included in Table 5 should not be included.

That the changes to employment sites highlighted in Table 6 (page 25 of the report) be accepted and to accept the following changes to sites listed in Table 7 (page 25 of the report) – the changes to York Central, the inclusion of Towthorpe Lines and Whitehall Grange, the inclusion of ST19 Land at Northminster Business Park based on the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) position and the deletion of site ST6 – Land at Grimston Bar. The rest of the changes included in Table 7 should not be included (this refers to the proposed extensions at ST26 and ST27 and two new sites listed).

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be

progressed.

- (iv) That the revised policy approach to Gypsy and Traveller provision highlighted within the report and Annex 9 be agreed.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (v) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to approve all housing and employment growth related policies (including site specific planning principles) and the non-site related policy modifications at schedule (Annex 7) in accordance with the approved evidence base.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed

- (vi) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, be delegated to approve changes to the non-site related policy modifications schedule (Annex 7) following the completion of viability work.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (vii) That following the approval of the evidence base and policy in relation to housing and employment, authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to produce a composite draft Local Plan for the purposes of consultation.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (viii) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegated the signing-off of further technical reports and assessments to support the draft Local Plan including, but not limited to the SA/ SEA, Viability Study and Transport Assessment.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (ix) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegate authority to approve a consultation strategy and associated material for the purposes of a city wide consultation starting in September 2017 and to undertake consultation on a composite plan in accordance with that agreed strategy.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (x) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegate authority to approve a revised Local Development Scheme as per the timetable highlighted in paragraphs 98 to 101 of the report.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

Meeting	Local Plan Working Group
Date	12 October 2017
Present	Councillors Ayre (Chair), D'Agorne, Lisle, Mercer, Orrell, Reid, Steward, D Myers (Substitute) and Pavlovic (Substitute)
Apologies	Councillors N Barnes, Carr (Vice-Chair), Derbyshire, Looker, Warters and Williams

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of business on the agenda.

Councillor Steward declared a personal interest due to his ownership of one share in Sirius Minerals.

Councillor Mercer declared a personal interest due to her ownership of shares in Sirius Minerals.

10. MINUTES

Due to an administrative error, the wrong set of minutes had been attached to the agenda for approval at the meeting. It was, therefore,

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2017 be included for approval at the next meeting.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been three registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Councillor Kramm spoke in relation to item 5 (Minerals and Waste Joint Plan – Submission), focusing on three areas for concern where additional scrutiny could be required:

- whether a minimum horizontal separation distance of 500m from the sites was considered to represent a reasonable distance taking into account the potential for a range of impacts such as noise, vibration, light pollution etc;
- whether enough definitions and specifications to assess the potential for cumulative impact of the project were offered;
- whether the conditions for the financial guarantee for unconventional hydrocarbon development to ensure that the site was restored even in cases when the operator went bust were satisfied.

Sally Brooks also spoke in relation to item 5 (Minerals and Waste Joint Plan – Submission). She highlighted concerns in relation to waste produced as a result of hydraulic fracturing, explaining that the plan should define policies in that matter in order to avoid potentially harmful actions undertaken by developers, including flaring the gas. She elaborated on the effects of flaring such as noise, visual impact and emissions and suggested that the Reduced Emission Completion (REC), adopted in the USA, be implemented as part of the plan to avoid environmental damage and nuisance to the residents.

Kit Bennett spoke in relation to item 5 (Minerals and Waste Joint Plan – Submission), concentrating on six of the proposed changes, as described in Annex B, that could have a negative effect on local area:

- PC62 – lack of precise definition of what conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons meant, which allowed for different interpretations as part of the planning policy – fracking should remain one of the defining features of unconventional hydrocarbons;
- PC63 and PC66 – lack of clarification on which definition for fracking was used as part of the plan, which potentially allowed fracking when using less than 1,000m³ of fluid without restrictions imposed by the previous version of the plan;
- PC70 – removal of the need to consider the proximity of other planned well pads from policy M17 which could go against the overall plan for the local area in question;

- PC79 – removal of the need for decommissioning of the wells and allowing them to be suspended for long periods whilst oil and gas companies considered their options;
- PC80 – lack of clarification on water arising from wells as “not always being waste”.

12. **UPPER AND NETHER POPPLETON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

A report summarising the results of the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan referendum was presented to Members. The Head of Strategic Planning was present to provide an update and answer potential questions. It was highlighted that a referendum on 23 August 2017 was held by the City of York Council (CYC) and 91.3% of the residents (n = 1,102) accepted the plan. It was also explained that, depending on the Officers’ input, the costs outlined in Paragraph 16 of the report could differ for other neighbourhood plans should they be produced. Members commended the Officers for their work and it was

Resolved: a) That the results of the referendum be considered and a recommendation to Executive to formally ‘make’ the Neighbourhood Plan on 19 October 2017 be made.

b) That a recommendation to Executive to approve the Decision Statement attached at Annex B to be published in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) be made.

Reason: a) To allow the Neighbourhood Plan to progress in line with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

b) To allow the Neighbourhood Plan to progress in line with neighbourhood planning legislation.

13. MINERALS AND WASTE JOINT PLAN - SUBMISSION

Members considered a report presenting the outcomes of the consultation on the Addendum of Proposed Changes to the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan. The Development Officer for Strategic Planning (CYC) and the Head of Planning Services (North Yorkshire County Council) attended the meeting to answer any questions. It was highlighted that, should the plan be approved, the Examination in Public would be undertaken in early 2018. It was also explained that the plan struck the balance between the national policies and the needs of the local area.

In response to the concerns and questions from members of the public, the following was then clarified:

Separation Distances

- the separation distance of 500m was considered reasonable for residential development and environmental interest and was above the national guidance for local authorities;

Suspended and Decommissioned Wells

- suspended wells were common in oil and gas industry; a number of regulations were in place to control time limits and manage health and safety matters in relation to suspension;
- the applications for new wells would be judged based on their individual merits, taking into account other wells in operation which included suspended wells as part of considering the cumulative impacts;
- most of the development activity on the surface of the land took place during the drilling and hydraulic fracturing stages of development and not during suspension of the well;
- the decisions on decommissioning of the well were made by multiple authorities (e.g. Planning Authority, Environment Agency, Oil & Gas Authority) and regulations for decommissioning were put in place;

Financial Guarantees

- there was only one operator that NYCC worked with in relation to hydraulic fracturing at Kirby Misperton; that company signed a financial guarantee condition for £160,000 that would be used to restore the site should the

- company cease trading; this would be enough to restore the surface of the site as per the authority's jurisdiction;
- the Oil & Gas Authority had obligation to assess the company's insurance policies; if the company went into administration, the next liable company in the chain would take responsibility for the well;
- Officers were confident that policy M18 in the draft Minerals and Waste Joint Plan would enable authorities to secure a similar commitment from other companies should the authorities choose to work with more companies as part of the project;

Waste Gas and Flaring

- if a well did not have enough infrastructure to pipe gas out of the station, alternatives would need to be provided – this included using tankers and flaring;
- orange flames could not be seen from distance in modern gas sites during flaring as they were shielded;
- if the application included a flare, its impact would be assessed as part of the decision-making process;
- operating flares for significant periods of time was not commercially viable for the companies as the gas was effectively wasted as part of that procedure;
- the release of the gas into the atmosphere was not controlled by planning authorities, but by the Environment Agency;

Definitions of Unconventional and Conventional

- the differences between conventional and unconventional operations were recognised in the plan; the policy was written in order to safeguard against unreasonable restrictions in the industry;
- The Infrastructure Act's (2015) definition of hydraulic fracturing was different than the one adopted in the plan because the authority's concerns were different; the definition adopted in the plan provided a greater protection on a local level;

Density of Well Pads

- the acceptable density of well pads in the UK was different to countries such as the USA or Australia where vast amounts of land did not have any designations; the grid system approach would be difficult to achieve in the UK given the level of environmental designations and the

distribution of residential buildings; the applications would be judged on that point on a case-by-case basis;

Waste Water

- waste water from the wells would be tankered or piped off site; all applications would be required to have water management plan as part of submission;
- water coming out of the well was analysed for Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) and disposed of accordingly;
- all water coming out of the well would be treated; as per the EA stipulations, this included water that would be returned down the well.

It was highlighted that the policy should not unreasonably restrict the conventional gas well development that had been taking place over the previous decades and that the policies sought to offer the greatest protection possible, taking into account the national guidance.

The Chair thanked the Officers for their work and it was

Resolved: That the following recommendations be made to the Executive:

(a) That the representations received on the Addendum of Proposed Changes to the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for York, North Yorkshire and the North York Moors National Park be considered.

(b) That the Submission draft of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for York, North Yorkshire and North York Moors National Park (comprising the Publication draft Plan 2016, accompanied by the Addendum of Proposed Changes 2017) to be approved for submission for examination be recommended to Full Council.

(c) That the Director of Economy and Place, in consultation with the Executive Member for Transport and Planning, be

authorised to make non-substantive editorial changes to the Submission Draft and other supporting documents proposed to be submitted alongside the Plan be recommended to Full Council.

Reason:

(a) To consider whether to recommend to Full Council whether to move forward the plan to Submission.

(b)(c) To progress the NPPF-compliant Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

Cllr N Ayre, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30pm and finished at 6.50pm].

This page is intentionally left blank



Local Plan Working Group**23rd January 2018**

Report of the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection
(The Local Plan is the portfolio of the Leader and Deputy Leader)

City of York Local Plan**Summary**

1. This purpose of the report is:
 - (i) To provide a background summary of the previous iterations of draft policies and the circumstances which led to the rationale of the Executive decision to approve the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan for consultation;
 - (ii) To provide a summary of the present national policy and legislative context, including the “soundness” requirement and potential for Government intervention;
 - (iii) To report responses to the Autumn 2017 Pre Publication Draft Local Plan Consultation;
 - (iv) To provide Officers’ advice regarding appropriate responses to the Consultation outcomes; and
 - (v) To seek Member approval of the next steps in the York Local Plan making process.

Recommendations

2. The LPWG request Members of Executive to:
 - (i) Consider any potential changes to the pre publication draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) based on the information included within this report and associated annexes and confirm the basis on which the

Local Plan should be progressed to the Regulation 19 stage including a city wide consultation.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (ii) Following decisions on the matters referred to in (i) above authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to approve all policies necessary for the production of a composite Local Plan for the purposes of public consultation.

The Leader and Deputy Leader to keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed

- (iii) Delegate to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader the consideration and approval of further technical reports and assessments to support the Local Plan including, but not limited to the SA/ SEA, HRA, Viability Study and Transport Assessment.

The Leader and Deputy Leader to keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

- (iv) Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to approve a consultation strategy and associated material for the purposes of a city wide consultation and to undertake consultation on a composite plan in accordance with that agreed strategy.

The Leader and Deputy Leader to keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

Background

3. Officers produced a publication draft Local Plan in Autumn 2014. This process, however, was halted by Council resolution on the 9th October

2014. Following the Local Government Elections in May 2015 the agreement between the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups, to establish a joint administration for City of York Council from May 21st 2015 states that:

'We will prepare an evidence-based Local Plan which delivers much needed housing whilst focusing development on brownfield land and taking all practical steps to protect the Green Belt and the character of York.'

4. In 2016 a Preferred Sites Consultation was undertaken. It began on 18th July 2016 and ended on 12th September 2016. 1,766 individual responses were received from members of the public, developers and statutory consultees. After the Preferred Sites Consultation concluded the Ministry of Defence (MOD) announced as part of its Defence Estate Strategy on 7th November 2016 the release of three substantial sites in York:
 - Imphal Barracks, Fulford Road;
 - Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall; and
 - Towthorpe Lines, Strensall.

Technical work was carried out which established that the sites represented 'reasonable alternatives' and, therefore, should be considered as part of the Local Plan process.

5. At the Executive in July 2017 Officer's sought approval to undertake a full consultation on a Pre publication draft Local Plan (Reg 18). To support this process the report included a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which made a recommendation on the level of housing growth for York, an Employment Land Review (ELR) and a series of sites to meet the related arising demand. It also included recommendations on non sites related policies.
6. The Local Plan Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) included an annual housing figure of 841 dwellings pa. The SHMA produced by GL Hearn suggested increasing this figure to 867 dwelling and including an uplift of 10% to the baseline household projections for York to allow for market

signals (lifting it to 953 dwellings per annum). Members accepted the higher baseline figure, but not the 10% uplift on the basis that the figure of 867 dwelling represented a significant step change in past delivery. They considered Hearn's conclusions were speculative and arbitrary, rely too heavily on recent short-term unrepresentative trends and attached little or no weight to the special character and setting of York and other environmental considerations. The employment land requirements included in the ELR were agreed.

7. A city-wide consultation on the Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Reg 18) commenced on the 18th September 2017 and finished on 30th October 2017. It was carried out in compliance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2007). The consultation included contacting individuals and organizations on the Local Plan database, public exhibitions, meetings, a special edition of 'OurCity', and information provided via conventional and social media.

National Policy Context

8. On 7th February 2017, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) published a Housing White Paper. As part of which, DCLG also consulted on changes to planning policy and legislation in relation to planning for housing, sustainable development and the environment. It is anticipated that the outcomes of the consultation will involve amendments to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and regulations. This is likely to be before the end of Summer 2018.
9. Following on from the White Paper on 14th September 2017 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) released 'Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals'. These focused on streamlining the planning system and were primarily concerned with how local housing need is assessed. The consultation ran for eight weeks and closed on 9th November 2017. The Government indicated that after reviewing the responses to this consultation along with responses to the Housing White Paper it would publish a draft revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2018.

10. The DCLG November 2017 consultation included a proposed methodology for calculating housing need. This is based on three principles: simplicity, using publicly available data and producing realistic targets. The document applies this methodology to City of York and indicated a minimum of 1,070 dwellings p/a for the period 2016 to 2026. It should be noted that this methodology was the subject of consultation and formal changes to the NPPF have not yet been incorporated by the Government.
11. In addition, it should be noted that the figure of 1070 dwellings is based on 2014 sub-national population projections (released in 2016) which are due to be replaced with the 2016 sub-national population data in May 2018. The National Population Projections released in October 2017 (on which the 2016 sub-national population figures will be based) suggest slower growth than the previous (2014-based) projections. This is because of lower assumptions about future levels of fertility and international migration, and an assumption of a slower rate of increase in life expectancy.
12. A key change is that the proposed methodology put forward by DCLG is forward looking; conversely the current target included in the Pre-publication Local Plan involved considering under delivery from 2012 – 2017 and meeting this by adding to the future supply.
13. The consultation on the proposed new methodology made explicit reference to protecting Green Belt and acknowledged it as a constraint. It also highlights the extent of York's Green Belt. It is not however completely clear about the effects of this constraint and how it would effect York in setting Green Belt Boundaries for the first time.
14. It is proposed by DCLG that in the absence of an up-to-date local strategic plan that after 31st March 2018 the new method for calculating housing need would be adopted. However, should the revised national planning policy framework be published after this date, subject to the outcomes of consultation, it will be introduced at that later date. Given the Government haven't yet responded to this consultation and the potential timeframe for the publication of the revision to NPPF the 31st March adoption date seems unlikely. For the purposes of this report we will continue to use the methodology reported to Members in July 2017.

15. The National Population Projections were published by the Office for National Statistics on 26th October 2017. We anticipate that the Sub-National Population Projections will be released in May 2018 in accordance with previous releases. The Sub-National Household projections to be released by the DCLG, which use the population ONS data, are likely to follow in July/August 2018. This reflects the nature of changing data sets that surround the plan making process.
16. On 16th November 2017 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to the Council. The letter emphasised the importance of up-to date local plans. He then expressed concern about the lack of progress City of York has made on plan-making. The last adopted detailed plan for the city was produced in 1956. The Council is asked to respond by 31st January 2018.
17. The Council is currently preparing a response to the Secretary of State emphasising the importance of responding through the Local Plan process to the release of the MOD sites in November 2016 and including a commitment to submit at the end of May 2018.

Local Plan Pre Publication Draft Consultation Response

18. During the autumn 2017 consultation period we have received responses from circa 1,295 individuals, organisation or interest groups. In response to the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) held in July - September 2016, we received 1766 responses from individuals and organisations.
19. In conjunction with this report all representations received will be published on line via the Council's website and will be available both electronically and in hard copy at West Offices reception. Those representations received from members of the public will have personal information redacted to comply with the Data Protection Act 1998.
20. The representations received as a part of the consultation raise a range of issues some of which are complex in nature. These are provided in summary in Annex A to this report along with potential changes for Members' consideration.

21. Given the historical and national policy context associated with the development of the City of York Local Plan Members' attention is particularly drawn to the following key issues :

- Housing Need and Land Supply; and
- Employment Land Supply.

Housing Need and Land Supply

22. The historical approach taken to housing need and the related changing national policy context is detailed above. In addition comments received during consultation on this matter are included in Annex A and provided in summary below.

- Support was received for the principle of council meeting their entire objectively assessment housing need (OAHN).
- Some parish representations supported the 867 dwellings per annum figure particularly in comparison to the Government's proposed standardised methodology.
- In respect of housing numbers responses, particularly planning agents and developers, objected to using 867 dwellings per annum; the reasons for this included: the failure to comply with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) and the lack of conformity with both existing and emerging national policy.
- Some respondents objected to the approach taken to backlog, student housing and windfalls.
- The majority of responses from the public were in objection to proposed sites.

23. It is important to recognise that the proposed methodology included in the document produced by DCLG was for the purposes of consultation and may be subject to change (although at present it indicates the direction of travel anticipated for national policy). The methodology differs from that applied by the Council in reaching the housing need figures, and thus cannot be compared without further analysis. The reasons for this are outlined below.

24. As previously highlighted the Government's proposed methodology is forward looking and unlike the Council's methodology, does not add in any additional amounts for previously unmet demand. The City of York Local Plan has an effective start date of the 1st April 2012 in terms of population and housing. This is to fit with the position taken by Government in terms of their demographic projections. Using the Council's methodology, any under delivery against the housing target between 2012 – 2017 is accommodated over the life time of the plan.
25. In July the Executive agreed a figure of 867 dwellings per annum for the duration of the City of York Local Plan and Green Belt (until 2033 and 2038 respectively). As the Council's methodology includes provision to meet previous under supply within the 2012 to 2017 period, this means the plan as produced for the autumn 2017 consultation includes a sufficient overall supply to meet both these requirement.
26. Members must be satisfied that they consider the Submission Draft Plan meets the test of "soundness". This is a statutory duty. Officer's advice is that the direction of travel in national policy indicates that if the site proposals previously consulted on were increased this would be a more robust position. However, this is not to say that the proposals previously consulted on would be unreasonable; It is a matter for Members to determine the degree of risk they wish to take.
27. In Officer's opinion, an increase in the supply of housing would place the Council in a better position for defending the Plan proposals through the Examination process. However, Members will be aware of the counter arguments in particular the community responses to consultation. In addition in potentially increasing supply Members will also be mindful of the time required for achieving this more robust position in line with legislative requirements. An important issue to consider is whether changes can be made to the plan without undertaking additional consultation. This is a critical issue if the Council is to meet the May 2018 deadline for submission.
28. In response to developer proposals submitted during the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan Consultation (details of which are included in Annex A),

potential options for increasing the housing supply are set out in tables 1 to 4 below along with the potential risk in terms of the need for additional consultation. The table also highlights a small reduction on the Queen Elizabeth Barracks Site. This reflects outcomes from the Habitats Regulation Assessment.

Table 1: Potential changes to housing sites allocated in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan in response to developer proposals (With minor or no boundary changes)

Allocation Reference	Site Name	No. Included in PPLP	Potential Revised Figure
ST5	York Central	1500	1700 - 2500
ST35	Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall	578	500

29. Following consultation discussions have been held with representatives from the York Central Partnership. This has indicated that York Central is capable of accommodating between 1700 – 2400 residential units and that the higher figure of 2500 units could be achieved through detailed applications by developers for individual plots and / or flexibility to increase residential at the margins of the commercial core. The figure of 1700 reflects land currently under the partnerships control; the higher figure includes land in private ownership or currently used for rail operations.
30. The higher number is proposed to be part of the partnerships planning application anticipated in summer 2018.

Table 2: Potential changes to housing sites allocated in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan in response to developer proposals (With boundary changes)

Allocation Reference	Site Name	No. Included in PPLP	Potential Revised Figure
ST 7	Land East of Metcalfe Lane	845	975
ST 14	Land West of Wiggington Road	1348	1,672
ST 15	Land West of Elvington Lane	3,339	3,901

31. Table 1 & 2 relates to increasing the capacity and extending existing site allocations. It is a matter of judgment as to whether the changes to the existing sites are “material”. However, in the context of the large strategic allocations, it is considered arguable by your officers that the additional land is not a material change. However, this is a matter of judgment, and there is a residual risk that the Examiner will take a different view and require the Council to undertake further consultation on this issue following submission.

Table 3: Potential new housing site allocations, in response to developer proposals (previously rejected housing sites)

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Revised Figure
H28	Land North of North Lane, Wheldrake	88 dwellings / 3.15 ha
H2b (132)	Land at Cherry Lane	18 dwellings / 0.44 ha
H37 (6)	Land at Greystone Court Haxby	34 dwellings / 3.47 ha
SF10 (874)	Land North of Riverside Gardens Elvington	102 dwellings / 4.15 ha
H2a (33)	Racecourse stables off Tadcaster Road	98 dwellings / 2.44 ha (years 16-21)
964	Galtres Farm	1575 dwellings / 75 ha (years 16-21)

32. Table 3 includes sites that have in the past been assessed against the site selection criteria and rejected, but now given further work Officers feel should be considered. These could potentially be included in the Publication Draft without the need for a further additional consultation, as they have already been the subject of public scrutiny through previously published Local Plan evidence or SA/ SEA. There is however a higher risk than tables 1 & 2 that the Examiner may find further consultation is needed.

Table 4: Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals

Site Reference	Site Name	No. Included in PPLP	Potential Revised Figure
956	Milestone Avenue, Rufforth	n/a	9 dwellings / 0.37 ha
959	Land at Kettlestring Lane, Clifton Moor	n/a	92 dwellings / 3.2 ha (years 16-21)

33. Table 4 includes new sites that have emerged during the Autumn 2017 Consultation. Although they do meet the requirements of the site selection methodology and therefore potentially represent reasonable alternative, they have not been included in any previous consultation. If any of these sites were to be included in the next stage of the Local Plan the lack of consultation creates a risk to process and the Examiner could require further consultation before the Examination could proceed. Carrying out further consultation now about proposing to include these new sites would mean that the May 2018 date for submission could not be met.

Employment Land Supply

34. The Employment Land Review (ELR) July 2016 published as part of the Preferred Sites Consultation used projections by Oxford Economics (OE) dated May 2015 as the forecast for employment land demand over the Local Plan period. These forecasts provided the starting point for determining the amount and type of employment land required to be identified in the Plan. The projections by Oxford Economics presented a baseline scenario for York forecasting a job growth of 10,500 jobs over the period 2014-2031. Two further scenarios were considered by OE; scenario 1 – higher migration and faster UK recovery, which identified an additional 4,900 jobs above the baseline over the same period and scenario 2 – re-profiled sector growth which identified 500 additional jobs above the baseline. Scenario 2 was endorsed as it reflected the economic policy priorities of the Council to drive up the skills of the workforce and encourage growth in businesses which use higher skilled staff.
35. To sensitivity test the original 2015 OE projections, the latest Experian economic forecasts within the Regional Econometric Model (REM) were used. The conclusion was that the original forecasts were still robust. At the Executive in July 2017 Members endorsed this position.
36. During the consultation a range of points were raised. These are provided in summary below:

- general support for the Local Plan as positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth, including tourism and leisure;
- the approach to focusing retail development in the City Centre and reducing / limiting future development at out of town locations was also supported;
- some representations recognised the uncertainties inherent in long term economic forecasting and therefore suggested that the using the baseline forecast to inform the employment land requirements of the Plan was over cautious;
- it was also suggested that housing and employment policies are restrictive and the employment land supply will not cater for York's future needs;
- the cost of housing impinging on companies and public services abilities to recruit staff was raised;
- a perceived conflict was highlighted relating to acknowledging the universities importance for growth but failure to allocate land for expansion; and
- a few members of the public were opposed to, or questioned, economic growth as a goal in of itself saying it is incompatible with sustainability.

37. Given comments made about economic growth Members may wish to consider increasing the employment land supply. The sites included in tables 5, 6 and 7 provided potential options. As with housing supply above it is important that this is balanced against whether changes can be made to the plan without undertaking additional consultation, a critical issue if the Council is to meet the May 2018 deadline for submission.

Table 5: Potential changes to employment sites allocated in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan in response to developer proposals (With minor or no boundary changes)

Allocation Reference	Site Name	No. Included in PPLP	Potential Revised Figure
ST5	York Central	60,000 sqm	100,000 sqm

Table 6: Potential changes to employment sites allocated in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan in response to developer proposals (With boundary changes)

Allocation Reference	Site Name	No. Included in PPLP	Potential Revised Figure
ST27	University of York expansion	21.5ha	26ha
ST26	Elvington Airfield Business Park	10 ha/	15 ha / 33,000sqm

38. Table 5 and 6 relates to increasing the capacity and extending existing site allocations. It is a matter of judgment as to whether the changes to the existing sites are “material”. In the context of the large strategic allocations, it is considered arguable by your officers that the additional land is not a material change. However, this is a matter of judgment, and there is a residual risk that the Examiner will take a different view and require the Council to undertake further consultation on this issue following submission.

Table 7: Potential new employment site allocations, in response to developer proposals (previously rejected employment sites)

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Revised Figure
795	Greenacres Murton Lane	1.95ha / 6,000 sqm
864	Extention to Elvington Industrial Estate	5.4ha / 17,820 sqm
940	Remaining Land at Bull Commercial Centre	3ha/ 10,000 sqm

39. Table 7 includes sites that have in the past been assessed against the site selection criteria and rejected, but now given further work Officers feel should be considered. These could potentially be included in the Publication Draft without the need for a further additional consultation, as they have already been the subject of public scrutiny through previously published Local Plan evidence or SA/ SEA. There is however a higher risk than tables 5 & 6 that the Examiner may find further consultation is needed.

Transport Assessment

40. To support the Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Reg 18) Consultation, future year forecasting of the transport impacts of potential residential and employment allocations together with the inclusion of a number of infrastructure improvements that can realistically be expected to be put in place within the Plan period was undertaken. This is contained in the Transport Topic paper, 2017. This is important background to any further decision on sites.
41. The main outcome of this forecasting shows that from 2016 to 2032/33 on the network as a whole:
 - Total trips increase by approximately 20%
 - Total travel time increases by approximately 30%
 - Total delay increases by approximately 55%
42. More detailed mapping of the forecast changes in traffic volume, traffic speeds and changes in traffic speed from the baseline year (2016) to the end of the plan period (2032/33) show that the main parts of the network to be impacted on are:
 - The A64
 - A1237 Clifton Moor to A64 Hopgrove
 - A59/A1237 Roundabout /A59 / Wetherby Road
 - Malton Road
 - A19 / Fulford Road
 - Hull Road
 - Tadcaster Road
43. Although the more detailed mapping referred to in the preceding paragraph shows the changes in traffic volumes and vehicle speeds across the network they may not necessarily give the information that would be of direct relevance to road users undertaking journeys into, around, or through York. To provide a more relevant indication of how a typical journey will be affected in the future year the changes on travel time on the fifteen routes that could be deemed to be representative of 'typical' trips on the network are shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Comparison of future year modelled travel times with baseline year travel times

Trip		2016 Base year modelled peak hour trip time (min : sec)		Future Year (2032/33) Forecast					
				Modelled peak hour trip time (min : sec)		Increase from baseline year (min : sec)		Percentage increase in time from Baseline year	
Route No.	Description	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	A1237 (Northbound)	26:38	34:46	28:03	32:34	01:25	-02:12	5.3	-6.3
	A1237 (Southbound)	26:28	25:55	28:26	28:34	01:58	02:39	7.4	10.2
2	A64 (Northbound)	14:05	14:06	16:06	16:06	02:01	02:00	14.3	14.2
	A64 (Southbound)	14:07	14:47	15:42	17:15	01:35	02:28	11.2	16.7
3	Inner Ring Road (Clockwise)	22:15	25:48	24:11	27:39	01:56	01:51	8.7	7.2
	Inner Ring Road (Anti-clockwise)	19:03	21:38	20:40	23:27	01:37	01:49	8.5	8.4
	A1036 Tadcaster Road (Inbound)	12:55	12:32	13:24	12:40	00:29	00:08	3.7	1.1
	A1036 Tadcaster Road (Outbound)	11:24	10:27	11:54	11:08	00:30	00:41	4.4	6.5
5	A19 Fulford Road (Inbound)	15:46	14:18	19:31	18:49	03:45	04:31	23.8	31.6
	A19 Fulford Road (Outbound)	13:25	23:16	14:16	24:22	00:51	01:06	6.3	4.7
6	A1079 Hull Road (Inbound)	17:46	15:17	19:40	16:59	01:54	01:42	10.7	11.1
	A1079 Hull Road (Outbound)	12:11	14:47	12:37	18:18	00:26	03:31	3.6	23.8
7	A1036 Malton Road (Inbound)	07:40	08:12	08:04	9:04	00:24	00:52	5.2	10.6
	A1036 Malton Road (Outbound)	07:21	07:29	07:30	7:49	00:09	00:20	2.0	4.5
8	B1363 Wigginton Road (Inbound)	14:08	13:35	13:56	15:05	-00:12	01:30	-1.4	11.0
	B1363 Wigginton Road (Outbound)	13:59	13:34	13:40	20:39	-00:19	07:05	-2.3	52.2
9	A19 Shipton Road (Inbound)	14:23	09:57	12:30	09:55	-01:53	-00:02	-13.1	-0.3
	A19 Shipton Road (Outbound)	10:49	09:19	09:54	09:02	00:55	-00:17	8.5	-3.0
10	A59 Boroughbridge Road (Inbound)	18:10	17:13	18:19	18:39	00:09	01:26	0.8	8.3
	A59 Boroughbridge Road (Outbound)	15:50	19:20	17:16	19:58	01:26	00:38	9.1	3.3
11	B1224 Wetherby Road (Inbound)	08:07	08:09	08:35	08:31	00:28	00:22	5.7	4.5
	B1224 Wetherby Road (Outbound)	07:53	07:53	08:03	08:12	00:10	00:19	2.1	4.0
	Haxby Road (Inbound)	15:24	11:29	14:45	12:13	-00:39	00:44	-4.2	6.4
	Haxby Road (Outbound)	11:18	11:41	11:21	14:23	00:03	02:42	0.4	23.1
13	Water End (to northeast)	05:12	03:26	05:13	03:37	00:01	00:11	0.3	5.3
	Water End (to southwest)	03:38	03:40	03:35	03:37	-00:03	-00:03	-1.4	-1.4
14	Leeman Road (Inbound)	05:11	03:38	05:11	03:37	00:00	-00:01	0.0	-0.5
	Leeman Road (Outbound)	03:25	05:41	03:25	05:40	00:00	-00:01	0.0	-0.3
15	Bishopthorpe Road (Inbound)	09:52	08:38	09:53	08:40	00:01	00:02	0.2	0.4
	Bishopthorpe Road (Outbound)	08:34	08:42	08:40	09:08	00:06	00:26	1.2	5.0

44. If the housing supply for the Publication Draft Plan is increased from that in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan it is likely that the transport impacts will be exacerbated. For example, if the level of growth is

increased by the order of 10% it can reasonably be assumed that the impacts will increase by a similar scale. More detailed modelling will have to be undertaken to support the regulation 19 consultation.

Viability

45. Ensuring sites are viable and deliverable in the context of planning policy is a requirement of national guidance. Thus, 'The City of York Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment, 2017', was undertaken and issued for consultation alongside the Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft (Regulation 18).
46. For residential development policy testing was undertaken for each typology and strategic site. The policy testing comprised testing a series of policy layers. For each policy layer, the impact of those policy considered to have a notable impact on viability is then considered through adding policy 'layers' to judge the cumulative impact of these policies. These are:
 - Policy layer 1 – This is a base layer, which includes open space and design cost allowances but no policy layer applied;
 - Policy layer 2 – This layer adds a S106 contribution at £3,300 per unit to the Policy layer 1;
 - Policy layer 3 – Policy layer 2 plus the policy requirement for affordable housing (Policy H10)
 - Policy layer 4 – Policy layer 3 plus the requirement for meeting sustainable construction standards (Policy CC2)
 - Policy layer 5 – Policy layer 4 plus an allowance for Gypsy and Traveller pitches where required (Policy H5).
47. The Viability testing for residential development shows that there is viability across all residential site typologies with the imposition of the average S106 contributions (i.e. policy layer 2). But at cumulative policy layer 3, when affordable housing is also applied, some of the smaller sites (delivering less than 10 units) are unable to meet the full policy requirements beyond the average S106 contribution per unit. All the other tested typologies, including all sites within the urban area and all sites with 10 or more units in all locations (including the bespoke-tested

Strategic Sites), are shown to be able to fully meet the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan Policy requirements (i.e. at cumulative policy layer 5).

48. Overall, for residential development the viability testing results imply that the cumulative policy requirements identified in the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan (2017) do not adversely affect the majority of development in most parts of the City of York area. The recommendations included within Annex A seek to address the outcomes of this work.
49. It should be noted however that allowing an increase in site size could in some cases allow the delivery of an increased level of planning gain relating to facilities and services for future residents.
50. For Non- residential development two policy layers were tested:
 - Policy layer 1 – This is a base layer, where no policies are applied; and
 - Policy layer 2 – This layer includes the requirement for achieving a BREEAM ‘excellent’ delivery in line with Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction.
51. The viability assessment determined that all non-residential uses are unable to show viability with or without meeting proposed policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction with the exception of retail. However, the viability of non-residential uses is not necessary for supporting such allocations in the Local Plan, principally because non-residential development is generally more speculative than residential.

Sustainability Appraisal

52. When producing Local Plans, authorities are required to consider, at each stage of production, the impacts their proposals are likely to have on sustainable development. The emerging Local Plan is subject to ongoing Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) as required through NPPF. SA/SEA is a means of ensuring that the likely social, economic and environmental effects of the Local Plan are identified, described and

appraised to identify how they support the Council's sustainable development objectives.

53. At the Pre publication stage of the Local Plan a SA/SEA was undertaken. 'The Sustainability Appraisal Summary 2017' is a detailed technical document; and is an important background paper to this report to inform Members decisions. It has also been used to inform the recommendations in Annex A and will be updated following Members decisions on this report. It will be made available as a part of the Local Plan Publication (Reg 19) consultation.

Duty to Cooperate

54. The Localism Act 2011 introduced the Duty to co-operate (the Duty) that requires local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies to 'engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis' to maximise the effectiveness of local plan preparation in relation to strategic matters.
55. The Act also extended the purposes of the plans Examination to include determination as to whether the Duty has been complied with. National Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that Inspectors testing compliance with the duty at examination will assess the outcomes of co-operation rather than the process of dialogue. Failure to demonstrate compliance with the duty at the examination cannot be corrected after the local plan has been submitted for examination.
56. As it has developed the Local Plan has been subject to on-going and constructive engagement with neighbouring authorities and relevant organisations. This has included:
- the preparation and updating of a Duty to Cooperate Matrix (that has been generally circulated to the officer level groups for subsequent discussion and comment);
 - regular one-to-one officer meetings;
 - making representations, as appropriate, to other authorities Local Plan documents, and vice versa; and
 - regular technical discussions at regional sub-regional Member and officer groups.

57. Through the meetings highlighted Officers have sought to gauge the appetite of neighbouring authorities for a sub-regional approach to delivering housing within the context of the Duty to Cooperate. Whilst this wasn't supported for the current round of Local Plans there may be some support to consider this in the future.
58. Details on how the Council has fulfilled the requirements under the Duty was contained in the 'Demonstrating the Duty to co-operate (Interim Statement)' that is part of the supporting evidence base for the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan.
59. Several Prescribed Bodies including many of York's neighbouring authorities, the Local Enterprise Partnerships and Highways England returned representations during the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan consultation. These have been considered in coming to the recommendations included in Annex A. In addition they are summarised in Annex B to inform Members consideration of the recommendation associated with this report. The comments provided are broadly supportive of ongoing engagement and alignment with economic objectives, but stress the importance of an appropriate land supply for housing and the need for joint working on issues such as transport.
60. Post consultation reports on the City of York Local Plan have been considered at the following meetings:
 - Leeds City Region - Heads of Planning – 8th December 2017;
 - Leeds City Region Planning Portfolios Board 15th December 2017;
 - York, North Yorkshire East Riding and Hull - Directors of Development – 07th December 2017; and
 - North Yorkshire and York Spatial Planning and Transport Board 17th January 2018.

Options

61. Officers request that Members consider the following options to enable a composite Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) document to be produced for statutory soundness consultation prior to submission:

Option 1: *The additions of further housing sites from tables 1 – 4;*

Option 2: *The additions of further employment sites from tables 5 – 7;
and*

Option 3: The proposed policy changes highlighted in Annex A.

Analysis of Options

62. Members are being asked to consider amendments to the plan previously consulted upon and approve a Publication Draft Local Plan which ultimately will be subject to examination by a member of the Planning Inspectorate. They must therefore, when considering the options above, be aware of the procedures which the Council is required to follow when producing a Local Plan. These are derived from the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. The legislation states that a local planning authority must only submit a plan for examination which it considers to be sound. This is defined by the National Planning Policy Framework as being:

- **Positively Prepared:** based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements;
- **Justified:** the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective:** deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy:** enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

63. Members must consider whether in light of the consultation responses and changes in the national policy context the proposed Publication Draft Local Plan meets the above tests and is 'sound'. This includes the approach to both housing and employment need and supply.

Next Steps

64. Following the Executive, if Members agree, Officers will produce a composite draft Plan and a city-wide proposals map. In addition this

document will be accompanied by a range of technical documents which will need to be prepared after the Executive. These will include (but not be limited to):

- SA/SEA;
- Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA);
- City-wide transport model;
- Viability Assessment;
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA);
- Any technical addendums necessary arising from the recommendations of this report relating to growth and sites.

65. Following the Regulation 19 consultation, Officers will report the responses received to Local Plan Working Group, Executive and Council seeking approval to submit a plan for public examination before the end of May 2018. Legislation requires that Full Council, having had regard to any consultation responses, determines whether the plan is 'Sound' to enable submission for independent examination under Regulation 20. The timetable highlighted is in conformity with the Council's published Local Development Scheme (LDS).

66. Officers will continue to seek dialogue with key partners including neighbouring authorities, the County Council and both LEPs. In addition dialogue will also be sought with both DCLG and the Planning Inspectorate.

Impacts

67. **Financial (1)** – The work on the Local Plan is funded from specific budgets set aside for that purpose. Over the last four years, significant sums have been expended on achieving a robust evidence base, carrying out consultations, sustainability and other appraisals, policy development and financial analyses. Whilst this work remains of great value it is important that progress is made to ensure that unnecessary additional costs do not occur.

68. **Financial (2)** - It should also be considered that if the approach taken is subsequently judged to be non compliant with Government Guidance either before or after submission this could lead to further technical work

and additional consultation adding to the identified costs and creating delay.

69. **Financial (3)** - Managing the planning process in the absence of a Plan will lead to significant costs to the council in managing appeals and examinations.
70. **Human Resources (HR)** – The production of a Local Plan and associated evidence base requires the continued implementation of a comprehensive work programme that will predominantly, although not exclusively, need to be resourced within EAP.
71. **Better Decision Making Tool** – Attached as annex C.
72. **Legal** – The procedures which the Council is required to follow when producing a Local Plan derive from the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.
73. The legislation states that a local planning authority must only submit a plan for examination which it considers to be sound. This is defined by the National Planning Policy Framework as being:
 - **Positively Prepared:** based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements;
 - **Justified:** the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 - **Effective:** deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
 - **Consistent with national policy:** enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.
74. In order for the draft Local Plan to pass the tests of soundness, in particular the ‘justified’ and ‘effective’ tests, it is necessary for it to be based on an adequate, up to date and relevant evidence base. The Council also has a legal duty to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement in preparing the Plan. (S19(3) 2004 Act).
75. In addition the Council also has a legal “Duty to Co-operate” in preparing the Plan. (S33A 2004 Act).

76. In due course Council will be asked to approve the publication draft Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State. It will then be subject to examination by a member of the Planning Inspectorate before being finally adopted. If the draft Local Plan is not prepared in accordance with legal requirements, fully justified and supported by evidence, the draft Local Plan is likely to be found unsound at examination and would not be able to proceed to adoption.
77. **Crime and Disorder** – The Plan addresses where applicable.
78. **Information Technology (IT)** – The Plan promotes where applicable.
79. **Property** – The Plan includes land within Council ownership.
80. **Other** – None

Risks

81. The main risks in failing to progress a Local Plan for the City of York in compliance with laws, regulations and guidance are as follows:
- the plan is found ‘unsound’ at examination leading to ‘withdrawal’ or further work;
 - direct interventions by Government into the City’s Local Plan making;
 - inability to steer, promote or restrict development across its administrative area;
 - potential damage to the Council’s image and reputation if a development plan is not adopted in an appropriate timeframe; and
 - financial risk associated with the Council’s ability to utilise planning gain and deliver strategic infrastructure.

Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risks associated with this report have been assessed as requiring frequent monitoring.

Contact Details

Author:

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Martin Grainger
Head of Strategic Planning
Tel: 551317

Mike Slater
Assistant Director of Planning and
Public Protection
Tel 551300

Alison Cooke
Development Officer
Tel 551467

Executive Members Responsible for the Report:

Cllrs D Carr & A Waller

**Report
Approved**




Date 15/01/18

Specialist Implications Officer(s):

Finance Manager
Senior Solicitor, Planning

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*



Annexes

Annexe A: Pre Publication Draft Local Plan (2017) Consultation
Response Summaries & Recommendations
Annex B: Duty to Cooperate Responses
Annex C: Better Decision Making Tool

Background Papers

Transport Topic paper, 2017.

https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/14278/transport_topic_paper_2017

The City of York Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment, 2017.

https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/14273/local_plan_and_community_infrastructure_levy_viability_assessment_2017

The Sustainability Appraisal Summary, 2017.

https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/14276/sustainability_appraisal_summary_2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A

Pre Publication draft Local Plan Consultation Responses

Introduction

1. A city-wide consultation on the Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Reg 18) commenced on the 18th September 2017 and finished on 30th October 2017. It was carried out in compliance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2007). The consultation included contacting individuals and organisations on the Local Plan database, public exhibitions, meetings, a special edition of 'Our City', and information provided via conventional and social media.
2. During the consultation period we have received responses from circa 1,295 individuals, organisation or interest groups. Given that those responding tend to raise multiple points this equates to around 4,000 representations.
3. Annex A provides a summary of the representations along with potential changes for Members' consideration. Subject to Members agreement, changes will be incorporated into a Publication draft Local Plan to go out to citywide consultation (Regulation 19) in due course.
4. The Annex contains a proforma for each policy in the emerging Local Plan which includes:
 - Potential Changes to policy post Pre-Publication Consultation with changes shown as 'tracked changes';
 - Supporting text changes.
 - Summary of reasons for change.
 - Consultation responses summarised as supports, objections and comments.
5. These proformas are in plan-order as set out in the index (overleaf). The proformas are presented in two sections; policies and general site allocations. This includes suggested changes to the sites and alternative site allocations. All strategic sites (ST) are represented in the SS site policies section.
6. A table of sites submitted that were previously rejected or new sites considered are also summarised. Appendix 1 to this annex sets out analysis of any re-submitted previous rejected sites and any new sites that have been submitted as part of the consultation which have been identified as having potential for allocation.

Index of Policies

Policy Number	Policy Name	Annex Page Number
Policy DP1	York Sub Area	7
Policy DP2	Sustainable Development	9
Policy DP3	Sustainable Communities	12
Policy DP4	Approach to Development Management	14
Policy SS1	Delivering Sustainable Growth for York	15
Policy SS2	The Role of York's Green Belt	22
Policy SS3	York City Centre	25
Policy SS4	York Central (ST5)	30
Policy SS5	Castle Gateway (ST20)	39
Policy SS6	British Sugar/Manor School (ST1)	49
Policy SS7	Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2)	54
Policy SS8	Land Adjacent to Hull Road (ST4)	58
Policy SS9	Land East of Metcalfe Lane (ST7)	62
Policy SS10	Land North of Monks Cross (ST8)	72
Policy SS11	Land North of Haxby (ST9)	82
Policy SS12	Land West of Wigginton Road (ST14)	93
Policy SS13	Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15)	103
Policy SS14	Terry's Extension Sites (ST16)	113
Policy SS15	Nestle South (ST17)	118
Policy SS16	Land at Tadcaster Road (ST31)	121
Policy SS17	Hungate (ST32)	126
Policy SS18	Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33)	128
Policy SS19	Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35)	134
Policy SS20	Imphal Barracks (ST36)	147
Policy SS21	Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (ST26)	152
Policy SS22	University of York Expansion (ST27)	156
Policy SS23	Land at Northminster Business Park (ST19)	164
Policy SS24	Whitehall Grange (ST37)	168
Policy EC1	Provision of Employment Land	170
Policy EC2	Loss of Employment Land	173

Policy Number	Policy Name	Annex Page Number
Policy EC3	Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas	174
Policy EC4	Tourism	175
Policy EC5	Rural Economy	177
Policy R1	Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	179
Policy R2	District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades	181
Policy R3	York City Centre Retail	182
Policy R4	Out of Centre Retailing	186
Policy H1	Housing Allocations	188
Policy H2	Density of Residential Development	194
Policy H3	Balancing the Housing Market	198
Policy H4	Promoting Self and Custom Build	201
Policy H5	Gypsies and Travellers	204
Policy H6	Travelling Showpeople	207
Policy H7	Student Housing	210
Policy H8	Houses in Multiple Occupation	212
Policy H9	Older Persons Specialist Housing	213
Policy H10	Affordable Housing	215
Policy HW1	Protecting existing facilities	221
Policy HW2	New Community Facilities	223
Policy HW3	Built Sport Facilities	225
Policy HW4	Childcare Provision	227
Policy HW5	Healthcare Services	229
Policy HW6	Emergency Services	232
Policy HW7	Healthy places	234
Policy ED1	University of York	236
Policy ED2	Campus West	238
Policy ED3	Campus East	240
Policy ED4	York St. John University Lord Mayor's Walk Campus	249
Policy ED5	York St. John University Further Expansion	250
Policy ED6	Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education	253

Policy Number	Policy Name	Annex Page Number
Policy ED7	York College and Askham Bryan College	255
Policy ED8	Community Access to Sports and Cultural Facilities on Education Sites	257
Policy D1	Placemaking	258
Policy D2	Landscape and Setting	261
Policy D3	Cultural Provision	263
Policy D4	Conservation Areas	267
Policy D5	Listed Buildings	269
Policy D6	Archaeology	271
Policy D7	The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	274
Policy D8	Historic Parks and Gardens	277
Policy D9	City of York Historic Environment Record	279
Policy D10	York City Walls and St. Mary's Abbey Walls ('The Walls')	280
Policy D11	Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings	281
Policy D12	Shopfronts	282
Policy D13	Advertisements	283
Policy D14	Security Shutters	284
Policy G11	Green Infrastructure	285
Policy G12	Biodiversity and Access to Nature	287
Policy G13	Green Infrastructure Network	289
Policy G14	Trees and Hedgerows	290
Policy G15	Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches	292
Policy G16	New Open Space Provision	295
Policy G17	Burial and Memorial Grounds	299
Policy GB1	Development in the Green Belt	300
Policy GB2	Development in Settlements 'Washed Over' by the Green Belt	303
Policy GB3	Reuse of Buildings	305
Policy GB4	'Exception' Sites for Affordable Housing in the Green Belt	307
Policy CC1	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Storage	309

Policy Number	Policy Name	Annex Page Number
Policy CC2	Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development	312
Policy CC3	District Heating and Combined Heat and Power	315
Policy ENV1	Air Quality	318
Policy ENV2	Managing Environmental Quality	320
Policy ENV3	Land Contamination	322
Policy ENV4	Flood Risk	323
Policy ENV5	Sustainable Drainage	325
Policy WM1	Sustainable Waste Management	328
Policy WM2	Sustainable Minerals Management	330
Policy T1	Sustainable Access	331
Policy T2	Strategic Public Transport Improvements	335
Policy T3	York Railway Station and Associated Operational Facilities	340
Policy T4	Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements	344
Policy T5	Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements	349
Policy T6	Development at or Near Public Transport Corridors, Interchanges and Facilities	354
Policy T7	Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips	357
Policy T8	Demand Management	359
Policy T9	Alternative Fuel Fuelling Stations and Freight Consolidation Centres	360
Policy C1	Communications Infrastructure	361
Policy DM1	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	364

Index of General Sites

Site Number	Policy Name	Annex Page Number
General Housing Sites		
H1	Former Gas works, 24 Heworth Green (Phase 2)	366
H3	Burnholme School	368
H5	Lowfield School	369
H6	Land R/O The Square Tadcaster Road	371
H7	Bootham Crescent	373

H8	Askham Bar Park & Ride	375
H10	The Barbican	377
H20	Former Oakhaven EPH	378
H22	Former Heworth Lighthouse	379
H23	Former Grove House EPH	380
H29	Land at Moor Lane Copmanthorpe	381
H31	Eastfield Lane Dunnington	383
H38	Land RO Rufforth Primary School Rufforth	385
H39	North of Church Lane Elvington	387
H46	Land to North of Willow Bank and East of Haxby Road, New Earswick	391
H52	Willow House EPH, Long Close Lane	393
H53	Land at Knapton Village	395
H55	Land at Layerthorpe	397
H56	Land at Hull Road	398
H58	Clifton Without Primary School	401
H59	Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Howard Road, Strensall	403
General Employment Sites		
E8	Wheldrake Industrial Estate	406
E9	Elvington Industrial Estate	408
E10	Chessingham Park, Dunnington	410
E11	Annamine Nurseries. Jockey Lane	412
E16	Poppleton Garden Centre	413
E18	Towthorpe Lines, Strensall	415

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
<p>Policy DP1: York Sub Area</p> <p>The approach taken in the Local Plan to development will reflect the roles and functions of place in the Leeds City Region, the York and North Yorkshire Sub Region and the functional York Sub Area. It will aim to ensure the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP areas. ii. York City Centre's role as a shopping and leisure destination within the wider Yorkshire and Humber area is strengthened. iii. The housing needs of City of York's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area. iv. The further success of regionally and sub regionally important higher and further education institutions within the plan area is supported. v. City of York's role as a key node for public transport is strengthened, including improvements to the Leeds-York-Harrogate rail line, improvements to the outer ring road; improved access between York and Scarborough (the east coast) and projects to improve national connectivity, including links to the new high speed rail system (HS2). vi. City of York's outstanding historic and natural environment is conserved and enhanced recognising its wider economic importance to increased investment, employment and wealth within both the Leeds City Region and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP area. vii. The integrity of important landscapes, biodiversity and areas of environmental character (including the network of strategic green corridors) that extend beyond the City of York boundaries are safeguarded. viii. A Green Belt is defined around York which will safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city, the outer boundary of which will be <u>about</u> 6 miles from the city centre. ix. Development within the City of York area will not lead to environmental problems including flood risk, poor air quality and transport congestion for adjacent local authority areas.
<p>Supporting Text Changes:</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Summary of Reasons for Change</p> <p>Minor amendments to policy to reflect comments made through consultation regarding the extent of green belt around York and York's public transport role.</p>
<p>Consultation Responses</p>

Total representations: 20	Supports: 11	Objections: 4	Comments: 8
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council support the policy. Historic England supports the definition of a green belt, which will help safeguard the City's special historic character and setting. Several developers support that the local plan will seek to meet the housing needs of current and future populations including those arising from economic and institutional growth. Askham Bryan College support objective 'iv' and reference to the Council supporting the further success of higher and further education institutions. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council and two other respondents generally support the policy, but state that viii) needs amending to place the outer boundary of the Green Belt at <u>about</u> 6 miles from City Centre. Historic England suggests moving criterion (vi) to the beginning of the list of criteria and has provided amended text. East Riding of Yorkshire Council Policy highlight that a small part of ERC's authority area would lie within 6 miles of the city centre boundary and do not consider it appropriate for the York Local Plan to prescribe the exact extent of the outer Green Belt boundary where this would extend into a neighbouring local authority area. Provided amended wording. Network Rail considers that (v) should be updated to reflect the change in project priorities since the publication of the plan. York Green Party does not think that (v) 'improvements to the outer ring road' should be listed as an element of 'City of York's role as a key node for public transport'. Provided amended wording. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce state that there is a disconnect between the broad ambitions in the plan and how they are to be delivered. Persimmon state that York fails to plan for necessary housing growth and increased employment which will result in housing pressure in neighbouring authorities as there will be insufficient housing stock within York itself to accommodate this growth. Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee state that, although the city centre of York is defined in the Plan, the centre of the city is not and this is a requirement of calculating the extent of the green belt (6 miles from the centre of York). 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy DP2: Sustainable Development

Development should be consistent with the principles below. They will be applied in the consideration of all development proposals and underpin the subsequent sections of the plan.

- i. Development will help Create a Prosperous City for All through:
 - supporting strategic employment locations and ensuring employment land for the development period is provided;
 - safeguarding and enhancing the established retail hierarchy, the city centre, district, local and neighbourhood centres, while ensuring out of centre retailing is controlled;
 - protect and enhance the visitor economy through supporting existing facilities, promoting new development and encouraging improved infrastructure .

- ii. Development will help Provide Good Quality Homes and Opportunities through:
 - addressing the housing and community needs of York's current and future population; and
 - facilitating the provision of sufficient preschool, primary and secondary education and supporting further and higher education.

- iii. Development will help Protect the Environment through Development will help Conserve and Enhance the Environment through:
 - conserving and enhancing York's special character setting, character and heritage by ensuring development is in acceptable locations and of the highest quality standards in design and urban design conserving, and where appropriate enhancing, those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City by ensuring that development is in acceptable locations and of the highest standards in terms of urban design and detailing;
 - conserving and enhancing York's Green Infrastructure, including biodiversity, whilst promoting accessibility to encourage opportunities for sport and recreation;
 - reducing flood risk by ensuring that new development is not subject to or does not contribute to flooding;
 - maintaining water quality in both the River Ouse, and River Derwent and River Foss;
 - remediation of polluted land/ groundwater or the protection of groundwater.
 - ensuring sustainable design techniques are incorporated in new developments and maximise the generation and use of low carbon/renewable energy resources;
 - improving air quality and limit environmental nuisance including noise, vibration, light, dust, odour, fumes and emissions, from development;
 - reducing waste levels through the reducing, reusing and recycling hierarchy, and ensure appropriate sites for waste management are provided; and

- safeguarding natural mineral resources and maximise the production and use of secondary aggregates.
- iv. Development will help Ensure Efficient and Affordable Transport Links-through:
- delivering a fundamental shift in travel by [prioritising and](#) improving strategic public transport, cycle and pedestrian networks and managing travel demand and modal choice; and
 - improving the strategic highway network capacity whilst protecting residential areas, including safeguarding routes and sites.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Changes have been made to the policy to respond to comments made through the consultation, particularly by the National railway Museum, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Historic England and Environment Agency. Reference to maintaining water quality in the River Foss has also been added for completeness.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 25	Supports: 8	Objections: 9	Comments: 20
---------------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency supports the policy as it sets out that development will help protect the environment in a number of ways. • Highways England fully supports the vision to deliver a fundamental shift in travel patterns and the focus of promoting sustainable development in areas of good accessibility. • York Cycle Campaign is pleased to see cyclists considered and included in the Sustainable Development Plans for York (DP2) and in the Sustainable Access plans (T1) • Canal and River Trust welcomes the reference within policy to ensure development will help the environment by maintaining water quality in the Ouse and improve air quality and limit environmental nuisance. • Generally respondents are supportive of the spatial vision and the long term contribution to sustainable growth to address housing and community needs. A developer suggests that the policy should be expanded to include support for the utilisation of previously developed land in line with Government policy.
---------	---

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency highlights that the list of bullet points does not include remediation of polluted land/ groundwater or the protection of groundwater. Two additional bullet points suggested. Also recommend that a point is included within policy DP2 or Policy CC2 to ensure that appropriate water efficiency measures are secured for developments. • Historic England suggest amendment to the heading of iii) to read: "Development will help conserve and enhance the
-----------	--

	<p>environment through...". and iii) first bullet point, to read: "conserving, and where appropriate enhancing, those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City by ensuring that development is in acceptable locations and of the highest standards in terms of urban design and detailing"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe PC wish to see the River Foss included in the rivers for which water quality should be maintained in iii). • Network Rail suggest an amendment to iv) to reflect sustainability objectives. • Green Party generally supports the policy but suggest changes to several bullet points to strengthen the policy. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust states that the policy should include an extra bullet point with a specific mention of biodiversity. • National Railway Museum seeks an additional bullet point which explicitly seeks to protect and enhance the visitor economy through supporting existing facilities, promoting new development and encouraging improved infrastructure. • McArthur Glen states that the supporting text should clarify that this measure of control is not intended to prevent appropriate expansion at the York Designer Outlet • CPRE suggest amendments to better reflect the need for new development to consider new green infrastructure as well as conserving and enhancing existing networks.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency is keen to see water efficiency measures being promoted and highlight the need for abstraction and/or discharge permits, as necessary. • Dunnington Parish Council state that any development in Dunnington will have to deal with the inevitable shortage of school places, play areas, playing fields and other green spaces due to the rise in population. • Nether and Upper Poppleton Parish Councils make comments in relation to prevention of homes flooding, modal transport shift. • Some developers state that the principles in this policy cannot be achieved with a local plan that fails to plan for the full OAHN it requires and that emphasis should be placed on the flexibility of this policy. • One respondent felt that the policy means nothing when the local planning authority is still cautious about renewable energy. • Another suggested that housing in York is not sustainable, 40% of jobs in York are in the tourist industry and low paid whereas the house prices are some of the highest in the North. • Another response states that the plan needs to be more ambitious in regards to transport.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy DP3: Sustainable Communities			
<p>New development, including all the allocated sites as identified on the proposals map, should, where appropriate, address the following overarching development principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. respect and enhance the historic character, green spaces and landscape of York; ii. deliver high quality design and appropriate density, layout and scale whilst ensuring appropriate building materials are used; iii. create a high quality, locally distinctive place which relates well to the surrounding area and its historic character, and exploits opportunities for creating new and enhancing existing key views; iv. ensure the highest standards of sustainability are embedded at all stages of the development; v. create <u>contribute to</u> a sustainable, balanced community through provision of an appropriate range of housing; vi. ensure that social, and cultural <u>and community</u> infrastructure requirements of the new community neighbourhoods are met through provision of accessible facilities and services in a planned and phased manner which complements and integrates with existing facilities; vii. create a people friendly environment which promotes opportunities for social and community interaction; vi. deliver new development within a framework of linked multifunctional green infrastructure incorporating existing landscape areas and biodiversity value, and maximising linkages with the wider green infrastructure network; ix. protect and enhance the natural environment through habitat restoration and creation; x. promote integration, connectivity and accessibility to, from and within the site by maximising opportunities for walking, cycling and frequent public transport thereby promoting and facilitating a modal shift from the car to more sustainable and healthier forms of travel; xi. minimise the environmental impact of vehicle trips to and from the development and mitigate the impact of residual car trips on the highway network where possible, <u>including addressing air quality issues</u>; and xii. manage flood risk by ensuring development does not contribute to or is not subject to flooding. <p>Detailed policy requirements in relation to these overarching principles can be found under the relevant section of the plan.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Minor amendments have been made to the policy to reflect comments made through the consultation.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 22	Supports: 6	Objections: 2	Comments: 26

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports the policies aim to ensure that new development both conserves those elements which contribute to the character of the City and also enhances its distinctive character. • Dunnington Parish Council supports the comments on housing mix and that sustainable villages require a mix of household types to support a range of local amenities. • Several developers support the principles in this policy.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council suggests a wording change to (xi) to strengthen the protection of air quality. • The Homes and Communities Agency recommends that (v) should be amended to replace 'create' with 'contribute to'. • DIO (MOD) suggest that the following additional sentence is incorporated at the end of criterion ix: "...and development of previously developed land where appropriate".
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England recognises that (xi) applies equally to the city's primary roads and the A64 and that that physical mitigation measures will be needed in addition to the range of sustainable transport measures, particularly on the A64. • Several parish councils and community groups raise a number of issues that should be addressed in the policy to create sustainable communities e.g. provision of facilities, school buses, driveway/gardens with non-porous surfaces. • York Green Party suggests wording changes to the policy to emphasise the importance of environmental issues. • Several developers and agents commented that they had no objection to the policy but suggested some minor alterations to wording.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy DP4: Approach to Development Management				
<p>When considering future development the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. It will work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions, which means that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where they are in place, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 3		Supports: 1	Objections: 1	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gladman Developments consider that the policy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henry Boot Developments consider that many of the draft policies require an increasing number of complex supporting documents covering peripheral / ancillary issues for no apparent planning benefit. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Party ask that a comment about working with applicants at an early stage is added to the policy. 			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York			
Development during the plan period will be consistent with the priorities below.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide sufficient land to accommodate an annual provision of around 650 new jobs that will support sustainable economic growth, improve prosperity and ensure that York fulfils its role as a key economic driver within both the Leeds City Region and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership area. • Deliver a minimum annual provision of 867 new dwellings over the plan period to 2032/33 and post plan period to 2037/38. This will enable the building of strong, sustainable communities through addressing the housing and community needs of York's current and future population. 			
The location of development through the plan will be guided by the following five spatial principles.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserving and enhancing York's historic and natural environment. This includes the city's character and setting and internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites, green corridors and areas with an important recreation function. • Ensuring accessibility to sustainable modes of transport and a range of services. • Preventing unacceptable levels of congestion, pollution and/or air quality. • Ensuring flood risk is appropriately managed. • Where viable and deliverable, the re-use of previously developed land will be phased first. 			
York City Centre, as defined on the Proposals Map, will remain the focus for main town centre uses ¹ .			
The identification of development sites is underpinned by the principle of ensuring deliverability and viability. Additionally, land or buildings identified for economic growth must be attractive to the market.			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 58	Supports: 13	Objections: 45	Comments: 17

¹ **Main town centre uses as defined by the NPPF:** Retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment facilities the more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres, and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).

Housing growth	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support was received from a number of organisations for the Council to meet their entire objectively assessment housing need (OAHN). Some supported the 867 dpa target on this basis. • Hambleton District Council comments the methodology is the same as theirs. They consider that the Plan identifies sufficient land to meet the development needs of the City and establishes a Green Belt enduring 20 years. However, the representation also raises concerns in relation to lack of safeguarded land and opportunity to accommodate the increased level of growth proposed in the White Paper, should this be required. • CPRE support decision to not adopt a 10% uplift allowing for market signals as it does not give weight to the special character and setting of York and important environmental constraints. They also consider that 867 dpa is more deliverable although recognised to be above the average rate for York. • North Yorkshire County Council support policy SS1 in general. They also support the recognition and inclusion of windfall development in addition to allocations as a means of achieving additional flexibility for housing delivery. • Some Parish representations support the 867 dwellings per annum figure over the Government's standardised methodology figure of 1070 dpa.
Objection	<p>The majority of responses on this issue, particularly planning agents and developers, strongly object to using 867 dwellings per annum as the starting point for York's OAHN. The current estimate of housing is deemed significantly flawed and 'unsound' because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not comply with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) evidence base. • There is no evidence to support the current approach and it is therefore not 'justified'; • The 867 dpa figure is a 'policy on' intervention, which is not in conformity with NPPF; NPPF requires the OAHN to be 'policy off' when considering OAHN; • The current figure is not realistic to adequately satisfy the future housing needs of the city; It will exacerbate affordability and inequality. It is therefore 'not effective'. • It does not include a market signals uplift or consideration for affordability. All concur that this should be included and some consider that 20% market uplift is warranted as opposed to 10% included in the SHMA recommendation. • It is not considered to be in the spirit of 'positive' planning. • It is lower than the Government's figure released (1070 dpa) as part of their consultation on a standardised methodology (Sept 2017). Some representations think this figure should be taken forward. • The Council has taken the wrong approach to estimating housing commitments and backlog by including student housing in the figures;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The backlog figure for York is too low; • Windfalls are relied upon for supply in the long-term. Windfalls should only be used for flexibility, not part of the supply. • There is no demonstration of flexibility. • The housing target should be wholly expressed in policy SS1 to include the backlog applied (867+56 = 923 dpa as per the trajectory table); • A 10% non-implementation rate should be applied to commitments. • There was general concern, particularly from landowners and agents and some neighbouring authorities, that significant additional allocations are required to address the shortfall, particularly in the short-term. Some representations consider that the council should over-allocate land to ensure green belt permanence and flexibility. • Additional independent housing requirement reports submitted by planning consultants on behalf of clients recommend a minimum of 1,150 dpa. These include alternative household formation rates and exclude student housing from commitments and backlog. Previous reports were also alluded to/appended, which support target ranges of 920-1070 dpa and 1,125 and 1,255 dpa. • Some members of the public objected to all housing growth/ the scale of housing growth and/or 867 dpa given the impact on the environment, congestion and climate change. • Fulford Parish Council object to the plans stated intention of meeting the development requirements of the city in full within the York local authority area. They consider that this policy position has been taken by default, without considering the impact that meeting the aspiration will have on the historic setting and character of the city. FPC considers that the cumulative impact of the developments proposed would greatly harm the open land setting of the City which makes such an important contribution to the setting and special character of York.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England suggestion that the plan needs to demonstrate that it can deliver the scales growth anticipated in a manner commensurate with safeguarding these elements which make York a special place. • CPRE consider that some population figures used by GL Hearn to provide the OAN may result in residents using York to commute elsewhere. They are therefore concerned about potential double counting and an artificially high OAN being produced; CYC should ensure this is not the case. • It is of a great concern to all stakeholders of the York Local Plan that it should be considered sound. It is therefore crucial the Plan is positively prepared to meet the objectively assessed need. Not meeting the OAHN jeopardises the adoption of the

	<p>both the plan and therefore the adoption of an enduring green belt as a result of insufficient sites being identified for development in the long-term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members of the public concurred that sufficient housing should be included to reduce affordability issues. They also commented on the components of change and the influence of migration on housing growth. • The plan period for which the target applies needs clarifying.
Spatial Strategy	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England welcome the spatial approach and the limiting of growth on the periphery of the city. They consider this seeks to safeguard elements which contribute to the historic character and setting of the city. • Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership consider that the methodology used places employment sites where the historic character of the city can be preserved and good transport links provided. • Supportive comments have been received from a range of other representations (including Highways England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and York Civic Trust) that support the general spatial approach to development. This includes supporting the spatial principles, particularly in relation to access to sustainable transport, historic character and setting and previously developed land.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some developers feel that the Plan does not set out a clear spatial strategy or framework for the future development of the city, that the evidence base to support the spatial approach is entirely absent and the Council has failed to undertake an appraisal to consider level of growth. The spatial distribution approach was deemed clearer in Policy SS3 in the 2013 draft version. Some representations also considered that the appraisal of spatial options should be demonstrated. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust support in principle this policy, but acknowledge that indefinite continued future growth of the city cannot be sustainable in the longer term. • In pursuit of alternatives sites, some developers comment that it would be more appropriate to focus growth on the York urban area and the expansion of existing settlements rather than the spatial approach taken to include new settlements. • The Green Infrastructure spatial shaper should be updated to remove land to the south of the designer outlet. • The policy should support existing leisure uses which are located in accessible locations and/or within spatial shapers identified. • There is a heavy reliance on strategic sites to deliver the required housing growth in the city; smaller allocations which meet the spatial criteria should be included. • Whilst a brownfield first approach is supported, it does not relate to the phasing in Policy H1 wherein sites seem to be

	<p>released in a single phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan is exhibiting urbanisation in reverse. New developments will encircle York and slowly rob villages of their identity.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE consider that the impact of housing developments elsewhere in the city will impact detrimentally upon the historic character and setting as well as infrastructure provisions of the City. • Clarity is required regarding how the spatial strategy links to the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF). • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust suggest a clarification of bullet point three of Policy SS1: Locally significant nature conservation sites could be changed to '<i>locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or SINC</i>'. This should help to distinguish between SINC and SLI's. • Historic England recommend the following suggested text amendments to refer to both impact of location and scale of growth, and to recognise the contribution of the rural landscape to the special character and setting of the City, as follows: Para 3.5, "<i>...are illustrated in Fig 3.1. However, the open countryside beyond the ring road also makes an important contribution to the wider rural setting of the historic city</i>", and Policy SS1, "<i>The location and scale of development through the plan...etc</i>". • Some respondents requested more detailed maps of the spatial shapers are provided.
Employment growth	
Support	<p><u>Vision for Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was general support for the Local Plan to positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth, including tourism and leisure. • Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership support the allocation for employment, feeling that generally, policies within the Plan set out a presumption in favour of sustainable development that seeks to accelerate economic growth and attract inward investment which is consistent with the SEP and its good growth narrative. • West Yorkshire Combined Authority says York's economic growth ambitions in the plan are consistent with the LCR Employment and Skills Plan and LEP/WYCA priorities. • North Yorkshire County Council, Historic England, Rachael Maskell MP, Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plan Groups all support the general approach to focus retail development in the City Centre and reduce / limit future development at out of town locations. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust was generally supportive for vision for economic growth. <p><u>Linkages between housing and economic growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Yorkshire County Council support the ambitions for growth

	<p>and stated aim that the housing needs of City of York 's current and future population, including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area.</p>
Objection	<p><u>Economic Growth Forecast</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few objections or comments from developers expressed confusion around timeframes used to determine annual job growth figures (2017-2038) vs annual housing figures, which are apportioned across a 15 year timeframe. • Some representations recognised the uncertainties inherent to long term economic forecasting and therefore disagree with the cautious approach using the baseline forecast to inform the employment land requirements of the Plan. <p><u>Vision for Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce, consider that there is a disconnect between the broad ambitions of the plan (Policy DP1) and how they will be delivered. They, and a number of developer representations, consider that housing and employment policies are restrictive and that employment land supply will not cater for York's future needs. Consequently, the approach will constrain economic growth. • In addition, comments were received that many commercial and industrial businesses cannot be accommodated within the York Urban Area and that the plan risks being found unsound with such little allocation for employment growth. • Home Builders Federation feel the LEPs ambition for growth has not been considered and this is reflected in low housing / employment allocations. • York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce note the conflict between acknowledging the universities importance for growth but failure to allocate sufficient land for expansion. • A few members of the public oppose, or question, economic growth as a goal in of itself saying it is incompatible with UK climate change targets / environmental sustainability. <p><u>Linkages between housing and economic growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York TUC stress that the cost of housing is already impinging on companies and public services abilities to recruit staff leading also to a major loss of employment sites (especially city centre offices and Clifton Moor Sites) due to the imbalance between housing and employment land values caused by a housing shortage. York TUC and many Parish Councils stress the need to protect employment sites (MOD and city centre office space) from conversion to residential use. • A few members of the public also comment on stemming the loss of city centre office space for residential use. • There is a requirement to serve the latent demand for homes and encourage growth and diversification of the economy by broadening the supply and availability of employment land and

	premises.
Comments	<p><u>Vision for Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some representations consider that York's opportunity to build upon an already diverse economy and positively encourage new employers by having a good range of deliverable new employment sites supporting economic vitality and new jobs is constrained by land supply. • Some members of the public asked where jobs were coming from and how the city will attract and sustain new firms. • Historic England stress economic growth must not be to the detriment of conservation of the city. <p><u>Range and supply of sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Railway Museum and York Racecourse felt the plan should do more to support the expansion of local tourist attractions. <p><u>Employment sectors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Farmers Union felt planning policy could do more to support diversification of the rural economy, allowing conversion of farm buildings to create out of town centre tourist attractions / accommodation. <p><u>Forecasts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity is required in relation to which employment forecast is used.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy SS2: The Role of York's Green Belt			
<p>The primary purpose of the Green Belt is to <u>safeguard</u> preserve the setting and the special character of York and delivering the Local Plan Spatial Strategy. New building in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for one of the exceptions set out in policy GB1.</p> <p>The general extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Key Diagram. Detailed boundaries shown on the proposals map follow readily recognisable physical features that are likely to endure such as streams, hedgerows and highways.</p> <p>To ensure that there is a degree of permanence beyond the plan period sufficient land is allocated for development to meet the needs identified in the plan and for a further minimum period of five years to 2038.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
To align with comments made by Historic England, the first paragraph of SS2 is amended to read: "The primary purpose of the green belt it to <u>safeguard</u> ...the setting".			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 34	Supports: 9	Objections: 24	Comments: 8
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several adjacent Local Authorities and Parish Councils support the principles set out in the policy and welcomes that 'The Green Belt's prime purpose is that of preserving the setting and special character of York'; • In general, responses are supportive that the Green Belt should be protected whilst taking a proportionate amount of land to allow for appropriate levels of growth to be supported by suitable infrastructure with the intention to give the Green Belt a degree of permanence to 2038; • Two Parish Councils and members of the public support the removal of safeguarded land from the Local Plan. 		
Objection	<p>Historic England state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Green Belt which might need to be amended only 5 years after the end date of this local plan does not appear to have the degree of 'permanence' expected by national planning guidance; • Reference should also be made to safeguarding the special character and setting of the 'historic' city. • First para of SS2 should be amended to read: "The primary purpose of the green belt it to safeguard the special character and setting of the historic city of York. New building in the green belt etc..." 		

- Selby District Council questions whether a Green Belt boundary enduring 20 years is sufficient.

The majority of objections to policy SS2 and the omission of safeguarded land in the Plan are made by developers -for the following reasons:

- Tightness of the Green Belt boundary may not be sufficient to endure beyond plan period;
- Plan period should be extended to 2038 and an additional 20% buffer should be provided in relation to allocations to allow for flexibility;
- Safeguarded Land should be identified to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- No policy stating that Green Belt boundaries are as shown on the Proposals Map;
- 20 year 'life' for the Green Belt is not consistent with the NPPF intention that boundaries should have permanence in the long term. This is usually determined by the expectation that boundaries will not need to be reviewed for at least 25 years, but preferably longer;
- The lack of 'permanence' invites a review of the green belt boundaries and a lack of protection;
- Land which is unnecessary is kept permanently open should not be included within the greenbelt;
- Without a proper assessment and attempt to accommodate the OAHN the Green Belt boundary cannot be justified or evidenced;
- Need to provide sufficient land to ensure that the Green Belt remains unaltered well beyond the plan period;
- Insufficient allocated sites and no safeguarded land means that there will be nowhere to develop in York;
- The approach conflicts with legal advice if no safeguarded land is identified in the emerging Local Plan this would give rise to a serious risk of the Plan being found unsound;
- Given no safeguarded land, the plan fails to justify the end date with allocations as presented in the trajectory.

Some members of the public had similar views and stated that:

- Green Belt permanence of only five years after the plan period is totally insufficient given how long it has taken to deliver the current local plan;
- Broad brush green belt outside urban area is inconsistent with NPPF guidance which states that local authorities should "not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open";
- Green Belt boundaries should be reduced to introduce safeguarded areas which can be used to meet long term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;

	<p>In addition, comments from the public include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary put forward in this plan is based on the 2003 York Green Belt Appraisal. This did not assess all five functions of Green Belt in NPPF and must be considered as an unsound basis upon which to define the inner Green Belt boundary; • Local Plan is too protective of the Green Belt. Green Belt land is important to prevent urban sprawl and to provide residents access to the outdoors. However, it is protecting agricultural land of limited access and biodiversity; • Local Authority has failed to establish any exceptional circumstance that would necessitate the removal of land from the Green Belt which fulfils Green Belt functions in NPPF 80.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Galtres Garden Village Development Company comments that the commentary on Green Belt speaks from a position that assumes the boundaries are fixed in an adopted plan; and that this is erroneous as the boundaries are being defined. • Environmental groups state that the Green Belt should be protected as much as possible.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS3: York City Centre

York City Centre is the economic, social and cultural heart of York. It is vital to the character and future economic success of the wider city. Its special qualities and distinctiveness will be conserved and enhanced whilst helping to achieve economic and social aspirations of the Plan. The streets, places and spaces of the city centre will be revitalised and key commercial developments will be delivered.

York City Centre is identified as a priority area for a range of employment uses and is fundamental to delivering the plans economic vision. During the plan period it will be the principal location in the City of York area for the delivery of economic growth in the tourism, leisure and cultural sectors. It will account for the majority of the employment growth identified in these sectors.

Within the city centre, as defined on the Proposals Map, the following development types are acceptable in principle:

- Retail (A1) – within the designated Primary Shopping Area (PSA). Outside of the PSA the sequential test and impact tests will apply in order to protect the vitality and viability of the city centre;
- Office (B1a);
- Food and Drink (A3/A4/A5);
- Hotels (C1);
- Leisure(D2);
- Arts, Entertainment and Recreation (D1);
- Theatres (Sui Generis);
- Dwellinghouses (C3) ,in particular the reuse of upper floors for residential use is encouraged; and
- Finance and Professional Services (A2).

As shown on the Proposals Map, the following city centre sites have been allocated:

- ST32: Hungate (328 dwellings);
- ST20: Castle Gateway (mixed use); and
- Elements of ST5: York Central falling within the city centre boundary (mixed use).

The city centre will remain the focus for main town centre uses (unless identified on the Proposals Map). Proposals for main town centre uses for non city centre locations will only be considered acceptable in accordance with Policy R1 where it can be demonstrated that they would not have a detrimental impact on the city centre's vitality and viability and the sustainable transport principles of the Plan can be met. Change of use of existing Use Class A, B1(a) and town centre leisure, entertainment, and culture uses will be resisted.

Proposals that promote accessibility and movement are encouraged, particularly those that prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement and improve linkages between key places such as the railway station, York Central and the National Railway

Museum, the Minster, Castle Gateway, Hungate and the universities.

York Minster Cathedral Precinct is approximately 8 hectares in size (as shown on the proposals map). The Minster is still the pre-eminent structure in the City of York today and it continues to play a significant role in the religious, social and cultural life of the city. The Council will work with the Minster authorities, as appropriate, to future plan for its development to better reveal the significances of its special character and appearance.

The following principles will be taken into account when considering city centre development proposals.

- i. Conserve and enhance the existing historic character of York City Centre whilst encouraging contemporary high quality developments that add to the sense of place and create a prestigious and desirable location for thriving businesses.
- ii. Enhance the quality of the city centre as a place and rediscover the outstanding heritage of the city with reanimated and revitalised streets, places and spaces and with improved settings to showcase important assets such as the Minster and Clifford's Tower.
- iii. Enhance the gateway streets leading into the city centre to give a better sense of arrival, including the entrance and gateways to the footstreets, to improve pedestrian and cycle routes and to encourage visitors to explore further. Streets include Gillygate, Goodramgate, Peasholme Green and Stonebow, Walmgate and Fossgate, Piccadilly, Micklegate and Bootham.
- iv. Design streets around place and quality, not vehicle movement, creating civilised streets that make the city centre easy, enjoyable and safe to move around.
- v. Create a strong evening economy by diversifying the current functions of the city centre to provide more for families and older people and encouraging activities to stay open later in the evening.
- vi. Retain and add to the city centre's retail offer and retain and strengthen independent shops.
- vii. Enhance the setting of the River Ouse and River Foss and their frontages, turning them into attractive, vibrant and bustling environments with improved access to the riverside and linkages to other parts of the city centre.
- viii. Positively promote and integrate the presence, roles and contributions of the University of York and York St John University in the city centre.
- ix. Deliver sustainable homes that provide quality, affordability and choice for all ages, including a good mix of accommodation.
- x. Provide community and recreational facilities to encourage healthy, active lifestyles including the provision of green amenity spaces in the city centre to help to combat the effects of higher temperatures, air pollutants, flooding and climate change.
- xi. Support the reduction of through traffic, improving the public transport offer and the delivery of a bus interchange at York Railway Station.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change to policy.

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 18	Supports: 9	Objections: 7	Comments: 10
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports the proposals for the city centre, including the stated development principles and state that together these should help safeguard and enhance the elements that contribute to the special character of this part of York. • York Green Party supports the policy wording 'Change of use of existing Use Class A, B1(a) and town centre leisure, entertainment and culture uses will be resisted' • GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) are generally supportive of the intent of this policy particularly the provisions to promote accessibility and movement and welcomes its inclusion within the Local Plan. • Support of the policy has been shown by Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) and Arup (on behalf of York Central Partnership) • York Minster support reference to the Minster Precinct in policy. • General support was provided for the policy objectives with particular reference to the proposals for Castle Piccadilly, the Railway Station and National Railway Museum. Whilst support was also voiced to the re-letting of vacant shops and conversion of the upper floors of properties. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail believes that principle xi needs to be more robustly worded and suggests wording that seeks delivery of enhancements to the existing bus interchange facilities which shall provide a seamless journey, a clear less congested transition for passengers and demonstrate good urban design. • GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) comment that to allow for greater flexibility for the redevelopment of York Central and given the interconnected nature between the allocation and the rest of the city centre, the HCA requests that the city centre boundary is extended to all of the proposed allocation. They believe that the policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised and weighs in favour of a future planning application. Policy amendments should be made to clarify that sequential and impact assessments should not be required for other uses referred to in the policy (in line with NPPF) where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. • York Minster's response, whilst supporting specific reference to the Minster, is concerned over lack of status afforded to Minster as a principle area of York and absence of a supportive policy in plan. Provides suggested policy for the Minster, including maintaining a high quality Minster Quarter, enhancing the setting, supporting improvement of the precinct and any new 		

	<p>development to be of outstanding quality and design. In addition, they attach a boundary accurately reflecting the extent of their ownership to update Minster Precinct on the Proposals map..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General objection received to this policy provide comment that whilst York is a city of culture and a major tourist destination the needs of residents should be met first. Concerns have been raised to the view that too many shops are closing and are being replaced by restaurants and coffee shops. A policy should be implemented that limits these changes and attracts good quality shops whilst CYC should also consider a reduction in rental charges to encourage more retail units within the centre. • A comprehensive approach has been suggested by some objectors to this policy that would improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity and that city centre road space should be re-allocated in favour of sustainable transport whilst ensuring the centre is still accessible for businesses, residents and visitors alike. Reduced congestion and improved air quality should be sought. • Further concern was expressed over the wording in the policy regarding York Minster stating that it is not accurate to refer to York as having a single 'religious life'.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Railway Museum comments that policy should allow for greater flexibility for the redevelopment of York Central and given the interconnected nature between the allocation and the rest of the city centre, they request that the city centre boundary is extended to all of the proposed allocation. They believe that the policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised. Policy amendments should be made to clarify that sequential and impact assessments should not be required for other uses referred to in the policy (in line with NPPF) where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. They support the provisions within this policy that promote accessible movement (particularly pedestrian and cycling) and improve linkages between key places. Improved access between the NRM, York Central and the rest of the City is very important. • The Canal & River Trust welcomes the policy principle under part vii to enhance the setting of the Ouse and access to the riverside. • General positive comments are provided to this policy from the York Green Party. However, they are disappointed that there is no mention of city centre residents. They state that the Plan should be more clearly ambitious about seeking a largely car free city centre and further strengthen the requirement to protect and provide green space for city centre residents, workers and visitors. They suggest the several amendments to achieve this. • Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) agree with the general principles of this policy but considers that there

	<p>should be emphasis on the scope of the City Centre to deliver more new homes. Clarity should be provided within the policy in terms of the capacity of the Hungate development site not just phase 5+.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership are generally supportive of this policy, however, would welcome the inclusion of York Central (ST5) within the policy area that would allow for consistency and clarity for the policy application across the site. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) point out that this policy, along with others, require all A1 retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area are currently required to undertake a sequential and impact assessment. Whilst this is in accordance with NPPF such an approach could harm the ability of York Central Partnership to allow for a comprehensive and sustainable development (at ST5) that meets the needs of its future community including both the residents and workforce. • Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee passed comment that the loss of shopping from the city centre and increasing number of vacated shops is problematic and will deter visitor footfall. The possible use of temporary art exhibitions or displays from schools/colleges would be better than empty premises. They cite the work that Civic Trust are do to bring the historic value of sections of the city to everyone's attention as being worthy of note. • York Consortium for Conservation and Craftsmanship point out that the Plan acknowledges York as being a special city, valued for its history, archaeology and fine buildings. This inheritance owes much to the traditional crafts and conservation skills that are very much alive in the city today and without the businesses employing these crafts people the historic infrastructure could not be maintained and the city would lose some of its special character. They suggest these businesses are included within the development types which are acceptable in principle in the city centre (policy SS3) that would provide a vibrancy and richness to the mix of activities in the city and suggest craft studios could be accommodated within the York Central (ST5) site. • Several general respondents mention the number of vacant retail units within the city centre that is suffering from out of town developments, whilst it is felt by some that too many cafes are replacing traditional retail shops in the centre of town. More cycle racks at appropriate locations should be considered whilst taxi boats and monorails were suggested as means to improved city centre transport links. Whilst better use of upper floors to retail units is seen as a means of improving an appropriate policy suggestion.
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS4: York Central (ST5)

York Central (ST5) will enable the creation of a new piece of the city; with exemplar mixed- use 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.

The following mix of uses will be permitted within York Central-: ~~Proposals for main town centre uses will be subject to an impact and sequential assessment:~~

- Offices (B1a);
- ~~Financial & Professional Services (A2)~~
- Residential;
- Hotels (C1)
- Culture, leisure, tourism and niche/ancillary retail facilities;
- Open space, high quality public realm and supporting social infrastructure;
- and
- ~~Rail uses associated with operational rationalisation and functionality and catering for HS2, Harrogate Line alternative approach and the potential tram/train linkages; and~~
- Non ancillary retail subject to an impact and sequential assessment:

Land within York Central is allocated for ~~1,500~~ 1,700 – 2,500 dwellings, of which ~~1,250~~ a minimum of 1,500 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period, and ~~61,000~~ 100,000 sq m of Office (B1a).

Development within the York Central site will be permitted in accordance with the principles of development set out below. The principles of development at York Central are to:

- i. Create a high quality sustainable, mixed use urban quarter for York including a range of commercial, residential, cultural and leisure uses.
- ii. Provide a new business district with a critical mass of high quality offices suitable for modern business requirements.
- iii. Enhance the quality of the cultural area around the National Railway Museum through high quality public realm and improved connectivity to the wider city.
- iv Support expansion and improvement of the National Railway Museum as a prime cultural asset.
- v. Create a distinctive new place of outstanding quality and design which complements the existing historic urban fabric of the city and respects those elements which contribute to the distinctive historic character of the city and assimilates into its setting and surrounding communities.

- vi. Conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the adjacent Central Historic Core Conservation Area and St Paul's Square/ Holgate Road Conservation Area.
- vii. Maximise the benefits of job creation and sustainable economic growth.
- viii. Create a sustainable new community with a range of housing types and tenures. To reflect the site's location, high density development may be appropriate.
- ix. Ensure provision of social infrastructure which meets the needs of York Central and, where viable, the wider city communities including sports, leisure, health, primary and nursery education and community facilities and open space
~~Ensure provision of social infrastructure which meets the needs of York Central and the wider city communities including sports, leisure, health, education and community facilities and open space.~~
- x. Maximise integration, connections and accessibility to/from the site including inter-modal connectivity improvements at York Railway Station.
- xi. Deliver development and maximise connectivity within a green infrastructure network and integrate with wider public realm in the city.
- xii. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.
- xiii. Minimise the environmental impact of vehicular trips.
- xiv. Ensure sustainability principles are embedded at all stages of the development.
- xv. Provide high speed fibre broadband across the whole site.

Supporting Text Changes

Para 3.25 to be amended in line with the policy:-

3.25 The site is considered to have the capacity to deliver a total of up to 1,500 residential dwellings and 61,000 sqm of office space. The figure of 1,500 dwellings has been assumed at this stage in the plan process to reflect complexity of delivery. The site will include a range of uses including offices, residential, cultural, leisure, tourism and niche/ancillary retail (subject to sequential and impact tests), open space, public realm, social infrastructure, rail use and car parking. Whilst part of ST5 falls within the city centre boundary (as shown on the proposals map), in retail terms this element of York Central is 'edge of centre' as it is more than 300m from the Primary Shopping Area. The type and quantity of any retail provision on the York Central site would therefore need to be informed by a detailed retail assessment. It should be noted that ST5 is subject to detailed ongoing technical work and masterplanning which may increase the overall capacity of the site. This will be confirmed as the Local

Plan progresses towards publication stage and will be reflected in future iterations of the plan.

Paragraph 3.27 should be updated to 'general rail capacity schemes designed to improve and enhance all routes on the network affecting York' with the reference to York Leeds Harrogate deleted.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amendments have been made to reflect work undertaken by the York Central Partnership. This has indicated that York Central is capable of accommodating between 1700 – 2400 residential units and that the higher figure of 2500 units could be achieved through detailed applications by developers for individual plots and / or flexibility to increase residential at the margins of the commercial core. The figure of 1700 reflects land currently under the partnerships control; the higher figure includes land in private ownership or currently used for rail operations.

Allocation ST5

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	35.0ha	35 ha
Estimated Yield	1,500 dwellings, 61,000 sqm / 3.33ha B1a employment	1700-2,500 dwellings 100,000sqm B1a employment floorspace
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan and Post Plan period (Years 1-21)	No change

Potential Allocation Boundary



Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change			
The boundary is proposed to change in line with a submission and further work undertaken in conjunction with the York Central Partnership.			
Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 81 (plus 1 NDM)	Supports: 16	Objections: 46	Comments: 30 (plus 1 NDM)
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of comments support the principle of delivering development on this large brownfield site, including from York Central Partners, Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership, GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), Historic England, Highways England, Network Rail and Lichfield's on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd. • There is support for ST5 from Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership. GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) is generally supportive of the intent of this policy and welcomes its inclusion within the Local Plan. • Historic England gives support for the principle of development on this large brownfield site, as part of a wider development strategy designed to achieve the protection of key elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting of York. Support requirement for development within principles designed to: enhance the quality of the cultural area around National Railway Museum (NRM); create a distinctive new place; conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the adjacent Central Historic Core Conservation Area/St Paul's Sq/Holgate Rd Conservation Area and maximise sustainable economic growth. • Network Rail is pleased to note that the potential access to York Central from the 5 acre land has been removed from this iteration of the local plan. Highways England considers development principle (xii) to be satisfactory. • Some of those writing in support of the scheme support the development proposals for York Central and the expansion of the National Railway Museum including the former railway works site. Support is given for this brownfield site being used for high density housing and employment. It should be sustainable given its location, especially in terms of transport. There were also several queries regarding the access points to the site, including more cycle and pedestrian paths and whether it could be a car free development. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) state that the York Central Partnership are now confident that the site can accommodate up to 2,500 dwellings and 100,000sqm of office uses alongside a variety of supporting uses including retail, leisure and hotel provision. The HCA would be grateful for amendments to be made to Policy SS4 to reflect this up-to-date quantum. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA. Policy EC1 (Provision of Employment Land) lists the city's strategic employment sites, defining those as being over 5 hectares (ha). It 		

	<p>then states that York Central's employment land area measures 3.33ha. In order to avoid confusion and potential challenge as the plan progresses, it is requested that the reference to the scale of strategic sites is amended or a clarification is made relating specifically to York Central.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) The policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised and weighs in favour of a future planning application. The policy should also be amended to clarify that similar requirements for sequential and impact assessments are not required for the other uses referred to in the policy, in line with the NPPF, where those uses are proposed within the city centre boundary. The policy should include an indicative floor space provision. Key Principle (i) should include retail and hotel amongst the range of uses. Alter key principle (ix) so that it reads <i>"Ensure provision of social infrastructure which meets the needs of York Central and, where feasible, the wider city communities including sports, leisure, health, education and community facilities and open space"</i>. • Although supportive of the principle of development on this brownfield Site, Historic England query the deliverability of the quantum of development proposed within the site's heritage context, both in terms of impact on the site's many heritage assets and also potential knock-on to the city centre. Suggests a lot more work is needed to demonstrate how 1,500 dwellings and 61,000 sqm of office floorspace can be created on the site in a manner which would also be compatible with the need to safeguard the significance of the numerous heritage assets in its vicinity and the other elements which contribute to the special historic character of the City. The risk of a development strategy focused on tall buildings and its impact on the historic skyline is also raised by a number of other respondents, including Shepherd Group and DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes, O'Neill Associates on behalf of Jorvik Homes and O'Neills Associates on behalf of Galtrees Garden Village Development Company • A number of objections from Planning agents on behalf of house builders/landowners and the York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce, query ST5's assumed delivery. Concerns relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is considerable doubt about the viability and deliverability of the site and its lead-in time. • Concern over the net developable area being less than 35ha. • The over-reliance on housing delivery from York Central could undermine the potential for the Plan to provide sufficient land to accommodate projected housing need over the Plan period. • (York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP). Increased flexibility in approach to use of employment sites is welcome but there is a concern over the planned target of only 60000 sq m of B1a office
--	---

	<p>space at York Central given the significantly higher figure in the EZ proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail state that the policy wording with regard to sequential testing needs to be reconsidered to ensure that unnecessary obstacles do not obstruct achieving a mix of uses within the allocated area. The policy wording could be updated to reflect the change in rail priorities. Amend 4th bullet to read 'Rail uses associated with operational rationalisation and function and catering for HS2 and all other future rail capacity projects'. Concerned that principles x,xi and xii are seeking the same objective, are a reiteration of overarching policies in the plan and need to be built upon in this more detailed policy. The policy should be more proactive in supporting innovative design based solutions to sustainable transport objectives by favouring design consistent with achieving a low speed traffic environment, emphasising place making over vehicle movements and creating high quality walking and cycling links with the city centre and York Station . Paragraph 3.27 should be updated to 'general rail capacity schemes designed to improve and enhance all routes on the network affecting York' with the reference to York Leeds Harrogate deleted. The wording in relation to broadband should be clarified with the emphasis on the site developer facilitating broadband in those areas of the site that will support office and residential development. • The cumulative impact of the site on the city's already congested road network is seen as a significant threat, and the lack of detail regarding sustainable transport options inadequate. It is considered that this should be a car free living site. Amongst others, Friends of Holgate Garden is particularly concerned that the prospective route for access to the York Central site crosses the community garden, citing the loss of productive and creative gardening and loss of amenity space. They note further significant impacts including from additional traffic/pollution on local resident's health and quality of life. Schools and shops need to be provided with outdoor play space for children, teenagers and adults. Need for more affordable housing/social housing on ST5. • This site is a key space for increasing employment opportunities in York, York needs more high quality employment opportunities in the city centre and needs a mix of employment types not just tourism allowing creative industry to flourish and deliver on the UNESCO Creative Cities Network promises. The railway carriage buildings could be converted for new uses and preserving the heritage of the city. The city needs a medium sized multifunctional venue. A mix of studio and office space with gallery/exhibition space and cafes would allow a cultural quarter to develop and compete with larger cities. Employment allocation should be 30% of the site. Make it York note the overall increase in requirement for employment uses, and specifically that relating to B1a Office uses is a very welcome addition. Others believes that allocating office space in the 'teardrop'
--	---


	<p>York Central site is a waste of time and money as there are other office structures in York which have been unused for decades. Suggests leaving construction of business spaces until they are guaranteed to be used.</p>
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership request that the reference to the scale of strategic sites (5ha) is amended or a clarification is made relating specifically to York Central which is 3.33ha to avoid confusion. • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership and GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) suggest it would be unduly prescriptive to refer to the sequential and impact assessments in relation to town centre uses on this site. It seems un-necessary to for broadband requirements to be stipulated in the policy framework for York Central. Suggest an alteration to ix, whilst York Central is an opportunity to meet local infrastructure needs, it must be allowed to succeed in its primary objective of delivering significant housing and employment space in a sustainable location and supported by infrastructure necessary to meet its own needs, alteration to policy suggested. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) suggest as a minimum, they would expect the development to include space for a food store and other retail uses necessary to support a major new residential community, an employment cluster and a national museum, the cumulative space of which is likely to exceed 2,500sqm. • National Railway Museum welcomes and endorse points iii, and iv. of policy SS4 which supports the expansion of the museum, the creation of high public realm around the museum and improved connectivity with the rest of the city. Suggest an alteration to ix, whilst York Central is an opportunity to meet local infrastructure needs, it must be allowed to succeed in its primary objective of delivering significant housing and employment space in a sustainable location and supported by infrastructure necessary to meet its own needs, alteration to policy suggested. • Highways England indicate that any further increase in site capacity will increase the traffic on the A64. • Northern Power Grid indicate the potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required.

- North Yorkshire County Council state the development of this site will provide new economic and residential uses and activity in the centre of the City in a location well connected to sustainable transport which will benefit from regeneration.
- Nether Poppleton Parish Council indicate that this site has potential for a transport hub where a bus/train interchange might be possible. At present, many of York offices are being converted into flats so question whether offices are needed here. If they are, then other out-of-centre employment sites should be reduced. Shopping has changed its profile but this is not reflected in the Local Plan. An extension of St Peter's Quarter would be most suitable for this area. It could act as a template for the teardrop site.
- Network Rail Supports, as part of the York Central Partnership, ARUP's letter which makes specific representations in relation to York Central. Support, in particular, their concern that development on brownfield land may not be viable if the requirement for housing and other policies cannot be more flexibly applied to brownfield sites. Note that the [5 acre] site has been show on the Proposals Map as a site of local interest to nature conservation. Recent biodiversity surveys at the site did not observe any rare or uncommon plant species. The site has previously been in railway use and is important operational land needed to safeguard the employment at the depot and rationalise the railway operations at the York Central Site. Clarification is sought on the reason for the site's designation. Land at the 5 acre site will soon be the subject of an application for a new track fan to facilitate better train access arrangements into the depot. The Council's response to a pre-application enquiry supported the principle of the development.
- Specific issues include: what sort of mix/type of mix/type of housing is proposed, and will it meet York's needs, including an element of affordable; York Central Action. In favour of developing the site but ensure the development will benefit existing residents Residential uses, development should include a mix of housing, the greatest need is for affordable housing. Ideal location for smaller houses. Welcome the commitment to a mixed tenure development. what supporting development is proposed (shops, green space, doctors etc).; ESFRA - Supports development of infrastructure and reference to education. Would be helpful if plan could safeguard land for provision of new schools to meet housing demand.
- Conservation Areas Advisory Panel - Policy should note the site's historic context, namely its railway heritage. York Georgian Society state that the policy should note the site's historic context, namely its railway heritage. Keen to see York Central developed as long as the development does not hinder or compromise the future development of the railway infrastructure. It is important to preserve the Railway Institute and its related buildings as these are a valuable community

asset. The built environment should be connected to the heritage of the railways. Space should be retained adjacent to the train station for future extension necessary to deliver HS2 (or HS3 / Northern Powerhouse Rail) connectivity.

Boundary change Submitted

Boundary change submitted by the York Central Partnership following further discussion (overleaf).



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

~~Policy SS5: Castle Gateway~~

~~Castle Gateway (ST20) is allocated as an Area of Opportunity, as indicated on the Proposals Map. The York Castle Gateway ('Castle Gateway') has been identified as a major regeneration area of the city centre. The area is home to major high quality cultural, river and heritage assets that form part of York's unique character, but suffer from a poor quality setting amongst car parking and neglected buildings. There is significant potential to revitalise the area, reinterpreting and reasserting the varied history of the site, and creating a better connection with the city centre through improved pedestrian and cycle access.~~

~~The purpose of the regeneration is to:~~

- ~~• Radically enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower and the Eye of York to recognise and interpret their importance to York's unique history.~~
- ~~• Improve the economic, environmental and social sustainability of the area.~~
- ~~• Integrate the area with the broader city centre.~~
- ~~• Improve pedestrian and cycle flow throughout the area and in to the wider city.~~
- ~~• Bring forward new commercial development that improves the area and compliments and facilitates the implementation of the public space masterplan.~~

~~To achieve these aims development in the Castle Gateway will be delivered through the following:~~

- ~~• Removing the Castle Car Park to create new public spaces and a high quality development opportunity.~~
- ~~• Provision of a replacement car park either underground at its current location or as a multi-storey car park on the site of existing surface level parking at Castle Mills.~~
- ~~• The addition of a new landmark River Foss pedestrian cycle bridge.~~
- ~~• The opening up of both frontages of the River Foss with riverside walkways on one or both banks.~~
- ~~• Engagement with important stakeholders in the masterplanning of high quality public realm and spaces, as a catalyst for wider social and economic improvement.~~
- ~~• Funding the implementation of the cultural partnership masterplan for public space and infrastructure through viable developer contributions and commercial uplift from new development sites.~~

~~In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, development within the three Castle Gateway sub areas, shown at Figure 3.4, will be delivered in accordance with the following principles:~~

~~Castle Piccadilly~~

- ~~i. Create a development opportunity for a contemporary new building of exemplary architecture alongside the western bank of the River Foss on the site of the existing Castle Car Park.~~

- ~~ii. Deliver a contemporary new car park either underground at its current location or as a multi-storey car park on the site of existing surface level parking at Castle Mills.~~
- ~~iii. Provide a new landmark bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across the River Foss linking Piccadilly with the Castle Precinct through developer contributions and commercial uplift from new development sites.~~
- ~~iv. Create new public access, with varied treatment along one, or both sides of the River Foss, with new connections linking to the wider pedestrian and cycle network.~~
- ~~v. Provide active river frontage to any new development on sites adjoining the River Foss.~~
- ~~vi. Reduce the size of the vehicular carriageway on Piccadilly and Lower Tower Street and improve size and quality of the pedestrian foot streets, including tree planting on Piccadilly.~~
- ~~vii. Consider important sightlines across the Castle Gateway area.~~
- ~~viii. Seek developer contributions in the form of land and/or funding to contribute to delivering the masterplan and highways improvements.~~
- ~~ix. Consider the potential for flood improvement work as part of any new development.~~

~~Foss Basin and the Ouse Riverside~~

- ~~x. Improve existing and create new connections for pedestrians and cyclists between St George's Field and the Foss Basin and the wider Castle Gateway area.~~
- ~~xi. Maximise the development potential of the Foss Basin and St George's Field as a key economic, cultural and social asset for the city.~~
- ~~xii. Enhance existing public realm at Tower Gardens and along the Ouse Riverside and River Foss.~~
- ~~xiii. Consider the potential for flood improvement work as part of any new development.~~

~~Coppergate/Fossgate~~

- ~~xiv. Improve the physical fabric, permeability and appearance of the Coppergate Centre to optimise the retail and cultural offer.~~
- ~~xv. Create new and improve existing pedestrian connections between the central shopping area and the Castle Gateway.~~
- ~~xvi. Improve the Fossgate streetscape by reducing vehicle dominance and creating a pedestrian friendly environment.~~

Policy SS5: Castle Gateway

Castle Gateway (ST20) is allocated as an Area of Opportunity, as indicated on the Proposals Map. The York Castle Gateway ('Castle Gateway') has been identified as a major regeneration area of the city centre. The area is home to major high quality cultural, river and heritage assets that form part of York's unique character, but suffer from a poor quality setting amongst car parking and neglected buildings. There is significant potential to revitalise the area, reinterpreting and reasserting the varied history of the site, and creating a better connection with the city centre through improved pedestrian and cycle access.

The purpose of the regeneration is to:

- Radically enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower and other features within the Eye of York to recognise the significance of these historic assets and interpret their importance in York's history.
- Improve the economic, environmental and social sustainability of the area.
- Integrate the area with the broader city centre.
- Improve pedestrian and cycle flow throughout the area and improve connections with the wider city.
- Bring forward new commercial and other development that improve the area and complements and facilitates the implementation of the public realm enhancements.

To achieve these aims development in the Castle Gateway will be delivered through the following:

- Removing the Castle Car Park to create potential new public space and high quality development opportunities.
- Provision of a replacement car park within the Castle Gateway area.
- The addition of a new landmark River Foss pedestrian cycle bridge.
- Where possible, the opening up of frontages of the River Foss with riverside walkways.
- Engagement with stakeholders in the development of masterplan and public realm proposals.
- Securing public realm transport and infrastructure investment as a catalyst for wider social and economic improvement.
- Funding the implementation of public space, transport improvements and infrastructure through developer contributions and commercial uplift from development sites across the area.

Development within the five Castle Gateway sub-areas will be delivered in accordance with the following principles:

King's Staith /Coppergate

- i. Improve the physical fabric, permeability and appearance of the Coppergate Centre including the possibility of a modest extension, to optimise the retail and cultural offer and to present an appropriate and well designed aspect when viewed from Clifford's Tower (see also Castle and Eye of York below).
- ii. Create new, and improve existing, pedestrian connections between the central shopping area and the Castle Gateway.
- iii. Improve the permeability of Coppergate as a key gateway into the area for pedestrians and cyclists.
- iv. Improve the Castlegate streetscape by reducing vehicle dominance and creating a pedestrian friendly environment.

Piccadilly

- v. Reduce the size of the vehicular carriageway on Piccadilly and improve the size and quality of the pedestrian foot streets, including tree planting.
- vi. Ensure active ground floor frontages to new developments fronting Piccadilly.

- vii. Provide active river frontages to any new development on sites adjoining the River Foss.
- viii. Seek developer contributions in the form of land and/or funding to contribute to delivering the masterplan and highways improvements.
- ix. Consider the opportunity to provide a new multi-storey car park on the site of existing surface level parking at Castle Mills to replace existing parking at Castle Car Park.
- x. Improve the Fosggate streetscape by reducing vehicle dominance and creating a pedestrian friendly environment.

Castle and the Eye of York

- xi. Create a public realm scheme for the Castle and Eye of York which celebrates the significance of historic assets and the setting of the historic Castle and prison.
- xii. Consider the opportunity to create a development opportunity for a contemporary new building of exemplary architecture alongside the western bank of the River Foss on the site of the existing Castle Car Park.
- xiii. Consider the opportunity to provide a new building to improve the southern aspect of the Coppergate Centre and service yard and enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower and the Eye of York.
- xiv. Provide a new landmark bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across the River Foss linking the Castle and Eye of York with Piccadilly with funding augmented from developer contributions and commercial uplift from new development sites.
- xv. Improve Tower Street to make it easier and safer to move between the Eye of York, Tower Gardens and St George's Field, by reducing vehicle dominance and creating a more pedestrian friendly environment.
- xvi. Consider important sightlines across the Castle Gateway area.

St. George's Field

- xvii. Consider the opportunity to provide a new multi-storey car park on the site of existing surface level parking at St. George's Field to replace the existing parking at Castle Car Park.
- xviii. Improve existing and create new connections for pedestrians and cyclists between St. George's Field and the Foss Basin and the wider Castle Gateway area.
- xix. Maximise the development potential of the Foss Basin and St George's Field as a key economic, cultural and social asset for the city.
- xx. Consider the potential for flood improvement work as part of any new development.

The River Corridors

- xxi. Encourage new public access, with varied treatment along one, or both sides of the River Foss, with new and improved connections linking to the wider pedestrian and cycle network.
- xxii. Enhance the existing public realm and consider new facilities at Tower Gardens to encourage better use of the space.
- xxiii. Improve the environment of the Foss and Ouse riversides and promote waterborne activities.
- i-xxiv. Consider the potential for flood alleviation work as part of any new development.

[See also Policy SS3, R1, R2, D1, D4, D5, D6 and T5.](#)


Supporting Text Changes:

Amendments made to supporting text to reflect policy changes as follows:

3.30 Castle Gateway comprises ~~three~~ five distinct, but inter-linked, sub-areas: Castle-Piccadilly; the Foss Basin and Ouse Riverside; and the area around the Coppergate Centre and Fosgate. The area contains a range mix of private land owners ships and a substantial amount of public estate with three museums/attractions (Castle Museum, Fairfax House and the Jorvik Viking Centre), three court buildings (Crown Court, County Court, Magistrates Court), many listed structures and a historic Scheduled Ancient Monument of international significance (Clifford's Tower).

3.35 A conceptual masterplan and detailed design of the public realm and infrastructure will be prepared, focusing on conservation and urban design and including a Statement of Significance. The masterplan will shape the key elements of the development on Castle Car Park, including the bridge across the River Foss. The commercial development elements of the Castle Gateway will also need to meet the quality criteria and vision for the area.

Figure 3.4: Castle Gateway Sub Areas -(revised figure)



3.36 St. George's Field has been identified within the Castle Gateway regeneration plans as an opportunity to provide enhanced car parking arrangements through the development of a multi-storey car park.

3.37 The site has an existing usage as a car park and this would not present a change in use or flood vulnerability. Car parks are not specifically identified within the National Planning Policy Framework flood risk vulnerability classification but due to its existing usage it could reasonably be considered as low risk. This continued usage as car parking should be supported where the design of the development maintains and preferably increases flood storage at this site.

3.38 The flood risk assessment for the site must ensure that the at grade parking area of any multi-storey car park continues to be floodable in the same frequency of flood events as present and delivers, through design, improvements in flood storage to ensure no increased risk to the site or others. All other levels of the car park should be designed with safe access and egress above the design flood levels. S104 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies approaches to the Exception Test to determine safe placement of developments within flood risk areas which is pertinent to the design ideals at this site:

- It must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared.
- A site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

3.40 The usage of undercroft car parking within the river corridor of York shows how well designed developments can continue to deliver flood storage benefits. Careful consideration within the flood risk assessment is required to achieve this, and any development on St. George's Field will need to consider similar approaches. There are many exemplars of this nationally.

Summary of Reasons for Change


Changes have been made in response to consultation on the Pre-Publication Local Plan (2017); to reflect ongoing technical and evidence base work to support the emerging masterplan for the Castle Gateway; and in response to ongoing consultation on emerging masterplan principles and ideas for Castle Gateway through the My Castle Gateway public engagement project.

Allocation: Castle Gateway ST20

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	N/a	No change
Estimated Yield	N/a	No change
Phasing	N/a	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary

955: Castle Gateway Area of Opportunity



Summary of Reasons for Change:

No Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 18	Supports: 6	Objections: 9	Comments: 7
------------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England generally support the policy principles guiding regeneration, with the proviso that, reflecting the distinct areas either side of the Foss (Clifford's Tower/Eye of York and Piccadilly), each have its own policy framework. • North Yorkshire County Council - the proposals to better link the Castle Museum / Clifford's Tower site with York's main shopping centre and potentially support improvements on Piccadilly are welcomed as they further strengthen the city's role as a retail and commercial centre serving a wider hinterland. • York Green Party support much of this approach with the
---------	--

following provisos:

- we support the removal of the Castle car park. We believe the option of replacing it with an underground car park should be discounted immediately – apart from the expense, the likely difficulties regarding flooding and potential impact on the structural integrity of Clifford’s Tower itself, the key reason is that retaining a car park entrance/exit on the Castle site will totally undermine the objective to remove the majority of through traffic from this area and enhance the setting of Clifford’s Tower and other historic buildings in the area through creating a high quality pedestrian space. We would also strongly suggest that the plan doesn’t specify that replacement car parking space should necessarily be provided at Castle Mills. Whilst this may turn out to be the case, specific assumptions about the most appropriate replacement parking shouldn’t be made until a detailed review of all the city’s off road parking capacity has been completed.
- The form and design of any building along the western bank of the Foss is crucial. The limitations on what is acceptable should be clearly defined from the outset.
 - Add the following *‘The building should be highly legible and maximise opportunities for full and open (non-paying) public access to the river frontage (required at v) directly from the Castle site, facing both the river and the new civic open space; it should maximise views of the Foss from the Castle site, preserve the current view of Clifford’s Tower from Piccadilly and facilitate an awareness of being between two rivers on the Castle site ; it should be no more than one storey high for a significant part of its length; and it’s footprint should take up less than one third of the area between the Foss and the bottom of the Castle mound’.*
 - Replace ii) with *‘Deliver a contemporary new car park if required to meet evidence based city centre parking needs, for example on the site of existing surface level parking at Castle Mills.’*
 - The principles should include some kind of definition of what is required on the Castle car park site. Add new principle *“Create a new city centre park on the former Castle car park, connecting this area with the Eye of York to provide a flexible civic space that includes green infrastructure, informal open space, more formal space for small and large events, reflects the heritage of the area and better connects the city centre to the Castle Museum”.*
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust generally support the overall concept of improving the area. Protected species e.g. Otters, will need to be considered if the banks of the River Foss become more open to the public. There may also be some possibilities of re-

	<p>naturalising some of the concrete and metal reinforcement of the river banks in some places.</p> <p>General supports include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is widely agreed that the current car park around the base of Cliffords Tower is visually unappealing and may not be the optimum use of space in such a historic area. Support the suggestions that the car park is relocated or put underground.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nether and Upper Poppleton Parish Council/Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee comment on the contradiction between the Plan's aim to reduce car use in the city centre and this policy which includes plans for car park. • York Georgian Society and Conservation Area Advisory Panel - policy needs extensive redrafting: should the plan establish such detailed principles when community consultation is actively underway?; policy content is in conflict with the outcomes and recommendations of Castle Car Park public inquiry, namely its reference to "(i) create a development opportunity for a contemporary new building of exemplary architecture alongside the western bank of the River Foss on the site of the existing Castle Car Park". Such a principle would be contrary to the outcome of the Public Inquiry held in 2002 and should not be included here; the whole of the Castle Gateway development site lies within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area - comment suggests that the recognition of this designation should be acknowledged as the first of the 'purposes(s) of the regeneration' by quoting the definition of the conservation area designation, viz: "<i>to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area</i>". This would comply with the Inspector's recommendation at the end of the Public Inquiry in that " a site with such historic associations and heritage value...the historic environment should have been the over-riding consideraton in the formulation of the scheme." This should be included as a 'purpose of the regeneration'; the contents of the 2006 Castle Piccadilly Planning Brief do not appear to have been taken into account in this policy. Note other detailed text changes. • Cllr Johnny Hayes - Concern about Clifford's Tower Motte. The space at the base of the four steps removed from green space land. Open space land cannot be apportioned, removed or its status altered without following the terms of the 1972 Local Government Act. Section 123 on disposal of land. It should be returned to open space land. <p>Other objections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over-prescriptive wording, pre-emptive of masterplaning, including use of the term 'development opportunity'; • Need for a car park should be established prior to planning its

	<p>replacement. Note potential for underground car park space to flood;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Car Park should be kept as open space. More should be made of the Castle's historic context including excavation of the car park and interpretation of remains. • Development on this site should face the Foss on Piccadilly and the current car park site. The river should be the focus of the area. A footbridge over the Foss should open up the site from Fossgate. Piccadilly should be developed to face the river and allow access to the water, enabling small rowing boats on the river or punting. Piccadilly should be developed to enable linking of the spaces along the Foss. • There should be a winter garden accessible all year with exhibition space, cafes, independent small shops and a medium sized venue - with a focus being cafe culture, family friendly not bars.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canal and River Trust welcomes the principles to enhance the public realm along the Ouse Riverside. Believe the document would be more precise if more guidance was provided on how it would be enhanced (i.e. Access). <p>Other comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the principle of a new building on the banks of the Foss has not specifically been flagged up as a wish through community engagement; • Tree planting on Piccadilly might be a good idea but there is no reason why it would be, in the absence of other consideration of redesign of Piccadilly as open space. • The Castle Gateway area could be an example to the rest of York. A place where pedestrians and cyclists are given priority and small-scale is prevalent. • design of any proposals should be in-keeping with the setting of heritage assets including Clifford's Tower and the Castle Museum. • lack of city centre bike parking puts people off cycling in and limits how / where they cycle in the centre. As such, is disappointed by the council's insistence on the need for the Castle Car Park. High density, covered, cycle parking with 24/7 CCTV would be better and would benefit businesses in the city centre (as opposed to out of town retailers) as more people feel comfortable cycling / leaving their bikes in the city centre.
<p>Boundary change Submitted</p> <p>No alternative boundary suggested.</p>	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
--

Policy SS6: British Sugar/Manor School (ST1)

British Sugar/Manor School (ST1) will deliver approximately 1,200 dwellings at this urban development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and be delivered in accordance with the following key principles:

- i. Create a sustainable balanced community with an appropriate mix of housing informed by the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- ii. Provide new social infrastructure which meets the needs of future residents of ST1 and where viable surrounding communities~~to serve the needs of the new community and surrounding communities~~ including local retail, health, community space, educational facilities and sports provision.
- iii. Provide appropriate education provision subject to detailed viability and deliverability work as part of site masterplanning.
- iv. Be of a high design standard to give a sense of place and distinctive character reflecting the sites historic use and social heritage. The site has views across the flat landscape toward the Minster and northwest, which need to be incorporated through the design to ensure views are achieved across the flat landscape.
- v. Create linked multi-functional green infrastructure including existing landscaped areas to maximise linkages to the wider green infrastructure network. The site contains the 'British Sugar Sidings' Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) bordering the railway line. Significant buffering would be required to ensure the integrity of this nature conservation site. This could be incorporated into the green infrastructure scheme on site.
- vi. Deliver new and improved green infrastructure to meet the needs for formal and informal recreation and leisure use. The site is part of the Acomb/River Ouse green infrastructure corridors and will require substantial natural open space. A tree survey will be required with particular reference to mature trees along Boroughbridge Road frontage.
- vii. Create a framework of public realm/spaces/routes to encourage pedestrian and cycle movements into and through the site.
- viii. Optimise integration, connectivity and access through the provision of new pedestrian, cycle, public transport and vehicular routes to ensure sustainable movement into, out of and through the site.

Supporting Text Changes:


N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change:

Minor amendment to policy proposed to clarify the requirements for local facilities.
--

Allocation: British Sugar ST1		
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	46.3ha	No change
Estimated Yield	1,200	No change
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1 - 16)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Change

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 73 (plus 1 NDM)	Supports: 5	Objections: 59 (plus 1 NDM)	Comments: 15 (plus 1 NDM)
---	-------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC support in principle the identification of the site as part of site ST1 for housing led redevelopment
---------	--

	<p>to deliver approximately 1,200 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several other respondents also support the principle of residential development on ST1. • Additional comments were made around the site having good access to the City without needing a car, support for the site if it is imaginatively designed, with a range of housing including social housing, improved cycle/footbridge would bring benefits, open space could also be provided to help meet existing deficits and provision and protection of the existing nature reserve.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC proposed new wording for the policy. Criterion ii. Delete and surrounding communities - agreed that there is no requirement for local retail or healthcare facilities, Any specific reference to these must relate to the Manor School part of ST1. This should be clarified. Criterion iv. deleted reflecting the site historic use and social heritage. This is unclear and should be deleted. The existing landscape will be reprofiled as a result of the remediation work and whilst every effort has been made to ensure views towards the city centre are maintained where appropriate this as to be done inline with the engineering works. This should be made clearer in the policy. Criterion v. delete including existing landscaped areas. The existing landscape will be reprofiled as a result of the remediation works. This should be recognised accordingly. Para 3.37 delete the wording 'This may include phasing development around the site to correspond to the lifecycle of the species'. A buffer has been put in to ensure protection of the SINC. The suggested wording regarding life cycle of bees and wasps should be deleted. • Highways England suggest, adding the following to the list of key principles: 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.' • Rachael Maskell MP questioned the availability of the British Sugar site as there are issues with land contamination which may not be addressed within the time span of the Local Plan. • There were many objections including one from Friends of Acomb Park to the site being extended which now includes the old Manor School playing fields, it was felt that open space deficit in Acomb will be made worse through this loss and the loss is not justified through evidence base. • Many respondents commented that the area has a number of mature chestnut trees lining the road which should be preserved as they are rare for the York area and provide a habitat for wildlife. A tree preservation order should be placed on them immediately to prevent felling. • Other major concerns relate to extra traffic onto already congested A59 and A1237 and the lack of a plan to alleviate congestion. Several people felt that the development should be put on hold till the Outer Ring Road is dualled. There were serious reservations about the new access road planned off Millfield Lane. The new road would cause the

	<p>destruction of a natural border habitat that supports a range of wildlife. Request for improved public transport connections as public transport in the area is currently infrequent and unreliable. Would generally like to see more provisions for cyclists. Major road improvements should take place before housing developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional concerns related to air and noise pollution, impacts on public health, lack of employment for those who will live in the new housing, no mention in the policy for the provision of nurseries, infant or junior schools or additional healthcare facilities.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England state that it is likely that a development of this scale will require capacity enhancement on the A64 west of York, particularly if the cumulative impact of other sites around the A1237 is considered. • Nether Poppleton Parish Council and Upper Poppleton Parish Council indicate that 500 houses should be completed on this site before any consideration is given to the opening of the ST2 Civil Service site. Access to the site should be with a dual carriage split entrance onto Boroughbridge Road. Concerned that access to site could be considered near level crossing on Millfield Lane. Should consult with Parish Council re bollard on Millfield Lane. Consideration should be given to an exit using a bridge across the Harrogate railway and linking to A19 or A1237 by new roads. Parking on double yellow lines needs to be addressed. Large trees and hedgerows on the site should be preserved. Provision should be made for adequate replacement of playing fields at the former Manor School and Former British Sugar Site cricket pitch. Concern about the noise from the railway for the new residents of this site. Local businesses which currently enjoy the ambience of a rural setting should be considered. Provision should be made for the elderly as well as starter homes for young people. Bungalows and the potential for sheltered housing is not mentioned in the policy. Garages should be big enough to fit modern cars and there should be off-street parking for 2-3 cars per house. • York Green Party suggests that the site should be subject to the same standards as the nearby York Central in terms of requirement for affordable housing, sustainable building and traffic minimisation. Much of this seems to be missing from the current site principles. Amenity and recreational open space in the area for existing and new residents should also be protected. The potential for a tram/train/light rail link through this site to the railway station shouldn't be a long term possibility but an immediate strategic transport priority. • Network Rail highlight that Millfield Lane [Level] Crossing continues to be a high risk crossing which is likely to see the number of trains increased in the short to medium term. Transport Assessments should assess likely vehicular and pedestrian movements over the crossing where the number of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements require improvements to the level crossing. • Amec Foster wheeler on behalf of National Grid highlight the proposed residential site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the

	<p>ground, and built structures must not be infringed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other comments highlight the need for houses to be affordable at £100K mark and infrastructure such as roads, schools, shops and parking need to be considered. The SINC should be protected. The mental and physical benefits of trees and green spaces are important.
<p>Boundary change Submitted</p> <p>No alternative boundary suggested</p>	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)		
--	--	--

Policy SS7: Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2)		
--	--	--

Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2) will deliver approximately 266 dwellings at this urban development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Create a sustainable balanced community with an appropriate mix of housing informed by the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- ii. Be of a high design standard to give a sense of place and distinctive character.
- iii. Provide appropriate off-site contributions for nursery, primary and secondary education provision.
- iv. Create a framework of public realm/spaces/routes to encourage pedestrian and cycle movements into and through the site.
- v. Deliver new and improved green infrastructure to meet the needs for formal and informal recreation and leisure use.
- vi. Provide new open space on site. The development will be required to include open space for recreational purposes which may help to alleviate demand in this location, particularly from the need arising from new development. Further detailed assessment would be required.
- vii. Optimise integration, connectivity and access through the provision of new pedestrian, cycle, public transport and vehicular routes to ensure sustainable movement into, out of and through the site. The site would need to provide new cycle facilities along Poppleton Road and through to Millfield Lane or improve links to existing pedestrian and cycle networks.
- viii. Set development back from the A59 frontage and retain mature trees and landscape feature (with appropriate setting) to provide a perception of openness and preserve separation between York and Poppleton.

Supporting Text Changes:		
---------------------------------	--	--

N/A		
-----	--	--

Summary of Reasons for Change:		
---------------------------------------	--	--


No change		
-----------	--	--

Allocation: Former Civil Service Sports Ground and adjoining Land ST2		
--	--	--

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	10.40ha	No change

Estimated Yield	266	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Change

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 26 (plus 1 NDM)	Supports: 3	Objections: 20 (plus 1 NDM)	Comments: 6 (plus 1 NDM)
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Prospects Ltd on behalf of Miller Homes highlights that an extensive evidence base has been prepared over a number of years which supports the delivery of the site and indicates that there 		

	<p>there are no environmental impediments to the site's delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England welcome the criterion that development should be set back from the A59 frontage and retain the mature trees in order to preserve the perception of openness. It is also highlighted that protecting land to the southern part of the site from development; would help preserve the historic character and setting of the City. • Support for the site as it is accessible to city without needing a car.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Poppleton Parish Council, Nether Poppleton Parish Council and the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee highlight several key issues including that the Examiner for the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan indicated that this land was in the general extent of the Green Belt and therefore could not be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan and the site should be assessed through the Local Plan process. It is a large Greenfield site and is grade 2 agricultural land. The presence of Grade 2 agricultural land is missing from the policy explanation. The former playing fields should be recommissioned. It is thought to be ironic that the Local Plan promotes healthy living but does not reinstate the playing pitches that were in place for 40 years on this site. Expansion of leisure and sporting facilities for Manor Academy should be considered for this site. This land is the last significant break in the landscape between the urban area of York and the villages of Upper and Nether Poppleton. The site acts as part of a green corridor and should only be used as a last resort for housing. Millfield Lane should not be used as access to the site. Vehicles would have to cross the level crossing. Increased traffic past the school will increase problems for local bus service. The increase on an already arterial road of potentially 3500 cars is not welcomed by residents. It is suggested that commenting on the availability of the Park and Ride as an alternative to car usage is not accurate as the services do not run after 7pm. Manor Academy is already at capacity. The Local Plan does not provide for new primary school on British Sugar site or this site. There will be a big increase in traffic to travel to nearest primary school 2 miles away. Air quality will be an issue due to standing traffic which will increase if this site is developed. • York Green Party are very concerned by the cumulative impact on congestion this development will have in conjunction with the British Sugar site (ST1). • A significant factor for those objecting to development of this site is congestion, due to the site's close proximity to the already highly congested northwest portion of the northern ring road. It was highlighted that the road infrastructure should be improved before houses are developed. Other common concerns raised in objecting to the site's development include; loss of Green Belt with a suggestion that this site plays an important Green Belt function; insufficient services and amenities to support new development (lack of education provision/nursery space/healthcare); loss of sports facilities and open space, the site should be retained to provide recreational/sports facilities for which there is a shortfall in

	<p>this area; health issues will arise from increased pollution from standing traffic; concern over the cumulative effect of this site and the British Sugar Site (ST1), each site should not be looked at in isolation. Valuable agricultural land should be preserved, it is not rough grazing land as suggested. Disagreement with the number of employment opportunities stated as a way of justifying so many houses.</p>
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Prospects Ltd on behalf of Miller Homes indicates that the site should be referred to as "the former" Civil Service Sports Ground and the site also includes adjoining land fronting to Millfield Lane and adjacent Manor School. In response to a number of points set out in Policy SS7 and the explanation section of the site's assessment at paragraphs 3.38, 3.39 and 3.40 Planning Prospects Ltd on behalf of Miller Homes would like to highlight that: 1) the site should be referred to as the former Civil Service Sports Ground and Adjoining Land. 2) Mention is made of the need to cater for additional school capacity as a result of the development and this can be judged relative to capacity within existing schools at the time of determination of a planning application. 3).Access is possible to both Millfield Lane and Boroughbridge Road however there is a strong desire not to create a through route for motor vehicles. • Upper Poppleton Parish Council, Nether Poppleton Parish Council and the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee highlights the policy only stipulates mixed housing, but it is felt that that policy should also consider the need for affordable housing addressing needs for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. Development of this site will increase the use of the local amenities within Poppleton and the City. It is considered that a buffer zone should be established between the site and Manor Academy as set out in the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan. There are significant trees, hedgerows and shrubs within and surrounding the site. The external hedge boundary acts as a buffer and should be retained. • Network Rail highlight that Millfield Lane [Level] Crossing continues to be a high risk crossing which is likely to see the number of trains increased in the short to medium term. Transport Assessments should assess likely vehicular and pedestrian movements over the crossing where the number of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements require improvements to the level crossing. • Public transport seems ineffective at reducing congestion near ST2, could a parallel route along the railway or reconfiguration of the Harrogate-York line being used for metro type tram system instead of heavy rolling stock? • Other comments highlight the need for houses to be affordable at £100K mark and infrastructure such as roads, schools, shops and parking need to be considered.
Boundary change Submitted	
No alternative boundary is suggested	

Potential Change to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS8: Land Adjacent to Hull Road (ST4)

Land adjacent to Hull Road (ST4) will deliver approximately 211 dwellings at this urban extension development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and be delivered in accordance with the following key principles:

- i. Maximise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to local facilities. The site is adjacent to the Grimston Bar Park & Ride which provides a high frequency bus service to the city centre and is close to other frequent bus routes. It is important that sufficient good quality pedestrian and cycle path connections are made between the site and these facilities and that the Field Lane roundabout barrier to cycling and walking is addressed.
- ii. Provide access to the site from a new roundabout created for the Heslington East development via Field Lane, subject to detailed transport analysis. Other access (e.g. via Hull Road) is not preferred.
- iii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- iv. Ensure important views including to York Minster are protected and that the site is designed appropriately in relation to the gradient of the site which forms part of Kimberlow Hill (York Moraine) and provides important views of York.
- v. Maintain and enhance existing trees and hedgerows behind the site which act as a gateway for biodiversity.
- vi. Provide appropriate contributions to expand existing education facilities, given that primary and secondary school facilities have limited existing capacity to accommodate the projected demand arising from the site.
- vii. Undertake an air quality assessment as there is potential for increased traffic flows which may present new opportunities for exposure if not designed carefully. The assessment should also consider the impact of the University of York boiler stacks.
- viii. Undertake a noise survey given the site's proximity to the A1079 and the Grimston Bar Park & Ride.
- ix. Explore any land contamination issues due to the site's location within 250m of a closed land fill site. Investigation and remediation work (if necessary) will be required to ensure that the land is safe and suitable for its proposed use.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change:

No change

Allocation: Land Adjacent to Hull Road ST4

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	7.54	No change
Estimated Yield	211	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Change

Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 18	Supports: 4	Objections: 10	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England support the principle of development in this location, although preference given to use of the site as an allocation to meet the future needs of the University of York, thereby enabling a reduction in ST27 to a scale less likely to harm the special character and setting of the city. • Historic England also welcomes the inclusion of the development principle relating to the need to protect important views and that the site is designed appropriately in relation to its gradient. • Comments from members of the public recognise that this development will supply much needed housing in this area and consider it ideally placed for public transport and local amenities. • Persimmon supports the allocation of this residential development. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England state that a criterion identical to xii) in Policy SS4 is added (transport issues). <p>Fulford Parish Council thinks the site should be deleted and kept permanently open for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area of the city is being urbanised. • The presence of the University is being used to justify further development of open land in this area including ST4 and ST27, ignoring that these locations were shown as protected buffer areas by the Heslington East Masterplan. • Site forms part of Kimberlow Hill (York Moraine) which is a very important landscape feature and is of significance in the history of York. • Persimmon (landowner) considers that the site has capacity for 240 dwellings rather than 211. • York Ramblers highlighted that this site crosses an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Escrick. As such would appreciate maintaining a green way over Kimberlow Hill, rather than a path along the edge of a carriage way. <p>Several individuals made comments relating to the green space/landscape/wildlife in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not suitable for 211 houses as the fields form part of the landscape setting that was required for the new campus planning agreement in order to protect the character and setting of the city and surrounding area. • If homes are built half way up Kimberlow Hill the residents' cats will play havoc with wildlife/ground nesting birds. • More green space should be made available. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member of public states that Field Lane is already busy and gets congested at peak times and would be better to have access to the settlement via the P&R.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Grid identifies that this site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. It is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. • The Northern Power grid recognises that there may be potential need for HV infrastructure reinforcement for connections to this site to accommodate the additional load. <p>A ward councillor highlights that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development of the ST4 site should aim to maintain a strong green corridor (buffer zone) between development and existing housing to mitigate against visual and noise impact and to ensure that main arterial route maintains a green wedge. • ST4 site has a triangular wedge, bordered by Field Lane to the west and Hull Road to the north - this could be designated as a required green space. • Field Lane traffic will need re-assessment as anecdotal evidence says that car speed and volume along this route is rapidly increasing.
<p>Boundary change Submitted</p>	
<p>No Alternative Boundary Suggested. Only alternative development quantum of 240 homes</p>	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS9: East of Metcalfe Lane (ST7)

Land East of Metcalfe Lane (ST7) will deliver approximately ~~845~~975 dwellings at this garden village development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Create a new 'garden' village that reflects the existing urban form of York of the main York urban area as a compact city surrounded by villages.
- ii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy.
- iii. Create a new local centre providing an appropriate range of shops, services and facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development.
- iv. Deliver education and community provision early in the scheme's phasing, in order to allow the establishment of a new sustainable community. A new primary facility and secondary provision (potentially in combination with Site ST8 – North of Monks Cross) may be required to serve the development as there is limited capacity available in existing schools. Further detailed assessments and associated viability work will be required.
- v. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with sites ST8, ST9, ST14 and ST15 should be addressed.
- vi. Provide vehicular access from Stockton Lane to the north of the site and/or Murton Way to the south of the site (as shown on the proposals map), with a small proportion of public transport traffic potentially served off Bad Bargain lane. Access between Stockton Lane and Murton Way will be limited to public transport and walking/ cycling links only.
- vii. Deliver high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services through the whole site, to provide attractive links to York City Centre. It is envisaged such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport. Public transport links through the adjacent urban area will be sought, as well as public transport upgrades to either the Derwent Valley Light Rail Sustrans route, or bus priority measures on Hull Rd and/or Stockton lane, subject to feasibility and viability.
- viii. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods, to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling).
- ix. Create new open space (as shown on the proposals map) to protect the setting of the Millennium Way that runs through the site. Millennium Way is a historic footpath which follows Bad Bargain Lane and is a footpath linking York's strays and should be kept open. A 50m green buffer has been included along the route

of the Millennium Way that runs through the site to provide protection to this Public Right of Way and a suitable setting for the new development.

x. Minimise impacts of access from Murton Way to the south on ‘Osbalwick Meadows’ Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and provide compensatory provision for any loss.

xi. Preserve existing views to, and the setting of, York Minster, Millennium Way and Osbalwick Conservation Area

Supporting text changes

N/A


Summary of Reasons for Change

Minor change to policy wording to reference working with Highways England in relation to transport issues.
Change to number of dwellings to reflect boundary change.


Allocation: Land East of Metcalf Lane ST7

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	34.5ha	44ha
Estimated Yield	845	975
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1-16)	No change

Potential Allocation Boundary



Pre-publication boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

Boundary change to southern western edge to reflect assessment of technical submission.

Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 34	Supports: 8	Objections: 19	Comments: 15
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB Planning on behalf of TW Fields support the development of a garden village in this location. Technical evidence undertaken for a new village in this location does not present any constraints that would preclude development. The site is available, suitable and deliverable although amended boundaries are proposed. Evidence base referred to includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site. • Several developers support the principle of a garden village in this location, although they support alternative boundary with amendments to policy. In addition it was felt that it appears more thought has gone into the planning of landscaping and blending into the surroundings with minimal disruption to existing properties nearby, it now looks like a natural extension the area. This is to be welcomed however the addition of a road linking the site onto Stockton Lane, even if only for use by public transport, would ease traffic flow in and out of the proposed routes and help residents to access the A64, A1237 and park and ride sites more easily. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB Planning on behalf of TW Fields gives an ST7 alternative. A larger site boundary is proposed to deliver 975 homes (as per Officer recommendation in July 2017). This site would be a sub-urban garden village of 43.54 ha (70% developable area - 30.47ha net). Site density would be 32 dph. Development to commence 2019/20 following planning permission. Build out rate of least 90 dwellings per annum with the potential to develop 120 dwellings per annum (3 outlets). 0.43 ha of land would be provided for a local centre and 10.31 ha provided for public open space. Land for a primary school (0.59ha) and playing field (1.32ha) would be provided (1.91 ha total). The site would be by landscape-led masterplanning, including protection for Millennium Way and views of Minster. Three access points are proposed: north, south and Bad Bargain Lane. Evidence base undertaken for the site states that there are no constraints that would preclude development. Evidence base referred to includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site. • PB Planning on behalf of TW Fields gives a second ST7 alternative. A larger site boundary is proposed to deliver 1225 homes. This site would be a sub-urban garden village of 57.27 ha 		

	<p>(70% developable area - 40.1 ha net). Site density would be 32 dph. Development to commence 2019/20 following planning permission. Build out rate of least 90 dwellings per annum with the potential to develop 120 dwellings per annum (3 outlets). 0.43 ha of land would be provided for a local centre and 14.83 ha provided for public openspace. Land for a primary school (0.59ha) and playing field (1.32ha) would be provided (1.91 ha total). The site would be by landscape-led masterplanning, including protection for Millennium Way and views of Minster. Three access points are proposed: north, south and Bad Bargain Lane. Evidence base undertaken for the site states that there are no constraints that would preclude development. Evidence base referred to includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England suggests that the first sentence in key principle (v) needs to be modified to 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...' • Historic England state the allocation will harm a number of key elements identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as being of importance to the special character and setting of the City: would reduce the gap between the A64 and the edge of the built up area to just 575 m at its narrowest point, impacting on key views and a large encroachment into open countryside; a new settlement so close to the existing urban edge would appear out of keeping with York's historic pattern of development, harming this element of its character. Development should be pulled away from the ring road - the most appropriate approach may be for some limited development on the eastern edge of the City, of a scale which does not harm the scale or compact nature of the City. • Other respondents including Turley representing Gallagher Estates also suggests that development at ST7 will result in encroachment into the rural landscape at the edge of York. It will have some impact on the rural setting of the town and on key views from the A64 towards the historic core. • Additional objections include changes to the boundary and how this will affect access. A general concern over inadequate access to the site, negative effect on the SSSI if a new road is constructed on Murton Way. The green wedge should not be reduced to green corridors and small spaces. Concern over the loss of Green Belt and habitats for wildlife, lack of infrastructure and pressure on existing infrastructure, lack of medical facilities, lack of schools and concern over the roads getting busier, no provision is suggested for people accessing by foot, cycle or horseback. • Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Trustees Object to criterion iii) of Policy GI6 and further land beyond the boundaries of strategic site. It is suggested that there is no
--	---


	<p>justification for this. Request does not sit well when land is being retained as green belt. Further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey seeks alterations to reflect the wider role the school will perform. Early engagement is sought to address the primary and secondary requirements; there may be viability issues associated with the developer building the school. There is also no location shown on the proposals map for a secondary school. There maybe viability issues associated with the developer building the school at their own cost. The current ST7 boundary creates a remote development served off highly costly access roads. It is divorced from the existing settlement making it more expensive to develop, restricts the viability of on-site facilities and makes walking and cycling trips less likely given the routes back into the existing community areas. The target of 846 dpa is significantly below what is sustainably achievable in the northern and southern sectors of land. Currently the scale of development makes facilities difficult to achieve. If numbers were increased, it would increase attractiveness and deliverability of facilities and infrastructure. Do not support the new green wedge to west as it serves no purpose and does not perform green belt functions. This area need to be designated to ensure that in the quality of the land and its use are maintained in the long-term. Object to the footpath requiring 50m wide buffer. It is considered that the masterplan can achieve green corridors through alternative sound advice. Alternative ST7 boundary supported. An extension to the north towards Stockton Lane is supported. The alternative site size is 46.3 ha with direct access onto Stockton Lane. Circa 750 dwellings could be supported. Considered suitable, deliverable and viable. A Masterplanning document to support Land off Stockton Lane is attached setting out access principles, sustainability and integration, opportunities and constraints, green belt analysis and masterplan. • Persimmon Homes Ltd propose an alternative boundary. It is proposed that the boundaries of ST7 should revert to the development boundaries put forward by the Council in its Publication Draft Proposals Plan Consultation Draft October 2014 Local Plan for the northern part of ST7. The proposed western boundary would sit 70-250m from the existing urban edge. Concern that this buffer area would become ill-managed and overgrown. There should only be a gap if there is a technical reason. Northern boundary is 170m south of Stockton Lane, divorcing a development from its main road access introduces a number of problems. It would be more efficient to use the land fronting Stockton Lane, the allocation should be extended northwards. Eastern boundary - the 2014 Publication Draft boundary should be used. The old Foss Beck is a strong boundary. The 2017 Reg 18 boundary is 34.5ha and allow for an estimated 845 dwellings in the short -medium term. The proposed new boundaries would increase the site size to 43.8ha and 1,052
--	---

	<p> dwellings in the short - medium term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes indicate that the Council's decision to decline to accept the higher housing figure [of 953 dpa], and progress with a OAN of 867 dwellings per annum has an adverse impact their Clients' land interests, as three sites were to be either increased in capacity (ST7 – Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick and ST14 – North of Clifton Moor), or in the case of site reference SF10 (Riverside Gardens, Elvington), introduced as a new housing allocation, on the basis that the OAN was to be increased to 953 dwellings per annum have not been carried forward into the Pre-Publication version of the Plan.
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England notes that the second sentence in key principle (v) states that the cumulative impact of sites should be addressed. However, it does not indicate how this should be done. A development of this scale may require capacity enhancement on the highway network, particularly if the cumulative impact with other sites in the area is considered. Para. 3.45 provides the necessary reference to a transport assessment which should address the impact of the development on the Hopgrove roundabout and Grimston Bar junctions on the A64. • Murton Parish Council is concerned about the impact on Murton in terms of the relationship between the City and Murton Village. The gap of 750m is not a 'reasonable gap'; this should be significantly increased. Concern for the Parish Council that the proposed development will mean an increase of traffic through Murton. The existing public transport serving the area is inadequate. • York Green Party indicates there is no mention of the importance of flood mitigation measures in the site principles and an additional principle to this effect should be added. • York Environment Forum suggests that this isolated site is too small to provide a sustainable settlement 'garden village'. Recommends size of development is increased so it can become a stand-alone community or be designated an "urban extension site" as separation from existing built up area is minimal. • National Grid highlight the proposed residential site is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain its existing overhead lines in-situ. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. • Additional comments include: major investment to local road network must be carried out before any building work is started. All local utilities will need to be increased to accommodate the development. Should take into account requirements for new schools in location, size, characteristics, and land for expansion. • Issue raised by Johnson Mowat representing Taylor Wimpy over the financial implications, CIL and Viability on a site specific basis.

Boundary Changes Submitted


Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey

Alternative ST7 boundary submitted featuring an extension to the north towards Stockton Lane. The alternative site size is 46.3 ha with direct access onto Stockton Lane. Circa 750 dwellings could be supported. Considered suitable, deliverable and viable. A Masterplanning document to support Land off Stockton Lane is attached setting out access principles, sustainability and integration, opportunities and constraints, green belt analysis and masterplan.




PB Planning obo TW Fields

ST7 alternative (1). A larger site boundary is proposed to deliver 975 homes (re-submission). This site would be a sub-urban garden village of 43.54 ha (70% developable area - 30.47 ha net). Site density would be 32 dph. Development to commence 2019/20 following planning permission. Build out rate of least 90 dwellings per annum with the potential to develop 120 dwellings per annum (3 outlets). 0.43 ha of land would be provided for a local centre and 10.31 ha provided for public openspace. Land for a primary school (0.59ha) and playing field (1.32ha) would be provided (1.91 ha total). The site would be by landscape-led masterplanning, including protection for Millenium Way and views of Minster. Three access points are proposed: north, south and Bad Bargain Lane. Evidence base undertaken for the site states that there are no constraints that would preclude development. Evidence base referred to (not attached) includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site.




PB Planning obo TW Fields

ST7 alternative (2). A larger site boundary is proposed to deliver 1225 homes. This site would be a sub-urban garden village of 57.27 ha (70% developable area - 40.1 ha net). Site density would be 32 dph. Development to commence 2019/20 following planning permission. Build out rate of least 90 dwellings per annum with the potential to develop 120 dwellings per annum (3 outlets). 0.43 ha of land would be provided for a local centre and 14.83 ha provided for public openspace. Land for a primary school (0.59ha) and playing field (1.32ha) would be provided (1.91 ha total). The site would be by landscaped masterplanning, including protection for Millenium Way and views of Minster. Three access points are proposed: north, south and Bad Bargain Lane. Evidence base undertaken for the site states that there are no constraints that would preclude development. Evidence base referred to (not attached) includes landscape assessment, archaeological and built heritage statement, Transport assessment, ecology assessment, flood risk and drainage. Ecology assessment identified that there are a number ecological constraints but none that would preclude the development of the site.



Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd

It is proposed that the boundaries of ST7 should revert to the development boundaries put forward by the Council in its Publication Draft Proposals Plan Consultation Draft October 2014 Local Plan for the northern part of ST7. The proposed western boundary would sit 70-250m from the existing urban edge. Concern that this buffer area would become ill-managed and overgrown. There should only be a gap if there is a technical reason. Northern boundary is 170m south of Stockton Lane, divorcing a development from its main road access introduces a number of problems. It would be more efficient to use the land fronting Stockton Lane, the allocation should be extended northwards. Eastern boundary - the 2014 Publication Draft boundary should be used. The old Foss Beck is a strong boundary. The 2017 Reg 18 boundary is 34.5ha and allow for an estimated 845 dwellings in the short -medium term. The proposed new boundaries would increase the site size to 43.8ha and 1,052 dwellings in the short - medium term.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS10: Land North of Monks Cross (ST8)

Land North of Monks Cross (ST8) will deliver approximately 968 dwellings at this urban extension development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- ii. Create strategic landscape buffering along the existing road network that borders the site. This will retain key views towards the Minster as well as to the north that should be preserved.
- iii. Include an appropriate landscape treatment adjacent to the link road, with landscaping where appropriate, to protect the setting and character of York.
- iv. Explore the creation of a new green wedge to the west of the site to play an important role in protecting ecological assets, safeguarding the historic character and setting of the city and conserving on-site heritage assets including Ridge and Furrow, archaeology, hedgerows and trees that contribute to the setting of Huntington. It should be linked into the adjacent new housing scheme currently under construction at Windy Ridge/Brecks Lane. The provision of the new green wedge to the west of the site will also create an appropriate setting for the existing village of Huntington, allowing Huntington to maintain its identity and not sprawl outwards, with ST8 forming a new contained neighbourhood within the main urban area.
- v. Increase biodiversity and connectivity with the natural environment. The site intersects with local green infrastructure corridors and contains some trees with protection orders. There are opportunities for this site to interconnect with existing green infrastructure corridors and to integrate a scheme throughout the site which should be exploited.
- vi. Create new open space on additional land to the east of the Monks Cross Link Road (as shown on the proposals map). This land remains in the Green Belt. Open space provision should still be provided to the required quantum within the main allocation boundary and traffic calming measures should be provided along Monks Cross Link Road alongside the provision of pedestrian footways and safe crossing points. Ecological mitigation is also required on land to the east of the Link Road.
- vii. Provide new social infrastructure which meets the needs of future residents of ST1 and where viable surrounding communities including local retail, health, community space, educational facilities and sports provision.
~~Maximise the sites function as a sustainable new development by incorporating an appropriate range of community facilities.~~
- viii. Deliver a new primary school in an accessible location (to be assessed further

based on generated need) as well as providing appropriate contributions for nursery and secondary education.

ix. Provide new site access from Monks Cross Link Road with no new direct access to the A1237.

x. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The site will exacerbate congestion in the area, particularly at peak times given its scale and the capacity of the existing road network. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with sites ST7, ST9, ST14 and ST35 should be addressed.

xi. Deliver high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services through the whole site including facilitation of links to local employment centres and York City Centre. It is envisaged such measures will enable 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport.


xii. Provide enhanced safe and integrated pedestrian and cycle routes to the existing available facilities at Monks Cross to maximise the sites sustainable location. The site is bordered by existing road infrastructure to enable access onto the site but further strategic connections for pedestrian and cycle routes would be required.

xiii. Maximise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding areas creating well-connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods.

Allocation: Land North of Monks Cross ST8

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	39.5	No Change
Estimated Yield	968	No Change
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1-16)	No Change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change to Boundary

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 38	Supports: 5	Objections: 21	Comments: 15
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation supported in principle by landowners/ developers (Redrow/Barratt/David Wilson) confirming a willing landowner. • Developers support the potential use of land to the east of Monks Cross Link Road to deliver additional open space and ecological mitigation to ensure that the Council's identified dwelling quantum can be delivered in full, whilst also providing a number of additional benefits to the area. • General comments were received which support large 		


	development within the ring road and this site in principle.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England suggests that the first sentence in key principle (x) needs to be modified to 'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...' • Highways England also states that the explanatory paragraphs contain no reference to the Transport Assessment needed to support this key principle. • Historic England consider that the allocation seems likely to harm a number of key elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City (see full representation for details) <p>Members of the public state the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local infrastructure cannot support development of this size (roads, drainage, schools, doctors etc); • Development will worsen congestion on the A1237- tampering with the nearby roundabouts on the outer ring road will not improve things. • Site is not suitable for development as there is already congestion problems nearby creating air pollution and health problems; • Site is green belt; • Object to site as doesn't adjoin Huntingdon so is not an urban extension. More logical to provide extension rather than island of development. • The boundary should be amended to make efficient use of the land currently identified in the gap. • Do not accept conclusion of SA that this site is most appropriate option; consider alternative boundary incorporating land to the north and west more sustainable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gallagher Estates state that the development would be highly visible from a number of the approaches to York from the surrounding area and the proposed green wedge would result in a poor relationship between the new housing and existing settlement edge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowners Redrow and Linden Homes suggest a boundary change to include land to north of North Lane. Expanded site should deliver an additional 400 homes which could: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - assist in the provision of a primary school, - provide for a more open 'green' design, - assist in delivering community facilities, - assist in providing c100 more affordable homes. • In addition, the landowners object to Policy SS10 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - defined housing mix has no regard to 'local demand' - will

	<p>commission a site specific housing market assessment as advised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - green wedge to west of site - fulfils no green belt purpose and would be difficult to manage/farm. If retained, should be designated 'green wedge' rather than green belt, which would allow wider range of uses; - text should more clearly define need to protect existing features of ecological value and enhance biodiversity within specific areas of the site; - open space provision should be partially accommodated in the western green wedge; - reference should be made to adjacent employment/retail - further retail provision on site should not be prescribed by policy; - text should clarify that the primary school would be the focus for wider community use, rather than a separate facility; - viability issues re provision of school - to be discussed; - cumulative traffic impacts - Council needs to be clearer on what is expected of this and other named developments, by way of highway improvements, timings and costs; re cycle links - this to be achieved via Monks Cross Link Road.
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Huntington PC state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of social housing at this site needs to be increased and type of housing needs to be stipulated; • If the Local Plan could designate a particular site in the green belt as a development for social housing, it would lower the value of the land enough for a housing association or the council to purchase it for the sole use of social housing; • The road infrastructure for this development will need to be upgraded to cope with traffic exiting onto Monks Cross Link Road. • Drainage and surface water will require special attention as most of Huntington has clay soil. • A medical facility or an Elderly Care Facility rather than a community centre would be preferable, for any section 106/CIL contribution, as Huntington has a high proportion of elderly residents. • Northern Power Grid identifies potential need for HV infrastructure reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load. <p>Members of the public state the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear why the Council has not amended the boundary to take into consideration comments made by Historic England despite land being available with willing landowners. • The site could be useful for employment at Monks Cross. • Site is regarded as an urban extension. Green wedge to west could be narrowed and still give adequate separation from Huntington. Questions how open space will be managed. If

	<p>agricultural, will not be accessible to public. The provision of OS8 will not be accessible to residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be increased to include land south of ring road (between Strensall Road and Monks Cross Link Road) to meet housing demand. • Traffic calming measures should not be used on Monks Cross Link Road. This road needs to be maintained as a high capacity part of the transport network and key access point from the Northern A1237 Ring Road into the commercial and leisure site at Monks Cross (including the future Community Stadium). Provision should be retained for the link road to be expanded for dual carriageway standard as a spur from the outer ring road aiding traffic to avoid the frequently congested junction with the A64 at the Hopgrove roundabout (ref policy T4). <p>Redrow own majority of site and highlight the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced scale of the allocation; • Inconsistencies in relation to 'strategic green space' and 'new green wedge' immediately to west of ST8 – the masterplan identifies the primary school and playing fields in the green wedge to the west; • Numerous policies in the Local Plan may have financial implications but information on whether or not they apply and to what extent is not outlined in the Plan. • Unclear on the timing of strategic highway improvements and educational facility upgrades and to what level individual developments are expected to contribute. • Viability Appraisal based upon a standard S106 cost of £3,300 per dwelling but no mention is made as to whether or not education and highways is included or excluded from this sum. • Site ST8 will not be viable with the suggested CIL and to have the site specific; education, community facilities, public transport upgrades and wider strategic higher network upgrades sat outside the CIL as additional items. • Housing mix on the site, do not agree with policy H3 - will commission a site specific housing market assessment. • Points 2 and 3 re strategic landscape buffer could be merged. • Agree with concept of protecting and enhancing biodiversity but policy could focus on protecting existing features and enhancing biodiversity in green wedge. • Support principle of new open space but should be provided in green wedge. • Site near Monks Cross so no lack of retail facilities. Community facilities should be focussed around the school in the green wedge. The size of the development would only generate the need for a single entry primary school - this needs to be stated in text. • Accept that there should be no access from site to A1237. • Policy needs to be clearer about the cumulative traffic impact
--	--


Johnson Mowat obo Redrow and Private landowners

Support the inclusion of ST8 as a strategic urban extension. Site is deliverable with national house builder on board to develop the site. Redrow own majority of site. Concerns with reduced scale of the allocation and wording of certain policies. Inconsistencies in relation to 'strategic green space' and 'new green wedge' immediately to west of ST8. Council confirmed intention for land to be designated as green belt. Do not consider that this land will perform green belt functions so should be identified as 'green wedge' not green belt. Masterplan being discussed with Council includes: open space, new access from Monks Cross Link Road with bus links to site, new primary school, appropriate landscaping, new playing fields and sports pitches. The masterplan identifies the primary school and playing fields in the green wedge to the west.



Johnson Mowat obo Redrow and Linden Homes

Land to the north of North Lane at Monks Cross North(north of ST8) should be reinstated as part of ST8. Was included in the 2014 Publication draft but removed at Preferred Sites stage (2016). Whilst North Lane provides a defensible green belt boundary to the north, it is considered that the A1237 provides a more appropriate boundary. This land is approx 8.55ha which could deliver 250 dwellings north of north lane.



ID Planning obo Green Developments

Support for an alternative site boundary for ST8 that includes land to the north of North Lane, Huntington . Object to proposed site boundary as it does not adjoin Huntington and therefore does not result in a natural extension to the urban area. Unclear why a 'gap' has been left between Huntington and the site allocation; this is unnatural. Support the position put forward by objectors at the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) detailed in the SHLAA annexes that

the boundary should be amended to make efficient use of the land currently identified in the gap. Current boundary at odds with the the plans vision to deliver sustainable pattern of development. Assume that ST8 as allocated would score worse than alternatives in Sustainability Appraisal due to gap to with Huntington. Do not accept conclusion of SA that this site is most appropriate option; consider alternative boundary incorporating land to the north and west more sustainable.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS11 : Land North of Haxby (ST9)

Land North of Haxby (ST9) will deliver 735 dwellings at this urban extension development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles:

- i. Be of a high design standard which will provide an appropriate new extension to the settlement of Haxby.
- ii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy, addressing local need for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing.
- iii. Create new open space to the south of the site (as shown on the proposals map) to reflect the needs of the Haxby and Wigginton ward including formal pitch provisions, informal amenity greenspace, play provision and allotments. The openspace needs of the area should be assessed in detail, liaising with Haxby Town Council and Wigginton Parish Council, the neighbourhood plan group and local residents.
- iv. Create new local facilities as required to provide an appropriate range of shops, services and facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development.
- v. Provide a new primary school or required financial contributions to existing local primary and secondary facilities to enable the expansion to accommodate demand arising from the development.
- vi. Provide a suitable drainage strategy to ensure there is no increase to existing agricultural run-off rates and existing drainage ditches are maintained and enhanced. The strategy should be developed in conjunction with the Council and required statutory bodies and should ensure that the development will not exacerbate any existing issues with surface water and drainage owing to the site being flat with a high water table. The drainage scheme will need to connect to the Strensall and Towthorpe Waste Water Treatment Works to the north of the site given capacity issues with the Haxby Works to the south of Haxby village.
- vii. Connect the site to the public sewer network, which will incur additional costs. Developers will need to work with Yorkshire Water in developing a suitable scheme.
- viii. Provide access from Moor Lane to the west of the site with appropriate improvements to the junction with the Village and secondary access from Usher Lane to the east with associated improvements to the junction with Station Road.
- ix. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site's ST7,

ST8, ST14 and ST15 should be addressed.

x. Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, ~~connecting with the B1363 Wigginton Road~~ with secondary access to Usher Lane to the East of the site. Improvements would be required both to the junction of Moor Lane with The Village and Usher Lane/Station Road to improve safety and visibility. The scheme should seek to minimise the amount of trips using the Usher Lane/Station Road junction due to existing capacity and safety issues. ~~Alternative access should be explored which could include access from the site to the east of Usher Lane to Towthorpe Road.~~

xi. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods., to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling).

xii. Protect and enhance existing valuable landscape features including field patterns, mature hedgerows and trees. Development should minimise the impact on the landscape and setting of the village and reflect the character and rural setting of the surrounding area. Views into the site are limited as the site itself is mainly enclosed and well screened by mature trees and hedgerows which should be retained. New strong defensible landscape boundaries should be created and the historic field patterns should be protected and the layout of the development and the open space should be designed to integrate these narrow medieval strip fields.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A


Summary of Reasons for Change

Changes to the transport criteria has been made to aid clarity.

Allocation: Land to the North of Haxby ST9

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	35ha	No Change
Estimated Yield	735	No Change
Phasing	Lifetime of the plan yrs 1 – 16	No Change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No boundary changes proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 179	Supports: 12	Objections: 163	Comments: 25
----------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division – The developers wholly supports the allocation of ST9, the estimated development capacity of which they confirm can be delivered in the Plan period. They further support the need for a masterplan to guide development on the site. Note suggested alternative policy wording below (comments). • Carter Jonas obo client note that the whole of ST9 plus additional land to the immediate east may alternatively be considered for housing allocation in order to meet the OAN. • The small number of general supports received acknowledge that development would have benefits for current and future Haxby residents, principally in terms of proposed open space,
---------	---

	<p>affordable housing and improved rail accessibility. Those commenting in support note the need to improve infrastructure (schools, healthcare, housing mix incl dementia care, waste and water, cemetery extension) , and to ease congestion both locally and in relation to the ORR.</p>
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant number of objections were received in response to the proposed allocation of ST9 and its associated policy. • Haxby Town Council notes the extent of local objection, and raises a number of concerns including the impact of development on access and congestion, open space (noting that the proposed 'buffer' has reduced) the natural environment, biodiversity, ridge and furrow fields, and a bridleway. They further query the lack of cumulative impact assessment given that further sites local to Haxby have been identified since Preferred Sites consultation. • Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council raises serious concerns about the allocation of this site - it is requested that the site be removed altogether, or substantially reduced in size. Sewage from this site will be treated at Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works, the capacity of which is unlikely to be sufficient to cope with the extra flows from Site ST9, together with sites ST35, E18 and H59. Traffic from ST9 may also use Strensall to avoid congestion in Haxby, exacerbating traffic problems. • Both Cllr Cuthbertson and the Haxby and Wigginton Liberal Democrats, while accepting the need for new housing in York, believe that the number of houses indicated for this phase is too large for the community, retail and business facilities in the centre of Haxby. • Turley representing Gallagher Estates state that development at site ST9 would result in the loss of pleasant agricultural land with a distinctive pattern of well trees hedgerows and a historic small scale/strip field pattern. The existing landscape framework would make a comprehensive development scheme, including playing fields and access, difficult to achieve without resulting in losses of trees and sections of hedgerows. The proposed open space would result in a development which is poorly related to the existing settlement. The development would result in a significant northern expansion of the existing settlement and would impact on the rural approaches along Moor Lane and Usher Lane. This allocation cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. • Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery Committee request an amendment is made to the site boundary to protect the setting of the cemetery extension site. • Pilcher Homes comment on the extent of the site's 'reach' north of Haxby, stating that its boundary should be tightened. • York Environment Forum object to the scale of development proposed, as the town is already overdeveloped and under-

	<p>served.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <p><u>Transport and road safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with northern ring road (A1237/A64) and Haxby/Strensall roundabout would be compounded by further development north of Haxby. A substantial number of comments refer to the need to dual the outer ring road (A1237) prior to any further development taking place. • Concern that existing bus provision is already unsatisfactory and could not provide for additional residents. • Congestion and parking issues generally, and specifically in relation to Usher Lane/Station Road/Moor Lane/York Road and Wigginton Road <p><u>Inappropriate/inadequate access to the site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • point x 'Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B13363 Wigginton Road' needs clarification, as it suggests additional access would be provided directly from the B1363, which is not the case. • A number of comments query the site's potential access, and its impact on Moor Lane <p><u>Green Belt/Greenfield development:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is located in the Green Belt – development of housing is an inappropriate use. • Object to this site and have huge concerns over sustainability and the impact on green belt around Haxby and Wigginton will be disastrous. Brownfield development should be exhausted first. <p><u>Drainage and sewerage:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for flooding caused by development on a green field site. A common concern relates to inadequate drainage and sewerage – • Sewage from this site will be treated at Walbutts Sewage Treatment Works, the capacity of which is unlikely to be sufficient to cope with the extra flows from Site ST9, together with sites ST35, E18 and H59 <p><u>Local facilities and amenities</u></p> <p>Many comments point to the need for development to be self sufficient in amenities/services, including provision of a primary and secondary school. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of parking in the town centre • Lack of school space (noting the demolition of Oaken Grove) and requirements for new facilities. • Healthcare – reference to appointment waiting time of 2 weeks
--	--

- Lack of green/open space
- Library/community space
- Employment – none provided through development of the site and little local employment. Likely that new residents would commute to York and beyond.
- While several comments support the reopening of Haxby Station, there are significant concerns raised regarding the need to consider parking and extra car journeys coming in to Haxby to use it. Some even question the viability of the proposal.

Overdevelopment in Haxby – impact on the character of the place, the loss of ‘village feel’ and community spirit

Impact on environment

- loss of ridge and furrow on the land and possible roman remains
- loss of grade 3a agricultural land – noting the effect of Brexit and need for self –sufficiency.
- impact on air quality - the inevitable increase in slow and stationary traffic will have particularly negative impacts on the health of children and elderly residents with respiratory problems.

A number of objections raise similar issues with consultation fatigue and the Council’s failure to listen to the views of residents voicing significant opposition to the scheme.

- Typical comments - Too many houses in the proposed development, already have problems with access and drainage which have caused prior applications to be rejected, these problems have since got worse. Increase in traffic flow unacceptable, Usher Lane very narrow and unsafe for both drivers and pedestrians because of encroachment onto pavements. Congestion will worsen, negatively impacting air quality. Schools and medical already severely over-subscribed. Drainage already a problem that development will worsen, problems with standing surface water and backing up of sewage. Plan does indicate a small increase in the amount of green space but this is still below government guidelines. Council should prioritise brownfield sites over building on greenbelt, where greenbelt is only option it would be preferable to extend the new garden villages with their own infrastructure and direct access to ring road rather than extending current small villages and damaging their character.
- Haxby and Wigginton is already heavily populated and the existing facilities have developed to meet the needs of the current population - there is no room for them to expand to meet the demand of an additional 735 houses. The infrastructure, esp. road network and drainage are already overloaded. The

	<p>proposed accesses to the east and west are on existing lanes and have limited scope for improvement, road access from the south (along Usher Lane / Station Road and beyond along York Road to the Ring Road) are already heavily overloaded and this development will only make it worse. Access to the north is along narrow country lanes, over a very narrow hump back bridge and through a congested area of Strensall, past Robert Wilkinson Primary School, which is dangerous and is already a rat run. The northern Ring Road is already highly congested at peak times. Parking in Haxby is already inadequate around the shopping centre. Foul and surface water drainage is already inadequate and cannot cope with additional houses. The current land use is good quality agricultural land which should not be lost to housing when other sites are available. The land is also of historical importance, with ridge and furrow and Roman remains evident.</p>
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While Highways England does not object to the principle of development, they raise concerns about omissions from policy wording, namely: that the first sentence in key principle (ix) needs to be modified to <i>'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary...'</i> Although the site is some way from the A64, its size, when considered with other large sites in the area, is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city, so there should be a reference to the need to agree traffic impact and mitigation measures with HE. It is likely that a development of this scale will require capacity enhancement on the highway network, particularly if the cumulative impacts of sites around the A1237 is considered. • Northern Power Grid - EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. • Network Rail has no objections in principle but would like it to be noted either within the text or the wording of the policy that the transport assessment to support the development should consider increases in traffic likely at level crossings in the Haxby area. • Both Nether and Upper Poppleton Parish Councils and the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee note an inconsistency between SS11 and other sites (ST1/ST2) regarding the provision of a new primary school; there is not such requirement on sites ST1 and ST2 which would deliver

some 1500 new homes.

The Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group makes a number of suggested concerns regarding the allocation:

- require provision of essential services to meet the needs of new residents and ease congestion
- existing congestion on A1237 including upgrades to Haxby and Strensall roundabouts.
- Sever traffic congestion in Haxby and Wigginton; using Moor Lane as primary access is likely to impact on existing communities – potential for alternative access?
- potential roman ruins/ridge and furrow on site
- impact of overhead cables
- shortage of affordable housing and need to deliver appropriate housing mix
- lack of employment allocation

Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

- Concerns about the clause vi) in respect to the additional loading of the Strensall with Towthorpe Waste Water Treatment Works and the increase road tanker traffic.
- The clause in x) the highway provision from ST9 to Towthorpe Road but be studied especially if the rail station is located close to Towthorpe Road. The extra road traffic needs to be considered in terms of its impact on Strensall and Towthorpe.

A number of detailed comments regarding the policy's guiding principles were raised by Cllr Cuthbertson and Haxby and Wigginton Liberal Democrats, as follows:

- the design, quality, type, mix and construction of any proposed housing on ST9 must take account of the character of the wards existing housing and its social and demographic mix.
- Affordable and social housing should be included.
- Provision for a variety of ages and social groupings should be considered.
- Green and open space should be provided and existing trees and vegetation maintained where possible.
- Housing density should be similar to existing Haxby housing densities.
- Concern over the retail shopping area in Haxby as it would need to be expanded which is difficult in a conservation area. Prioritise retail over food outlets.
- Disappointing that no employment land has been allocated in Haxby / Wigginton.
- Three local primary schools near capacity, limited secondary provision. New primary school required.
- Health centre near capacity, additional facilities needed from the outset.
- Key problem is surface water drainage and must be considered.

	<p>Improved drainage needed in the buffer zone if it is to be used for open space. Flooding is an issue, pumping stations at capacity. Limited capacity of the sewerage disposal network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals on how to support increasing numbers of elderly residents must be included in the masterplan. • Cemetery expected to reach capacity during development period, space must be allowed for its expansion. • Space for a new library should be considered. • Appropriate social hall or meeting space required. • Dental and optical provision at capacity the provision of new facilities will be necessary. • Concern over air quality where there are heavy traffic movements and will cause respiratory issues. Monitoring of pollution levels should be carried out before a masterplan completed. • ST9 would have major impacts on wildlife, trees and vegetation. • National Grid power lines cross site ST9 health and safety concerns over these for residents, further information about the health and safety aspects of living near power lines should be provided alongside the masterplan for this site. • Parking an issue in Wigginton with no off street parking and Wigginton has no centre due to its linear nature. • Priority must be given to the provision of a detailed sustainable transport plan. • There must be improved access for Haxby and Wigginton to the wider road network. Including upgrading the A1237 roundabouts, a rail halt and improved bus service would also be needed. Current indicative Rail Halt location not viable due to lack of available land. A new site should be sought just outside the and to the north east of the village on Towthorpe Road based on fields between the road and the railway line. A parking area and possible bus terminus could be sites here and a footbridge over the railway line and footpath could be provided to Usher Lane. • Bus routes could be extended and additional routes added. Suggests new spine road through ST9. • Information regarding overloading at peak times on junctions near ST9 provided. Local roads to ST9 already at capacity at peak times. Concern Haxby used as a rat run for ST14, ST35 and H59. A masterplan is needed before development commences. • A clean safe pedestrian route should be provided from ST9 into the centre of Haxby to avoid people using their cars, alternative routes given. Existing Rights of Way through ST9 must be preserved. <p>The prospective developers (DPP Planning representing Linden Homes Strategic Land, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East Division) understandably support the site's proposed allocation, but raise some concern re policy wording. Their suggested amendments are as follows:</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • suggests reference is made for the need for the scheme to reflect up-to-date SHMA rather than to specify smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. Housing need may change across the lifetime of the Plan; • Key principle iii) and the proposals map still shows a single large area of strategic open space to the south of the Site. The Developers maintain their concern that such a specific locational requirement could prejudice the ability to provide for the other planning objectives mentioned in policy SS11 and a properly considered layout. The Developers feel that the open space to be provided on the Site should be determined through the master planning process, which they fully support, and which can determine the optimum location for such spaces. Reword as <i>'...the proposed development of the Site should lead to the creation of new on site open space to reflect the needs of the Haxby and Wigginton ward including formal pitch provisions, informal amenity greenspace, play provision and allotments; the location of which is to be determined through the preparation and submission of a masterplan and in liaison with the Council, Haxby Town Council and Wigginton Parish Council, the neighbourhood plan group and local residents.'</i> • Key principle x) suggests that the Proposed Development should seek to minimise the amount of trips using the Usher Lane/Station Road junction. There is no justification provided by the Council for this and the developer has demonstrated that a primary access and two secondary accesses onto Usher Lane can be accommodated. Request that this reference is removed from the policy. • The Transport Assessment which has been submitted in support of the development of the Site does not explore the alternative access to the seat of the site onto Towthorpe Road suggested in key principle x) and the respondent would like to discuss this in more detail. Requests the removal of last sentence of key principle x). • Noting the above, the developers suggest that key principle viii) be deleted and key principle x) be amended to 'Provide highway access via Moor Lane to the west, connecting with the B1363 Wigginton Road with secondary access to Usher Lane to the East of the site. Improvements would be required both to the junction of Moor Lane with The Village and Usher Lane/Station Road to improve safety and visibility. The scheme should seek to minimise the amount of trips using the Usher Lane/Station Road junction due to existing capacity and safety issues unless it can be demonstrated that these capacity and safety issues can be mitigated or that unacceptable harm to this junction will not be caused as a result of the scheme. • Julian Sturdy MP reiterates his previous concerns at the level of development afforded to Haxby which has taken much of the City's growth in preceding years. The ST9 proposal would be a
--	---

significant development for an area which feeds onto the Outer Ring Road, so he would expect air quality to be considered in terms of numbers and the impact on Haxby and Wigginton residents.


Those commenting on the scheme raise similar concerns to those objecting, albeit that they do not object in principle to the development:

- Support for the station reopening (with financial support from developer contributions) but concern that additional load on the York-Scarborough line would mean significant waiting time when crossing barriers are down;
- Road infrastructure should be improved before development progresses (notably the ring road). Junction at Usher Lane and Station Road is already dangerously busy, must be resolved to accommodate housing increase

Boundary change Submitted

Haxby and Wigginton Cemetery Committee

Request an amendment is made to the site boundary to protect the setting of the cemetery extension site to preserve the tranquil nature of the site and avoid overlooking.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS12: Land West of Wigginton Road

The development of Land West of Wigginton Road (ST14) supports the Local Plan vision in delivering a sustainable garden village situated to the north of the outer ring road. It will deliver approximately 1,348 dwellings, approximately 1200 units of which will be delivered within the plan period. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Create a new 'garden' village that reflects the existing urban form of York of the main York urban area as a compact city surrounded by villages
- ii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy.
- iii. Create a new local centre incorporating appropriate shops, services and community facilities to meet the needs of future residents.
- iv. Deliver on site, accessible combined nursery and primary education facilities, which are well connected to housing by dedicated pedestrian/ cycleways.
- v. Secure developer contributions for secondary school places as necessary to meet the need for new places.
- vi. Ensure provision of new all purpose access roads to the east/south from A1237 Outer Ring Road/Wigginton Road roundabout and off the Wigginton Road/B1363 (as shown on the proposals map). The internal layout of any future development on the site could be such that it creates discrete sectors, each with a specific access.
- vii. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site's ST7, ST8, ST9, ST15 and ST35 should be addressed.
- viii. Deliver local capacity upgrades to the outer ring road in the vicinity of the site, to include associated infrastructure to protect public transport journey times on junction approaches. Opportunities to provide grade separated, dedicated public transport routes across the A1237 should be explored in feasibility, viability and cost-benefit terms.
- ix. Deliver high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services throughout the development site, which provide links to other local rural communities where feasible, as well as to main employment centres. It is envisaged such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport.
- x. To encourage the maximum take-up of more active forms of transport (walking and cycling), ensure the provision of high quality, safe, direct and accessible pedestrian and cycle links which create well-connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods including to:
 - a) the community, retail and employment facilities immediately to the south, (likely to take the form of an overbridge);
 - b) the surrounding green infrastructure network (with particular regard to public rights of way immediately west of the site and improvements to A1237 crossing facilities); and
 - c) existing pedestrian and cycle networks across the city.

- xi. Maintain landscape buffers around the site to prevent coalescence with adjacent settlements and maintain the setting of the city and the village of Skelton.
- xii. Protect and enhance local green assets, trees and hedge-lines and enhance existing landscape character.
- xiii. Provide open space to the west of the site to minimise the visual proximity of the development areas to Skelton.

Supporting Text Changes:



N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change:

Proposed dwelling number to be amended following consideration of site submission and technical evidence through the consultation.

Allocation: Land West of Wigginton Road ST14

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	55.0ha	68 ha
Estimated Yield	1,348 dwellings	1672 dwellings
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan and Post Period (Years 1-21)	No change

Potential Allocation Boundary		Pre-Publication Boundary									
<p>Land West of Wigginton Road Post PSC Officer Proposal</p> 		<p>Site Ref: 848</p> 									
<p>Summary of Reasons for Change</p> <p>Following consideration of site submission and technical evidence through the consultation.</p>											
<p>Consultation Responses</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total no. of respondents: 100</th> <th>Supports: 8</th> <th>Objections: 75</th> <th>Comments: 26</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td colspan="3"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skelton Parish Council welcomes the proposed reduction in the total housing numbers for York, and in particular the reduced size of ST14. • Historic England states that harm to green belt would be less if settlement relocated to edge of city/ existing village. The site's size/location has taken account of the relationship which York has to its surrounding villages - identified within the Heritage Topic Paper as being part of the character of the City. Development does not threaten the identity or rural setting of neighbouring villages, preventing intrusion to the green wedge although there is work to do to deliver the housing in a manner which will minimise harm to the rural setting and the special character of York. Historic England also confirmed that they would object to an increase in the size of settlement as suggested by the site promoter. • General support for the location of a new settlement incorporating local facilities and transport links was received from the site promoter. However, they also promote 3 alternative boundaries for development. • General support for the sites location was received from the </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Total no. of respondents: 100	Supports: 8	Objections: 75	Comments: 26	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skelton Parish Council welcomes the proposed reduction in the total housing numbers for York, and in particular the reduced size of ST14. • Historic England states that harm to green belt would be less if settlement relocated to edge of city/ existing village. The site's size/location has taken account of the relationship which York has to its surrounding villages - identified within the Heritage Topic Paper as being part of the character of the City. Development does not threaten the identity or rural setting of neighbouring villages, preventing intrusion to the green wedge although there is work to do to deliver the housing in a manner which will minimise harm to the rural setting and the special character of York. Historic England also confirmed that they would object to an increase in the size of settlement as suggested by the site promoter. • General support for the location of a new settlement incorporating local facilities and transport links was received from the site promoter. However, they also promote 3 alternative boundaries for development. • General support for the sites location was received from the 		
Total no. of respondents: 100	Supports: 8	Objections: 75	Comments: 26								
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skelton Parish Council welcomes the proposed reduction in the total housing numbers for York, and in particular the reduced size of ST14. • Historic England states that harm to green belt would be less if settlement relocated to edge of city/ existing village. The site's size/location has taken account of the relationship which York has to its surrounding villages - identified within the Heritage Topic Paper as being part of the character of the City. Development does not threaten the identity or rural setting of neighbouring villages, preventing intrusion to the green wedge although there is work to do to deliver the housing in a manner which will minimise harm to the rural setting and the special character of York. Historic England also confirmed that they would object to an increase in the size of settlement as suggested by the site promoter. • General support for the location of a new settlement incorporating local facilities and transport links was received from the site promoter. However, they also promote 3 alternative boundaries for development. • General support for the sites location was received from the 										

	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust in recognition of low biodiversity value of arable land.
Objection	<p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green party consider this a large development and think that reducing numbers on site should be considered. • The site promoter considers that ST14 could accommodate a greater number of dwellings than the Local Plan currently envisages, whilst still preserving the character of the existing nearby communities & offers an exciting opportunity for a 'garden village' development. • Land immediately to the north of this site (and south of Moor Lane) should be safeguarded for development after the current plan period (i.e. Excluded from Green Belt) and designed into the village road / path layout as a sustainable extension to the new village. • Planning agents on behalf of housebuilders identify that ST14 is unsound in that it will not deliver the housing units identified in the Plan period. They consider that the site is isolated from existing settlements and located within the general extent of the green belt. Significant infrastructure will be required to bring the site forward and make it sustainable. <p><u>Landscape and heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skelton Village Trust argues that this site is a significant intrusion into valuable green space separating Skelton and Wigginton. • ST14 is not proportionate to the adjacent village of Skelton. Loss of agricultural land and open countryside. Infrastructure highway, facilities, drainage, water treatment will not support development. • Will have an adverse effect on the rural setting of medieval Skelton. • Skelton Village Action Group strongly object to the use of 55 ha of prime agricultural land in the Green Belt. • The woodland belt contains views from the east, whilst to the north, south and west, views will be possible despite the site being relatively flat. • A preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal Evidence submitted on behalf of a member of the public considered that the site lies in the middle of two important green views from York Minster, and development would have “major adverse” effect. The site would change the ‘established’ historic development pattern of the city and would comprise the first ‘planned’ extension to the City beyond the ring road, rather than the strengthening of the existing character of the city. Furthermore, development on the site would introduce visual detractors with increased amount of lighting which would conflict with landscape character. • The setting of the outlying villages would change as the


	<p>scattered settlement pattern would become less apparent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some responses, including York Green party, considered that the decreased site size to 55ha, wouldn't enable a sustainable standalone sustainable settlement. Sites over 100ha that could provide a minimum of 3,000 dwellings would be large enough to provide all the local services. • Some members of the public raised concerns in relation to the impact on green belt around Haxby and Wigginton which they consider will be disastrous. A long term evaluation for Green Belt of around 30 years needs to be carried out. <p><u>Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England states that a site of this size is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city. • Julian Sturdy MP argues that this site will significantly impact on York's already pressured transport network. • York Green Party argue that if built without additional sustainable transport provision will generate traffic congestion both in the immediate area and on arterial routes into the north of the city centre. • A number of Parish responses together with members of the public identified issues in relation to congestion on the outer ring-road. The majority of responses considered that the 1237 is already gridlocked and pollution is high and consequently there is a need to alleviate traffic problems. • Dualling of the ring road should be considered. • The increase in traffic would also have a bad affect on traders in the area. • The upgrading of infrastructure to support the development on ST14 would change the character of this rural road. • A Transport and Highways prepared on behalf of a member of the public states that ST14 will not achieve sustainable travel. There are existing issues associated with severe delays and congestion. Improvements to the junction and the dualling of the ORR will be required and finding/ third party land to achieve this is uncertain. • Cycling from Haxby to the city centre difficult, suggests a segregated cycle route like the one between Clifton Moor and Haxby Road to encourage more journeys into the city. <p><u>Education and Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many responses questioned the level of educational and local facilities on site and when these would be delivered. Most of the responses also recognised that there would be an increase traffic in and out of the development. • Should provide finance for an additional primary school, and there is not enough parking spaces in Haxby and Wigginton at present.
--	--

	<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Ecology Appraisal Update prepared by a member of the public concludes that the ST14 will cause loss of habitat, disturbance and fragmentation within ecological sensitive areas (namely Nova Scotia Plantation and Clifton Airfield SLI) and potentially affect protected species (badger and great crested newts). <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has not been assessed against reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal, nor is it deliverable or developable when considered in the context of the NPPF. • Consultants Turley Associates representing Gallagher Estates consider that due to the site's relative isolation from the existing highway, new roads would need to be developed crossing tracts of intervening countryside. This allocation cannot be justified as representing the most suitable when considered against a reasonable alternative. • Suggests that new housing should have solar panels and enough garden space. • Objects to nearby fracking. • Other sites in York (identified in the Plan) should be prioritised. • Questions police resources and the ability to provide extra officers to police the area. • Lichfields on behalf of Wakeford Properties do not consider ST14 is deliverable in the context of the NPPF as there is no indication when it will be permitted, it had multiple land ownership, is complex to deliver with phased delivery and the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure. • Support prioritisation of brownfield land, concerned by proposed building on 55ha of green belt for this scheme.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust consider that ST14 has the potential to be expanded as it is within arable farmland which will have low biodiversity. A net gain in biodiversity would be possible with well planned green infrastructure. Sustainable transport links to Clifton Moor across the A1237 would be quicker than car journeys so would encourage more active travel. Links by cycle to a new rail station at Haxby would also be possible and would enable car free commuting to work and schools etc. • Skelton Parish Council consider that the development would increase traffic flow and potential 'rat running' through Skelton to avoid the A1237. Improvements to the Northern Ring Road are vital. • York Georgian Society and Conservation Areas Advisory Panel suggests policy should reference best practice as exemplified at New Earswick, the work of Parker and Unwin reflecting the first Garden Village movement.


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skelton Village Trust recognised that ST14 has extensive tree cover which needs to be conserved. • The creation of a local centre needs joined-up thinking which includes transport and the city centre. The traffic aims need consideration within the process of urban design. • Will cause more congestion, road improvement needs to happen before more houses are built and ring road is dualled. • Should be possible to walk/ cycle if able. • There is no dedicated bus service to this site. • Haxby and Wigginton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consider that it would be more cost efficient for development at ST14 rather than ST9. Would provide the opportunity for community design. They also consider that there is a need for a traffic plan for Wigginton Road/A1237 and new services (GPs, dentists, schools, library, cemetery, church/mosque, green space, shops, parking), employment land (incl parking), transport links). • No access by Moorlands Road/ Moor land as the road is too narrow and should not be widened. • Northern Power Grid confirm that there is a potential need for network reinforcement for connections to site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required. May impact on development timescales advised so developers should submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid. • CPRE - North Yorkshire seek clarification how sustainable communities will be supported at this location as it is remote from existing infrastructure. New units would work better attached to another proposed new garden village or as an extension to existing settlement. • YEF considered that If development was increased in size to 5000 units and external transport issues addressed, a case could be made for development to take pressure off ST15 and ST9. • More houses and a secondary school needed at site. • The site promoter considers that this Garden village site is suitable with no technical constraints. However, whilst support principle of development three alternative boundaries are submitted which support proposed access points with no access to Moor Lane (to the north). Likely to have 2 outlets commencing from start of development to 4 outlets delivering 120-150 homes per annum.
--	--

Boundary change Submitted


1) Paul Butler Planning OBO Barratt Homes, David Wilson Homes and TW Fields
 The developer objects to the allocated boundary and housing number. Alternative boundary is re-submitted suggesting 1350 homes. Boundary includes additional land to the north with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 42.3 ha net site area at 32 dph. Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York. Consider that 1350 would be delivered within the plan period. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.46km. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 2 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 16.52ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial area of green space on western boundary. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.



2) Paul Butler Planning OBO Barratt Homes, David Wilson Homes and TW Fields
 The developer objects to the allocated boundary and housing number. Alternative boundary submitted suggesting 1725 homes, which is their recommended option. Boundary includes additional land to the north with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 53.9 ha net site area at 32 dph. Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York. Consider that 1725 dwellings could be delivered within the plan period. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.46km. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12 with proportionate enhancement of benefits. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 2 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 17.12ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial areas of green space on western boundary. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.



3) Paul Butler Planning OBO Barratt Homes, David Wilson Homes and TW Fields
 The developer objects to the allocated boundary and housing number. Alternative boundary is submitted suggesting 2200 homes. Boundary includes additional land to the north and south with some externalised openspace. Approximately 60-70% net developable area which equates to 67.9 ha net site area at 32 dph. Expansion of the site supports the case for higher housing numbers in York and the requirement to ensure a permanent Green Belt. Consider that 2200 dwellings could be delivered within the plan period of a care home and build to rent are implemented within first 5 years. Design retains view of the Minster and separation distances to Skelton and Wigginton Road. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.25km. Distance to Clifton Moor would be 0.42km. This development would deliver the principles set out in policy SS12 with proportionate enhancement of benefits. The vision and proposed masterplan of the site is landscape led development which is separated from the existing urban edge and surrounding villages to ensure preservation of historic character and setting. Access as proposed on Proposals Map. 2.26 ha of land for the provision of a nursery, 3 form entry primary school with secondary contributions. Provision of 27.09 ha of openspace within the site boundary and substantial areas of green space on western boundary. Additional openspace to north which would likely be new woodland plantation. Evidence base submitted for the area are relevant to this option.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS13: Land West of Elvington Lane

The development of Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15) supports the Local Plan vision in delivering a new sustainable garden village for York. It will deliver approximately 3,339 dwellings, around 2,200 units of which will be delivered within the plan period. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be masterplanned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Create a new 'garden' village that reflects the existing urban form of York as a compact city surrounded by villages.
- ii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy.
- iii. Be of a high design standard to reflect the existing settlement form of villages around the main urban area of York in-keeping with the existing urban form. The south eastern and south western boundaries of the site are less well contained than to the north so it will be important for the site to establish its own landscape setting.
- iv. Create new open space (as shown on the proposals map) within the site to maintain views of the Minster and existing woodland.
- v. Impacts on biodiversity within the site and zone of influence will be addressed by following the mitigation hierarchy with the overall aim to prevent harm to existing biodiversity assets, delivering no net loss for biodiversity and maximise further benefits for biodiversity. Where required compensatory measures should take full account of the extent and quality of the asset being lost or damaged and equivalent or enhanced habitats should be provided.
- vi. Follow a mitigation hierarchy to first seek to avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts or compensate unavoidable residual impacts on Heslington Tillmire SSSI and the Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar through the:
 - incorporation of a new nature conservation area (as shown on the proposals map) including a buffer of wetland habitats, a barrier to the movement of people and domestic pets on to the SSSI and deliver further benefits for biodiversity. A buffer of at least 400m from the SSSI will be required in order to adequately mitigate impacts unless evidence demonstrates otherwise; and
 - provision of an detailed site wide recreation and access strategy to minimise indirect recreational disturbance resulting from development and complement the wetland habitat buffer area which will be retained and monitored in perpetuity. A full understanding of the proposed recreational routes is required at an early stage.
- vii. Deliver ecological mitigation and compensation measures 5 years prior to commencement of any development. They must be supported by a long term management plan, and be retained and monitored in perpetuity.
- viii. Protect the character, setting and enjoyment of Minster Way.
- ix. Provide an appropriate range of shops, services and facilities including social infrastructure such as health, social, leisure, cultural and community uses to meet the needs of future residents, made early in the scheme's phasing in order to allow the establishment of a new sustainable community. This should be principally focused around a new local centre.

- x. Deliver new on-site education provision to meet nursery, primary and potentially secondary demand, to be assessed based on generated need. New nursery, primary and potentially secondary provision will be required to serve the earliest phases of development.
- xi. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site's ST7, ST8, ST9, ST14, ST27, ST35 and ST36 should be addressed.
- xii. Ensure provision of necessary transport infrastructure to access the site with primary access via the A64 (as shown on the proposals map) and a potential secondary access via Elvington Lane. The capacity of the local highway network including Elvington Lane and junctions is limited.
- xiii. Retain Common Lane/Long Lane/Langwith Stray as cycle/pedestrian routes only to ensure protection of the character of Heslington Village. These routes are very lightly trafficked roads, and could provide pleasant cycle and pedestrian routes from the site to Heslington. It is essential that there is no vehicular transport access to Heslington village along these routes to ensure the setting of Heslington village is maintained.
- xiv. Explore the potential for local bridleways (e.g. Fordlands Road/ Forest Lane) running through or near the site to be used as cycle routes.
- xv. Provide dedicated secure access for existing local residents and landowners to be agreed with the community of Heslington. Appropriate solutions would need to ensure access is preserved for existing residents and landowners developed in consultation with the community of Heslington.
- xvi. Deliver high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services through the whole site which provide links to new community facilities, as well as to York city centre and other appropriate service hubs, including University of York. A public transport hub at the local centre should provide appropriate local interchange and waiting facilities for new residents. It is envisaged such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport.
- xvii. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well-connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods, to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling).
- xviii. Exploit synergies with the proposed university expansion in terms of site servicing including transport, energy and waste.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a


Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendment to site capacity following consideration of site submission and technical evidence through the consultation.

Allocation: Land West of Elvington Lane ST15		
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	159 ha	193 ha
Estimated Yield	3,339 dwellings (2,200 dwellings in the plan period)	3,900 dwellings
Phasing	Lifetime of the Plan (years 1-21)	No change


Potential Allocation Boundary

984: ST15 Post PPD consultation alternative



Pre-Publication Boundary

Site Ref: 851



Summary of Reasons for Change

Following consideration of site submission and technical evidence through the consultation, boundary amendment and dwellings capacity change proposed.

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 175	Supports: 37	Objections: 119	Comments: 42
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England support the principle of development as part of the overall strategy to accommodate growth. The degree of harm of development in this location is less that should this volume of housing be located on the edge of the main urban area or surrounding settlements and the shape takes into consideration key views from the ring-road. Development of a new garden village as opposed to development in alternative locations adjacent to the urban area was also supported in representations from some 		

	<p>members of the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England broadly welcome Policy SS13 and the inclusion of criterion relating to no net loss of biodiversity which maximise enhancements. <p>General support for the policy SS13 and principle of development for ST15 was received from some members of the public and the site developers, particularly because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This uses brownfield land • There is potential for sustainable connections to the University of York's Campus East • The size of the site could provide for social infrastructure • There would be linked openspace/ wildlife creation areas • Some representation supported higher numbers on the site to ensure viability of on-site facilities. • Impact on Heslington village reduced as the boundary is further away. • Dunnington Parish Council were also in favour of infrastructure being provided on the A64 prior to commencement of development. To minimise impacts, public representations support the idea of retaining Common Lane as a pedestrian/cycle route and extending these routes to connect with the existing network. • The designated new area for nature conservation is also supported. However, clarification is required to ensure that public access to the nature conservation area is limited and does not compromise mitigation. • Support from willing landowners was received for all parcels of land included in the allocation. • Both Heslington Village Trust and Heslington Parish Council welcome the reduction in the size of the proposed new town as this will reduce pressure on the A64 and Hull Road. They also support the site's location being further away from the SSSI of Tilmire Common and A64. Concerns remain however in relation to open space and access arrangements. • A Wheldrake ward councillor notes that both Elvington and Wheldrake Parish Councils are broadly supportive of the proposed new 'garden village' as it would alleviate pressure on already over-stretched services and infrastructure and limit future infill in these villages. Overwhelming support has been for an enlarged 'garden village', as proposed by the developers, which would support a new junction onto the A64, thereby relieving traffic and congestion on the B1228 should the development proceed, and which would take up the overflow from the villages, rather than have them stretched to the point where services will start to fracture. Note concerns re local infrastructure.
<p>Objection</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some respondents felt that there was a lack of justification for the

site's inclusion and the amount of information provided in relation to its impacts.

- There is no link made between policy SS12 and Policy H5.
- There will be environmental protection impacts due to proximity of neighbouring industrial estate. Screen planting and consideration of air and noise pollution is required.
- Loss of airfield and development in this area may have negative economic impact on existing businesses.
- The size of this is not a village; it is a town and should therefore be referred to and planned as such.
- Through the response there were requests for the policy to be strengthened to ensure that a 'green' settlement.
- Existing facilities are already at capacity.
- The existing airfield is in existing leisure use.

Boundary

- The developer objects to the boundary and seeks to increase this to make the site more viable to deliver all necessary green, social and transport infrastructure to ensure a cohesive and sustainable settlement is developed that also addresses the ecological issues identified. Their proposal is for 246 ha and 4,500 dwellings delivered with an additional circa 130 ha for nature conservation mitigation. They also disagree on including land in third party ownership which complicates delivery and the nature conservation mitigation as proposed.

A number of public and planning agent representations object to the boundary proposed on the following grounds:

- The site needs to be enlarged to support a self sustaining settlement with required social infrastructure and transport access. A sustainable garden village should be for a minimum 5,000 homes.
- Moving the boundary northwards would limit biodiversity impacts on the airfield and impacts on Elvington.
- More brownfield land available which should be used for development to reduce green field development.
- Current boundary is out of proportion to surrounding settlements.

Delivery

A number of objections are raised in relation to delivery on the following grounds:

- there is no indication when it is likely to be permitted;
- lead-in to the site will be a minimum of 5 years;
- the land is in multiple land ownership;
- the site is complex to deliver with phased delivery; and
- the site is isolated with no existing infrastructure capable of accommodating the development, which will inhibit delivery or delay building.

Biodiversity and openspace

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and members of the public raise concerns that there is high potential for development in this position surrounded by wildlife sites to have significant residual impacts on wildlife and biodiversity despite mitigation and compensation. Key impacts are raised in relation to the Heslington Tillmire SSSI, the airfield SINC and Lower Derwent Valley SPA. Suggestions for design include unlit roads to village, significant screening including using bunds, public protection orders on the Tillmire and management plans for wildlife. • Concerns were raised by several members of the public in relation to detrimental effects on farming of the area and the need to ensure this remains viable. Objections are also raised in relation to the cumulative loss of farmland in this area over the course of time, including for the identified new openspace OS10. • The site promoter disagrees with the timescales for delivering the ecological mitigation and considers that the proposed OS10 area is justified for the proposed settlement. <p><u>Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England response states that a site of this size, especially when considered with other large sites in the area, is likely to have an impact on the A64 at the junctions with the A1237 to the east and west of the city, so there should be a reference to the need to agree traffic impact and mitigation measures. • The developer disagrees with the road alignment for access onto the A64. This is not feasible and needs to be moved westwards as shown is technical work. • General concerns were raised in relation to increased traffic and congestion in the area not leading to sustainable travel. It is suggested that the policy is strengthened to ensure issues in relation to traffic are addressed. Specific issues were raised with regards to the A19, A1079 and B1228 connected with congestion, commuting / HGVs and consequential effect on pedestrian safety and availability of sustainable transport options (including from Julian Sturdy MP). Concerns were also raised in relation to access to Heslington/ businesses via Common Lane and that methods for controlling access into the village need to be agreed. <p><u>Heritage and landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several public responses suggest that the airfield should be protected for historic reasons as well as leisure and tourism, particularly in connection with the air museum. • A number of responses raised that this development will have an urbanising effect on this area of York, which would be detrimental to the historic character and setting. Concerns were also raised in relation to the potential character of Elvington being eroded by new development.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England considers that there is further work necessary to understand the scale of transport infrastructure and mitigation to


- minimise harm. Further representations agree that this will require a significant investment and that the cumulative impacts on the network need to be understood in more detail.
- The site should ensure that existing tourist attractions such as the Air Museum and Maize Maze are not negatively effected by development.
 - It is recognised that compared to previous iterations, less greenfield land is included in the proposed allocation.
 - Any garden village development should reference best practice examples in York such as New Earswick. They should also commit to high standards of sustainable design and construction, including renewable energy and low running cost development.
 - Existing connectivity via footpaths and cycleways should be enhanced and stronger links made to health and well-being policies. A few representations also expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on existing routes used for farm vehicles.

Boundary change Submitted

Alternative boundary options were submitted through the consultation. These are summarised as follows:

1) Sandby/ Oakgate


The developer objects to the allocated boundary and housing number. Alternative boundary is re-submitted, which concurs with previous submission in 2016 for 246 ha and 4,500 dwellings (circa 2,400 within the plan period) but is slightly amended to exclude land on the eastern boundary to enable expansion of the existing Airfield Museum. This site is proposed to be delivered at a 60% net site area at 35-45 dph density. Outline planning circa 2019 with site delivery starting in 2021 with a development trajectory of approximately 23 years.



2) PB Planning obo Barratt and David Wilson Homes (overleaf)


Object to boundary of proposed allocation. Boundary should be extended to the northwest, with the following reasoning: would enable delivery of 4,000 homes, increasing the development's viability and deliverability, with particular reference to the feasibility of providing principle access from the A64 due to proximity. This would also enable early delivery on site, since access construction times would be reduced; CYC will require additional housing sites to those already identified in order to meet housing need - this site could provide necessary flexibility; no additional impact on biodiversity or historic/ landscape character; would retain separation distances with Elvington Lane / Heslington and replicate historic patterns of development (satellite settlements). Refers to 10th July LPWG report and officer commentary not to include alternative boundary due to concerns relating to landscape and heritage impacts.

985:ST15 Alternative PPC submission





3) PB Planning obo Barratt and David Wilson Homes (overleaf)

Rep suggests alternative boundary, providing 268.4ha site, approx 4,000 homes (1,620 within the plan period) developed at 30dph across 50% net site area. This net/gross split and lower development density better reflects garden village principles. Planning application submitted 2019 following adoption of Local Plan. Housing trajectory submitted. No identified technical/environmental constraints (suitable); no legal or ownership constraints (available); viable housing development can be achieved within first 5 years of the Plan (achievable). Land can be considered a deliverable residential development site and its release would deliver a number of significant economic, social and environmental benefits.



4) Yew Tree Associates on behalf of landowner (overleaf)
Land located to the north of ST15. Support this site's inclusion in an expanded ST15 boundary. The site is considered to be available with a willing landowner.

977: Land to the North of ST15



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
City of York Council. Licence No. 1000 20818

REP ID5710

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
--

Policy SS14 : Terry's Extension Sites (ST16)

Terry's Extension Sites (ST16) will deliver 111 dwellings in total at these urban development sites, 22 dwellings on Terry's Clock Tower, approximately 33 dwellings on Terrys Car Park and approximately 56 dwellings on Land to the rear of Terry's Factory. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, ST16 must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

Terry's Extension Site (Phase 1) – Terry's Clock Tower

i. Achieve high quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider Terry's factory site and buildings of architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas

Terry's Extension Site (Phase 2) - Terry's Car Park

i. Deliver development with high quality urban design, given the site's association with the wider Terry's factory site and the sites location as an entry point to the city, to contribute to the architectural merit of the city. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and The Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas.

ii. Be of a low height and complement existing views to the factory building and clock tower from the Ings, Bishopthorpe Road and the Racecourse.

iii. Constrain development to the boundary of the car park including any open space requirements.

iv. Retain existing vegetation and provide additional appropriate treatment on the southern and eastern boundaries.

Terry's Extension Site (Phase 3) - Land to the rear of Terry's Factory

i. Retain and enhance the formal gardens area adjacent to the site.

ii. Achieve high quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider Terry's factory site and buildings of architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas.

iii. Development should complement existing views to the factory and clock tower.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Allocation: Land at Terrys ST16			
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change	
Site Size	2.18ha	No Change	
Estimated Yield	Phase 1 - 22 Phase 2 - 33 Phase 3 - 56	No Change	
Phasing	Phase 1: short-medium term (yrs 1-5) Phase 2: short-medium term (yrs 1-10) Phase 3: short-medium term (yrs 1-10)	No Change	
Pre-Publication Boundary			
<p>Site Ref: 824</p>			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No boundary changes proposed			
Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 10	Supports: 3	Objections: 2	Comments: 6
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ext 1 - Historic England supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: achieves high 		

	<p>quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider site and buildings or architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ext 2 – Historic England supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: delivers high quality urban design, given the site's association with the wider Terry's factory site and location as an entry point to the City. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas; Is of low height and complements existing views to the factory building and clock tower from the Ings, Bishopthorpe Road and the Racecourse; Constrains development to the boundary of the car park, including any open space requirements. • Ext 3 – Historic England supports the policy's key principles, including the requirement that development: retains and enhances the formal gardens area adjacent to the site; achieves high quality urban design which respects the character and fabric of the wider site and buildings or architectural merit. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's factory Conservation Areas; complements existing views to the Factory and clock tower. • Henry Boot Development supports the allocations of the three Terry's Extension Sites (Phases 1, 2 & 3) as housing allocations under Policy H1, and would like to point out a minor typographical error in that all three sites are listed under Strategic Site ST14 rather than ST16. • A small number of general supports received.
<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry Boot Development – policy HW6 identifies ST16 to provide a 'spoke' facility for the Yorkshire Ambulance Service. It is presumed this should actually refer to ST16 sites 2 & 3 i.e. Terry's Car Park (Site 2) and Land to the Rear of Terry's Factory (Site 3). Site 1 is the clocktower and could not physically accommodate such a facility. Henry Boot Development, the owner of both sites, has at no time been approached by the trust or council to discuss this requirement and considers that such a use at this location would be unjustified and therefore unsound. HBD therefore object to this draft policy and would particularly question the suitability / deliverability of these sites as a potential location for such a facility given that no evidence is provided in the Plan to explain why these sites are considered suitable, and what other sites have been considered and why they have been discounted. For example neither site is close or readily

	<p>accessible to a major highway and development of such a facility would impact upon deliverability of planned beneficial regeneration of the site and potentially impact on heritage significance of the site. Site 3 would be particularly unsuited given its relationship to listed buildings, likely impact on residential amenity and access issues. Site 2 might physically be able to accommodate such a facility but this would impact on deliverability especially if the council maintain their stated desire to seek only low level development on this site. Reference to all ST16 Terry's sites should be removed from policy HW6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small number of general objections raising the following concerns: scale of development would not accommodate a self-sustaining community; impacts on congestion and lack of public transport alternatives;
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party comments on a number of issues: There is no reference to affordable housing on this site. A principle requiring affordable housing should be added – this site which was originally subject to widespread resident consultation has hugely disappointed by delivering housing and other services that are way beyond the budget of most local residents. Regarding Terry's Car Park site, support this principle: <i>'ii. Be of a low height and complement existing views to the factory building and clock tower from the Ings, Bishopthorpe Road and the Racecourse.'</i> Add <i>'Development should complement the rural character of the Ings up to where it joins the cycle path and incorporate a suitably graded disabled accessible route between Bishopthorpe Rd and the riverside.'</i> Add <i>'v) A full controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing must be provided to facilitate access between the main site and this extension.'</i> • CPRE raise concern as the policy does not refer to the need to deliver an appropriate mix of housing. This would ensure a mix of housing and tenures was delivered on this site located within walking and cycling distance of local amenities and close to public transport routes. • The small number of comments received relate to the need to restrict the height of development in respect of the factory building and the setting of the site (max 2.5 storeys); would support affordable homes; • ELG Planning on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Ltd states in relation to the Phase 2 Terry's Car Park Site, the figure of 33 dwellings is due to the Council's wish for a low profile development on this site. This ignores the positive visual, landscape and urban design benefits from a taller and denser development. This could be achieved on the car park site without compromising views of the Multi Storey Factory and Clock Tower. In relation to Phase 3 Land to the Rear of Terry's Factory supports housing allocation but suggests 100dpa instead of a density of 50dpa (56 dwellings), as this is to a normal density of a town centre site.

Boundary change Submitted

England Lyle Good Town Planning OBO Henry Boot Developments

Henry Boot Developments Ltd request that consideration is given to extending the allocation of ST16 phase 2 (Terrys Car park) to include additional land to the South and East as a logical extension capable of accommodating additional housing development. It is suggested that this is in a sustainable and accessible location without harm to other key interests, extending the site gives greater opportunity to deliver wider landscape and access enhancements to the surrounding land enhancing the green infrastructure network. Analysis is provided as to how the extended site does not meet greenbelt purposes and would not adversely impact on the conservation area setting or views of the clock tower.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)	
Policy SS15 Nestle South (ST17)	
<p>Nestle South (ST17) will deliver 863 dwellings in total, 263 in Phase 1 and up to 600 dwellings in Phase 2 at this urban development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles.</p>	
<p>i. Achieve high quality urban design which recognises the distinctive character of this part of the city and respects the character and fabric of the factory buildings of distinction including those on the Haxby Road Frontage including the library.</p>	
<p>ii. Conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the Nestle/Rowntree Factory Conservation Area.</p>	
<p>iii. Provide a mix of housing in line with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>	
<p>iv. Maximise accessibility and connectivity to the city centre and local area by pedestrian and cycle routes. <u>Including direct access from the site to the Foss Island Cycle Path which runs alongside the site boundary.</u></p>	
<p>v. Retain the mature trees along Haxby Road frontage and protect the setting of the site.</p>	
<p>vi. Maximise connectivity and linkages to surrounding green infrastructure including Bootham Stray.</p>	
<p>vii. Assess appropriate access from both Haxby Road and Wigginton Road along with associated junction improvements as necessary through Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Access between Haxby Road and Wigginton Road will be limited to public transport and walking/cycling links only.</p>	
<p><u>viii. Address any implications relating to the Haxby Road level crossing.</u></p>	
Supporting Text Changes:	
<p>New explanatory text to refer to new policy point viii regarding the implications of Haxby Road Level Crossing and cross reference to policy T7, which has been updated to refer to consideration of crossings where applicable.</p>	
Summary of Reasons for Change	
<p>Policy amendment proposed to respond to consultation comments in relation to cycle route connectivity and safety concerns in relation to Haxby Road level crossing.</p>	
Allocation: Nestle South ST17	
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan
	Potential Change


Site Size	Phase 1 (site 931) – 2.35ha Phase 2 (site 932) – 4.70ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Phase 1 – 263 Phase 2 – 600	No change
Phasing	Phase 1 – short-medium term (yrs 1-10) Phase 2 – medium-long term (yrs 6-15)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary

Phase 1: Site 931



Phase 2: Site 932



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Change to Boundary

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 9	Supports: 3	Objections: 4	Comments: 3
--------------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England endorses the stated planning principles, especially the requirement that development: achieves high quality urban design which recognises the distinctive character of this part of the city and respects the character and fabric of the factory buildings of distinction including those on the Haxby Road frontage, including the library; conserves and enhances the character and/or appearance of the Nestle/Rowntree Factory Conservation Area; retains mature trees along Haxby Road frontage and protects the setting of the site. They agree that these measures will help to ensure that the development of this site takes place in a manner which reflects its sensitive location. A small number of general supports for the site were also
---------	---

	received.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail - The Nestle site can only be supported as an allocation if the existing level crossing can be permanently removed and replaced with a road bridge or alternative measures are put in place to limit access across the level crossing. One of the key entrances to this site [ST17] will be via the Bootham Level Crossing - a high risk crossing located on Wigginton Road. Suggest that wording is added to the policy which seeks consideration of the level crossing as part of future development proposals . NR would object to the allocation without the inclusion of a reference to the level crossing upgrade. • Small number of objections received, on the grounds of impact on congestion.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England recommends that the following text is added to the list of key principles: <i>'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.'</i> • York Travellers Trust notes that a significant requirement of policy H5 is missing from SS15, namely that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums, is missing from SS15 wording. This should be stated as part of the policy's development principles. • York Green Party makes the following suggested amendments: iv. Maximise accessibility and connectivity to the city centre and local area by pedestrian and cycle routes, including direct access from the site to the Foss Island Cycle Path which runs alongside the site boundary. vii. Assess appropriate access from both Haxby Road and Wigginton Road along with associated junction improvements as necessary through Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Access between Haxby Road and Wigginton Road will be limited to public transport and walking/cycling links only. Strongly support. Add 'segregated, purpose built cycle link'. Add: Phase 2 must include an assessment of the need for any further on-site community facilities such as community meeting space, local shops, cafes, doctor's surgery, childcare facilities, onsite open space and play areas. These requirements should be included in more detail in the site principles both in order to provide appropriate amenity for residents and to reduce the need to travel in an area where the traffic impact is going to be very challenging. Why is there no more detail in the site principles? Phase 2 should include areas of car free development with car club provision. • One comment, noting the potential benefits of opening up the site to cross traffic of all modes, not just bus/cycle, in order to relieve congestion at Clarence Street/in front of York Hospital.
Boundary change Submitted	
No alternative boundary proposed	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS16 : Land at Tadcaster Road

Land at Tadcaster Road (ST31) will deliver 158 dwellings at this village extension site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be master planned and delivered in accordance with the following key principles:

- i. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- ii. Create new open space (as shown on the proposals map) within the site which should be delivered prior to ~~the commencement~~the first phase of development to ensure, in particular, the protection of the adjacent SSSI. There is the opportunity to extend and enhance the local green infrastructure corridor including enhancing links from Copmanthorpe to Askham Bog SSSI along the newly created footway. This would enhance the new tree planting and attenuation wetland area with seating adjacent to the site. This open space will also create a necessary buffer between the new dwellings and the railway line and A64 embankment.
- iii. Undertake detailed noise, air quality and vibration assessments, which may influence the final layout/masterplan of the site.
- iv. Reflect site topography to ensure that the site's visual impact is minimised particularly from the A64 and railway line. From its north eastern point by the A64 the first half of the site is generally flat however it then starts to gradually rise in a south west direction towards the existing residential properties.
- ~~v. Conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas~~
- vi. Provide site access via Tadcaster Road, with no secondary access from Learmans Way.
- vii. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods., to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling).
- viii. Provide required financial contributions to existing local primary and secondary facilities to enable the expansion to accommodate pupil yield.
- ~~ix~~viii. Undertake hydrological investigation and any necessary mitigation.

Supporting Text Changes:

Explanatory text amended to remove reference to the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas as factually incorrect.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amendments proposed in line with comments received through the Pre

Publication draft Local Plan Consultation (2017) to remove reference to the Tadcaster Road and the Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Areas, as factually incorrect. Also clarification is proposed regarding the timescale to deliver the openspace.

Allocation: Land South of Tadcaster Road ST31

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	8.10ha	No change
Estimated Yield	158	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Boundary Change

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 23	Supports: 4	Objections: 14	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gladman Developments support the identification of the Land at Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe as a strategic housing allocation. They state that it is supported by the local community through their neighbourhood plan and is available, achievable and deliverable. Attached documentation includes: Appendix 1: A Sustainable Future for Copmanthorpe: Assessing Housing Need and Vitality and Appendix 2: Land at Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe Development Statement. • Small number of responses received in support of the scheme – those who commented in support raised the following issues: Development of the existing footpath from the railway crossing to the Farmer's Way area into a cycleway / paved footpath would give good access to the village centre; would support the provision of affordable housing; generally support more housing being built in the area. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst supporting the allocation, Gladman Developments also object to the wording of clause (ii) of Policy SS16 as the provision of open space prior to the commencement of development cannot be implemented. In order to deliver the openspace adjacent to the SSSI it would require the construction of the access road which would constitute commencement of development. The clause as it is currently written could therefore not be complied with. Also object to para 3.69 of the Local Plan as the Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe site is not located within the Tadcaster Road or Racecourse and Terry's Factory Conservation Area. This reference should therefore be deleted. • Historic England recommends deletion of the site. The development could harm a number of elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the City. Site is perceived as being part of a swathe of open countryside south of the ring road; would impact on the relationship of Copmanthorpe with the City of York, in which the village is currently identifiable as a freestanding settlement; cumulative impact of P+R site at Askham Bar with proposed allocation would reduce the gap with the urban edge to less than 1km. • Copmanthorpe Parish Council objects to the inclusion of the whole site ST31 (8.1ha) instead of the limited development proposed for this site in the emerging Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan, using part of his land (3.0ha). Also, to maintain the current average housing density in the village, the density should be no more than 25 units per ha. This would result in 75 units as opposed to 158 in draft Local Plan. • Both DPP obo Shepherd Homes and DPP obo Linden Homes strongly object to this allocation and recommend it s deletion; it goes against the Council's own historic character and setting evidence base. Development of this site will result in a greater level of harm to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and other material consideration than comparable sites. The site is located on the entry 		

	<p>to the village and causes visual harm. Development of the site may result in harm to the SSSI due to the proximity of the location. The site is not well related to the urban area of Copmanthorpe and is a distance from the village services. Concerns are raised in relation to the standard of amenity with regard to noise levels in private gardens and air quality. ST13 would be better alternative site to ST31.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB Planning obo David Wilson Homes strongly objects to the allocation as it is considered that ST12 is comparatively a better site for development. This Site is known to have objections from Historic England in respect of historic character and setting as it is part of an area 'preventing coalescence' (parcel G3). Whilst the site is contained by physical boundaries these are not visual boundaries and therefore visual coalescence cannot be avoided. Potential impacts are also identified on the SSSI Askham Bogg. Site also scores worse in the Sustainability Appraisal (2017) on a number of objectives. <p>General objections to the allocation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing development takes up whole site of ST31 instead of part of land proposed by local Neighbourhood Plan (no more than 25 units per ha.); • impact on the character of the entrance to the village; • reference to Neighbourhood Plan comments re available development land and Historic England's objection to the site (O'Neill Assoc obo landowner) • disproportionate number of homes proposed in the village; • land is in the green belt • land has historic value - York Field is listed as a site of special interest on the proposed Copmanthorpe Heritage Trail. • Concerns that infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate development (schools, road, services) • Proximity to Askham Bog nature reserve
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England would not expect this to have a substantial individual impact on the operation of the A64. However, Highways England's previous modelling of Local Plan aspirations did identify capacity issues on the A64 west of York in future years. The developer should quantify the impact of the site on the junctions of the A64 with the A1036 and A1237 in the Transport Assessment. Highways England does not object to the scheme in principle, but requests the following addition to the list of key principles: <i>'Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure that as many trips as possible are taken by sustainable travel modes and promote and facilitate modal shift from the car.'</i> • The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust notes the sites proximity to the reserve at Askham Bogg and SSSI. Pleased to see the intention within the policy to protect the SSSI. More clarity required at point ii. covering design of open space. Supports connecting up the GI corridor. The policy needs to cover the potential for damage and disturbance on

	<p>the reserve from extra visitor pressure. Attached article in the CIEEM 'Human Impacts on Nature Reserves - The Influence of Nearby Settlements' (2017) by Fin Rylatt, Lauren Garside and Sara Robin analyses the damage and disturbance on Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserves in relation to their proximity to development. This gives an idea of the problems on nature reserves which nearby developments can cause.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The small number of comments received note potential for additional traffic, concerns around development density proposed and that the site may be 'unkind' to its eventual residents.
<p>Boundary change Submitted No alternative boundary suggested</p>	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS17: Hungate

Hungate (ST32) – Phases 5+ will deliver approximately 328 dwellings at this urban development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the agreed site masterplan through existing outline and full planning consents.

In line with the Hungate Development Brief vision, ST32 must be of the highest quality which adds to the vitality and viability of the city centre, is safe and secure, and which promotes sustainable development. Priority should be given to pedestrians, people with mobility impairments, cyclists and public transport. Design should respect local amenity and character whilst being imaginative and energy efficient. The special character and/or appearance of the adjacent Central Historic Core Conservation Area should be conserved and enhanced.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A


Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Allocation: Hungate ST32

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	2.17ha	No Change
Estimated Yield	328	No Change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No Change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Boundary Change Proposed			
Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
2	1	2	n/a
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) support the allocation, which is a brownfield site and occupies a sustainable city centre location, delivering 328 dwellings over the remaining phases. This site can help support substantial levels of development and an appropriate mix of uses including many new homes. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) state that it is not clear which elements of the Hungate scheme the 328 dwellings relates to or how this figure has been calculated. Further clarification required on this matter to ensure that this figure is consistent with the consent and future proposals of the site. Scope should be explored to increase the potential of such sites to deliver even more new homes. It is not necessary for the plan to state that this must be delivered in accordance with the agreed site masterplan through existing outline and full planning consents. This is unnecessary and should be more flexible to allow for change in the future to respond to changes in policy and circumstances. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments submitted. 		
Boundary change Submitted			
No alternative boundary proposed			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
--

Policy SS18: Station Yard, Wheldrake

<p>Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33) will deliver approximately 147 dwellings at this village extension development site. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.</p>

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policy, addressing local need for smaller family homes and bungalows/sheltered housing. ii. Be of a high design standard to which will provide an appropriate new extension to Wheldrake whilst maintaining the character of the village. iii. Conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the adjacent Wheldrake Conservation Area. iv. Undertake a comprehensive evidence based approach in relation to biodiversity to address potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar/SSSI. v. Establish a landscape setting, given the open fields to the south of the site. vi. Create new local facilities as required to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development. vii. Provide on-site open space to provide additional amenity green space and children's play facilities for the village. viii. Provide required financial contributions to existing nursery, primary and secondary facilities to enable the expansion to accommodate demand arising from the development. ix. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area creating well connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods, to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling). x. Undertake a noise assessment to inform the development, this may result in a reduction in the developable area should a buffer to the existing industrial area be required. |
|---|

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Allocation: Station Yard Wheldrake ST33		
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	6.0ha	No Change
Estimated Yield	147	No Change
Phasing	Short to Medium term (Years 1-10)	No Change
Trajectory start year	2018	No Change

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Boundary Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 65	Supports: 7	Objections: 52	Comments: 10
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England welcomes the requirement for development to conserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the conservation area. Quod on behalf of Vernon Land Partnerships supports for the allocation of ST33 within the Local Plan. Reconfirm the 		

	<p>representations made in September 2016 (and enclosed as Appendix 1 to their response). Re-confirms 2016 response that the site is suitable, deliverable and viable with no insurmountable constraints to preclude development. There is a pressing need to review the Green Belt boundary in York to meet its OAHN. Site ST33 would make a significant contribution to this, whilst ensuring a permanence to the refined Green Belt beyond the plan period and a protection of the surrounding hinterland. The characteristics of Site ST33 ensure that it is the most appropriate and sustainable location in Wheldrake to deliver new residential development. The site has good accessibility to local services and transport routes and it can be suitably served and accessed in highway terms. It is entirely appropriate for residential development in this regard. Site ST33 can deliver an appropriate mix of residential and employment uses alongside publically accessibly open space, creating a sustainable community. It is available for delivery in the short term and can therefore meet housing need in this area in the early part of the plan period. In accordance with the NPPF the allocation will respond positively to the three strands of sustainability, notably the economic, social and environmental aspects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents support this site if housing in Wheldrake is essential, as is would be less intrusive than other potential plots. Housing development in villages are the only way young people can afford to stay in the villages they grew up in, as there is a shortage of houses in the village. Additionally, a development will lead to enhancements of the services for the village. However, investment is needed for supporting infrastructure - shops, healthcare, community centres etc. but school capacity is in particular need. Would like a cycle path from Broad Highway across the airfield into the back of Heslington. Suggests resurrecting the old Derwent Valley Light Railway for a tram route, it would be of great benefit to outlying villages.
<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Wheldrake Ward Councillor states that the residents and Parish Council are wholly against ST33 as it currently stands. A previous planning application for part of that site was rejected for reasons of potential noise and other impacts associated with building residential properties near to an existing industrial estate. A large proportion of that site is located on good quality agricultural land and, therefore, it is considered that brown field sites should be explored instead of building on green fields. There is limited support for a small development of homes with the overflow being taken up by the 'garden village'. The school is oversubscribed with pupils from Wheldrake attending Elvington and Naburn schools as Escrick have now stated that they are unable to take any more children from outside of their own boundary. It would be difficult to extend capacity at Wheldrake school as in its current location it is bounded on all sides which is restrictive. The Doctors' surgery in Wheldrake is only open two half mornings per week and although there is a large new practice at Elvington unless patients have access to a vehicle it is not possible to

use that facility.

- Wheldrake Parish Council and villagers object to the size and scale of the proposed development as it is completely inappropriate for Wheldrake. The infrastructure is already at capacity. Also object to the scale of this proposed site as well as its proximity to the industrial estate. A planning application was refused for that part of ST33 nearest to the industrial estate for reasons of potential noise and other impacts. Significant proportion of the site is on good quality agricultural land and is currently recognised as Green Belt.
- Julian Sturdy MP states that congestion on the A19 at rush hour is already a significant issue for villagers and 147 extra properties will exacerbate this. This concern must be addressed for Wheldrake residents to be convinced of the viability of this site at the current housing level. Also, has concerns regarding oversubscription in school places.
- Stone Connection Ltd states that as a business based on the Industrial Estate they have serious reservations regarding the impact of this additional housing both on the village and the adjacent Industrial Estate where they are situated. They operate on a busy industrial estate where many of the businesses including ourselves receive regular van and articulated lorry deliveries throughout the day. Access is such that the Lorries often reverse into the industrial estate in order to gain access to the units. Currently in the main the only people on the Industrial Estate are the employees of the various businesses and visitors and they act with due care and attention when moving around the Industrial Site so lorries can operate in and out safely. It raises serious safety concerns if this area was to become a public thoroughfare. Goes into detail about safety concerns particularly around children being around the site, access issues, noise pollution, dust / air pollution, traffic, schools, public transport and provision of amenities in Wheldrake village.

Many other objections were received by individuals, based on the following key issues:

- Development is unacceptable in the Green Belt & open character of the area, and contrary to Green Belt policy. No very special circumstances exist to justify its development;
- Land is grade 2 & productive agricultural land;
- Residential development should be on brownfield, not Greenfield;
- Development is contrary to the Wheldrake Design Statement;
- Wheldrake is already over developed / too big;
- The proposed number of houses / density is too high, especially for a rural village;
- The school is at capacity and the impact of more development would be detrimental;
- There is only 1 shop in the village, which cannot cope with the extra demand;
- The village pub could not cope with extra people;
- The doctors / medical services in the area are over capacity;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage would be an issue as there is already an issue there; • It would result in a loss of jobs / potential future jobs; • The development would have an adverse impact on local nature conservation; • The village infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the extra demand; • The village streets are narrow and the extra traffic would create unacceptable levels of congestion; • Existing public transport is very poor and would not cope with the extra pressure – would need great improvement; • The development would have a much wider impact on surrounding areas – esp. the Crockey Hill / A19 and A19 / A64 junctions. Cumulatively, impact of this development and other developments including those in the northern part of Selby District will create serious traffic / congestion issues; • The impact of the adjacent employment area will create amenity issues for residents of the development, such as noise / vibration etc; • Planning permission for housing already been refused at a planning inquiry;
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England state that the potential impact of this site in combination with others on A64 junctions at Grimston Bar and at A19/Fulford Road need to be investigated, alongside appropriate mitigation. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust state that ST33 is close to the reserve at Wheldrake Ings. The Trust agrees with point iv that a comprehensive review of evidence with regard to biodiversity is required. Point vii need for a general recreation space and dog walking opportunities away from the nature reserve but within or accessible to the housing development. • CPRE North Yorkshire state that development of this site remains a concern - it is considered the development of this site would limit the expansion of industrial activities at the existing employment site. And potentially restrict current businesses from expansion. Public transport, services and facilities are not considered adequate. • Elvington Medical Practice states that their branch surgery at Wheldrake allows the elderly and people without transport access to primary care services, if more housing is to be built at Station Yard it is essential that Wheldrake surgery is improved to meet current standards and future need. There is no public transport between the villages of Elvington and Wheldrake. The recent application for development of Elvington surgery was rejected by the Vale of York CCG. Support and recognise the need for sheltered housing in the area but it is essential that funding is provided for development of the existing health care facilities. • One person asked whether the development could be reduced to be of a more proportionate size of the current village. • It was suggested that more affordable housing should be provided, for young people to remain in the village and facilities (e.g. the school) to have sufficient funding in order to expand to meet new demand.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy mentions walking and driving but not cycling, racks should be provided by default. • One representee was concerned that the condition stating that finance is available is not strong enough. Education facilities are critical for future expansion - would like the condition to be subject to a robust plan being submitted that demonstrates how local facilities will be expanded and one that has been agree in principle with local schools and LEA. • Several individuals suggested that the development as proposed is too large for the village to support, a smaller development or extension of ST15 would be preferable. Building any houses would necessitate: expansion of primary school facilities, expansion of health services, improvement of drainage and sewerage system, vastly improved bus services and the creation of a cycle route into York. • The proposed site at Station Yard is best option, though 147 buildings is too much and local traffic, schooling and doctors would struggle.
<p>Boundary change Submitted No Alternative boundary proposed</p>	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS19 : Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35)

Following the Defence Infrastructure Organisation's ~~disposure~~ disposal of the site by 2021, Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35) will deliver ~~578~~ 500 dwellings at this rural development site. Development is anticipated to commence in 2023. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

~~i. The mitigation hierarchy should be followed to ensure no net loss of biodiversity; where possible development should deliver biodiversity gain. Development will only be allowed where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse impact, alone or in combination, upon the integrity of Strensall Common SAC and SSSI. Address the impacts on biodiversity within the site and zone of influence by following a mitigation hierarchy with the overall aim to prevent harm to existing biodiversity assets, delivering no net loss for biodiversity and maximise further benefits for biodiversity. Where required compensatory measures should take full account of the extent and quality of the asset being lost or damaged and equivalent or enhanced habitats should be provided.~~

ii. Take full account of the extent and quality of ecological interest on Strensall Common through the:

~~□ preparation of a comprehensive evidence base to support the required Habitat Regulations Assessment and other assessments to be able to fully understand and avoid, mitigate or compensate impacts.; and~~

~~Xx. To help deliver this, a detailed Visitor Impact Mitigation Strategy must be prepared, which will be informed by comprehensive and repeatable visitor surveys (to be repeated as necessary). The Strategy will identify effective measures which will encourage both the use of alternative sites instead of Strensall Common and less damaging visitor behaviour on the Common. This will include (but not be limited to) the following measures:~~

- ~~• Within the site divert new users away from the SAC by;

 - ~~○ Providing natural green space within the site boundary attractive to a range of users, particularly dog walkers,~~
 - ~~○ The provision of a circular walk within the site,~~
 - ~~○ Ensuring no access throughout the life of the development either by vehicle, cycle or foot to adjoining land on the north, south and eastern site boundary, and~~
 - ~~○ Providing publicity, education and awareness to support these aims.~~~~
- ~~• On Strensall Common ensure suitable behaviour by visitors by;

 - ~~○ Implementing actions to manage recreational pressure at points of arrival, by type of activity and location of activity on site,~~
 - ~~○ Ongoing monitoring that will specifically lead to the implementation of prompt remedial measures such as the closure of access points etc if adverse effects are identified,~~~~

o Publicity, education and awareness

~~□ provision and maintenance of a detailed site wide recreation and access strategy to minimise impacts from development to be retained and monitored in perpetuity. A full understanding of the proposed recreational routes is required at an early stage. A mitigation hierarchy should be followed to first seek to avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts, or compensate unavoidable residual impacts on Strensall Common SAC/SSSI.~~

iii. Ensure all ecological avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures are fully operational and functioning ~~Deliver ecological mitigation and compensation measures~~ prior to commencement of any development. Measures must be supported by a long term management plan ~~and be retained and monitored in perpetuity which includes ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.~~

iv. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

v. ~~Address the significance of the site's historic environment, consulting relevant bodies. The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused~~

vi. Be of a high design standard, ensuring the development has a distinct identity from Strensall village and not be just a continuation of the existing development. The site should have its own identity and character that in its layout and spaces, reflects the site's long use as a barracks, its landscape context ~~identity and character that reflects the quality of the spacious site, its landscape context,~~ and the natural site assets ~~, alongside the site's previous military use.~~

vii. Retain all identified good quality trees, with appropriate distance to tree canopy, unless they pose an unreasonable restriction on development and their contribution to the public amenity and amenity of the development is very limited, and their loss is outweighed by the benefits and mitigation provided by the development.

viii. Undertake an archaeological evaluation consisting of geophysical survey and excavation of trenches to identify the presence and assess the significances of archaeological deposits.

ix. Prepare a Flood Risk Assessment and full drainage strategy, alongside further work regarding drainage of the site. ~~The strategy should be developed in conjunction with the Council and required statutory bodies and should ensure that the development will not exacerbate any existing issues with surface water and drainage~~ Hydrological studies that explore surface and sub-surface characteristics of the local hydrological regime would be required to identify the impact on the wet heath communities of Strensall Common SAC/SSSI and identify mitigation measures where ~~possible~~ required. Any hydrology plan/study also needs to consider impacts on water ~~-~~logged archaeological deposits.

x. ~~Retain and enhance recreation and open space for community use to reduce the impact on the adjacent Strensall Common SAC/SSSI through recreational pressure.~~

Increase the area and quality of open space within any proposed development beyond that found at present in order to reduce the impact of recreational pressure on Strensall Common SSSI/SAC'

xi. Create new local facilities as required to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development.

xii. Deliver sufficient education provision, including a new primary school, to meet the demand arising from the development. Further detailed assessments and associated viability work will be required.

~~xiii. Take account of impacts on Strensall Common when exploring potential access points into the development. Accessing the site via Scott Moncrieff Road to the north would involve upgrading a road which currently crosses the SSSI and SAC. Linking the Queen Elizabeth Barracks to the Towthorpe Lines site (ST36) would introduce increased traffic to the edge of the designations. This would not be supported~~

xiv. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with sites ST7, ST8, ST9, ST14 and ST15 should be addressed.

xv. Give further consideration to road safety at the Strensall Road/Towthorpe Moor Lane, in addition to the use of Towthorpe Moor Lane by through traffic. If identified as necessary, mitigation to Strensall Road/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction, will be required.

xvi. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site, and connectivity to the city and surrounding area, creating well-connected internal streets and walkable neighbourhoods, to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling). Cycle paths will need to be provided along the site frontages connecting into the site and also focus upon the route into the village and local facilities.

xvii. Undertake detailed noise and contamination assessments, including detailed assessment of the current and future use of the military training area adjacent to the site.

Supporting Text Changes:

Amendment to para 3.77 to remove reference to Historic England's pre-app advice to reflect consultation comment.

Amendments to para 3.81 to reflect requirement for full drainage strategy as per policy amendment.

~~"...Given the scale of the site, a full Flood Risk Assessment and full Drainage Strategy will be needed and further work needs to be done regarding drainage of the site..."~~

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amendments made to reflect consultation comments in relation to the heritage assets, design and the requirement for the site to undertake a full drainage assessment in conjunction with the Council and required statutory bodies.


Policy amendments have been made in relation to biodiversity and openspace to reflect the mitigation proposed and required in the emerging Habitat Regulation Assessment.

Following ongoing assessment as part of the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) there is a proposed change to housing number to reflect a 50:50 development ratio to enable the delivery of on-site openspace requirements to mitigate impacts on Strensall Common SAC.

Allocation Queen Elizabeth Barracks ST35

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	28.8ha	No change
Estimated Yield	578	500 (50% at 35 dph)
Phasing	Medium to long term (6-15 years)	No change

Pre- Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change			
<p>No change to boundary proposed. Proposals map to be updated to include a new Openspace buffer to Strensall Common.</p> <p>Change to housing number to reflect a 50:50 development ratio to enable the delivery of on-site requirements to mitigate impacts on Strensall Common SAC.</p>			
Consultation Responses			
Total no of respondents: 68 no.	Supports: 9 no.	Objections: 31 no.	Comments: 34 no.
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England confirms that transport issues are covered satisfactorily in key principle xiv). The Transport Assessment will need to address the additional traffic generated by the development seeking to use Towthorpe Moor Lane to access the A64. When the scheme to upgrade the A64 in the vicinity of Hopgrove is brought forward in the future roads period, it may be possible to include design measures to mitigate this impact should the associated timescales fit. Along with a number of other residents, Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council, whilst regretting the Government's decision to close Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks (and Towthorpe Lines), supports the inclusion of the sites in the Plan as logical; the allocation is broadly supported. It is considered that 578 dwellings is more realistic than the 850 which had previously been informally mentioned. The development of this site as soon as the Army vacates it to prevent dereliction would be supported. GVA on behalf of DIO (MOD) Estates supports the site coming forward for residential use. The disposal announcement provides a high degree of certainty of the sites availability for development; the site will be available from 2021. Technical evidence submitted in March 2017 underpins current allocation but further technical assessment of physical and policy constraints is ongoing which will inform masterplanning. Development of this site supports the Government's agenda for the development of previously developed land. Location adjacent to Strensall Road, considered to be a high frequency transport routes, also means that the site could incorporate higher densities than assumed allocation. Potential cycle and pedestrian links only from the site via Scot Monteith Road. Existing accesses and leisure facilities will be used. Particular attention will be given to Strensall Common adjacent. <i>Note objection re site capacity below.</i> CPRE - Inclusion of MOD site at Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall and Imphal Barracks are welcomed and supported provided they are master planned appropriately incorporating sustainable travel opportunities and any ecological and biodiversity constraints carefully identified, assessed and mitigated accordingly. These sites safeguard against potential further green belt releases. 		

	<p>Additional comments raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upgrading of the junctions from Strensall and Flaxton onto the A64 must take place so that traffic (both during construction and occupation) can be directed away from Strensall. Using the current road that links to the ring road (A1237) will only add further congestion. • New installations to deal with waste water and sewage must be provided as current provision is inadequate. • There are already major problems with parking in Strensall, new shops will be needed. • Improvements in bus services will be required, as will a cycle path to reduce the danger of travel into York by bike. • Potential for the scheme to deliver a new model settlement • Consideration could be given to providing a new village centre to the front of the development – village green, new school and amenities. • Reiterating previous comments made in the 2016 consultation: pleased at the reduction in green belt land being used and prioritisation of brownfield land. Particularly pleased at the removal of previously proposed sites for Strensall and Earswick.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Whilst NE support the inclusion of a bespoke policy, they have concerns relating to mitigation for the adjacent Strensall Common SAC. Given that further assessment is identified as being required with regards to the HRA, it is not considered that this site is likely to be deliverable which may affect the soundness of the plan. Advise that, should further HRA or other assessment suggest that this site is deliverable without adverse impact on the integrity of Strensall Common SAC, the requirements of SS19 should be updated in light of these findings. Keen to see detailed masterplanning detailing how urban edge and recreational pressures can be avoided. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust objects to the allocation due to the lack of detail as to what the impacts are likely on the Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Concern over the increase of domestic pets and visitors on the Common. There are protected species on the Common. Hydrological impacts a concern. Raising or lowering the water table could affect the Common. The Trust supports the suggested policies to protect the SAC but not confident that there is enough information to make sure the impacts can be prevented. Alternative open space must be made available. They raise concerns that the plan could be found unsound without a final HRA screening showing no Likely Significant Effects, particularly in regard to site ST35 . • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) – whilst supporting the allocation, it is considered that ST35 could have potentially a

higher yield than allocated. Currently it is suggested that the site and Policy SS19 should allocate for a minimum of 588 dwellings. Site capacity will be reviewed in line with ongoing technical assessments of relevant physical and policy constraints. Also consider that H59 should form part of the overall strategic allocation to enable comprehensive approach to site delivery. Further, an alternative boundary is proposed to include part of the site currently excluded and within the Green Belt; a site plan is provided. It is considered that currently the boundary is illogical and the amendment would fit national policy regarding green belts creating a clear and defensible boundary to the site. It is not considered that this parcel contributes to the Green Belt. Further suggested policy changes include:

- Criteria i - assumes impact where there may be none and therefore should read "*assess potential impacts and minimise effects by...*"
- Criteria ii - "in perpetuity" is a significant commitment and should be removed at all points from policy. Revised proposed recreational routes to "*understanding of proposed access routes*". Clarity is required to ensure that ecological mitigation and compensation measures relate to potential measures specific to the site and not Strensall Common SAC. Also wonder if the mitigation can be delivered prior to commencement of development.
- Criterion x - Existing openspace will contribute to provision but is not identified in Open spaces study update (2017)
- Consider that the supporting text to policy should not include reference to external advice from Historic England. Also that reference to archaeological assessment should be in support of a planning application.
- PB Planning obo Barratt and David Wilson Homes - concerned with inclusion of ST35 in relation to when and if the development comes forward. Unless uncertainty is resolved the quantum of homes on this site should be over and above the housing allocation identified. If not, possibility that Council will fail to demonstrate sufficient number of deliverable housing sites.
- Johnson Mowat obo KCS Development Ltd/Vernon and Co/Yorvik Homes/ Redrow Homes and landowner/Linden Homes. - site is owned by MOD and is still operational. Whilst the MOD has expressed an intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate nor certain. There are significant challenges related to the SSSI which will affect the site's viability.
- Turley representing Gallagher Estates - The Plan proposes the allocation of two existing Ministry of Defence sites located at Queen Elizabeth Barracks and Imphal Barracks. Until these sites are fully vacated by their existing users, they cannot be considered to be available. Relying on such sites to deliver the plan's housing

requirements presents a significant risk insofar as there is also a prospect of the current operator deciding to retain its ownership and operation of the sites. This issue arose in respect of joint Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester Core Strategy where the plan proposed the allocation of the Ministry of Defence's site at Ashchurch for 2,726 residential dwellings. During the Core Strategy Examination, the Ministry of Defence wrote to the Examination Inspector confirming its intention to retain a significant presence on the site, reducing the amount of housing it could accommodate to 550 units. This is not to say that these sites should not be treated as part of the potential supply of housing land, rather their inclusion and the extent to which they are relied upon to meet the City's housing requirements should be approached with caution.

- York Green Party have serious concerns about impacts on Strensall Common.
- York Environment Forum does not consider this site should be included as an allocation as release dates are problematic and subject to government policy changes.
- York TUC objects to the allocation of the use of the Army Barracks in the Plan for housing needs. The Plan should stick to the Council's policy to oppose the closure and protect around 1600 existing jobs.

Other objections raised include:

- Impact on green belt
- Site access - safety on the access road to the works which is narrow and single track, and used as a public footpath which leads to a wildlife reserve and Strensall Common. Principal access to site should be from Towthorpe Moor Lane not Strensall Road.
- Severe traffic congestion and parking problems will worsen
- Impact on the adjacent SSSI
- sewerage system will struggle.. Road infrastructure should be improved prior to commencement of development;
- failure to take responsibility for snickets and areas left by builders,
- lack of amenities/services (library, overcrowded schools and poor public transport are mentioned)
- little local employment, causing people to travel out from Haxby to work;
- poor affordability and lack of appropriate housing mix - Strensall has a high proportion of elderly residents and young people who find difficulty getting suitable housing. The cost to developers on brownfield sites will not make it viable and therefore the likelihood of affordable housing (40%) not

	<p>deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues with ORR (A1237) - without dualling the northern ring road and providing further access roads to the ringroad, plans north of Haxby will simply result in gridlock/congestion/pollution • respect to historical ridge and furrow medieval fields of Crooklands lane. • Walbutts treatment works at Strensall is already at full capacity and having issues with discharging pollutants into the River Foss.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail has no objections to the principle of the allocation however a transport assessment should support the application that looks at any likely increase in the use of the level crossing in Strensall • Historic England has no objection to the principle of development, however the site is part of long military associations with the City. Policy must ensure the significance of the area, of any buildings and open spaces on site would influence proposed new development. Suggests alternative wording as follows re policy SS19, criterion v: <i>"The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused;</i> Policy SS19, criterion vi: <i>"...identity and character that in its layout and spaces, reflects the site's long use as a barracks, its landscape context..."</i> • Earswick Parish Council notes that the proposed development of the army barracks at Strensall would inevitably lead to a considerable increase in the volume of traffic passing through Earswick village. The Parish Council are prepared to work closely with the City of York Council and potential developers to identify measures to mitigate against any such increase in traffic flows. • Julian Sturdy MP recognises the potential benefits of this large predominantly brownfield site in helping to meet York's future housing need, but that these benefits will only pay dividends if the necessary facilities and infrastructure can be secured. Further issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • notes that population growth in Strensall and the surrounding area over the past few decades has not been supported by significant improvements to road infrastructure and local facilities. This is extremely important to consider in the context of the proposed 578 dwellings at the site. Residents concerns about uncreased traffic on Strensall Road at the Towthorpe junction must be considered when deciding on access to the development. Scott Moncrieff Road is being considered as a major access point tom the development. This would likely create further traffic issues in Strensall given the scale of the

	<p>site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the proposal for a new primary school , to support residents of the development. • Key principle ix indicates 'further work regarding drainage of the site'. He expects extensive investigatory work to take place into the potential impact of the additional 578 properties at Site ST35 on the drainage system at Walbutts Farm, and appropriate action taken. • Local amenity must be protected, particularly the mature trees from the Strensall Road and Towthorpe junction into the village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (and other residents writing in support of their views) make a number of suggested comments/alterations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • request urgent site visit between CYC, the MOD and Historic England re safeguarding buildings worthy of preservation; • The steering group would like to see a master plan produced for the site as soon as possible. This requirement should be included in policy SS19. • Site ST35 and the explanations 3.77 and 3.83 are broadly supported with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clause 'xiii' - minimal effect of upgrading the existing highway between the barracks and Towthorpe Moor Lane would provide an alternate route from the development to the A64 at Hazelbush crossroads. Take issue with the implication that Towthorpe Moor Lane should not be the principal route for access & egress from the A64. Consider it to be essential to prevent further congestion on Strensall Road and the A1237. A major junction improvement at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction is absolutely necessary to the success of this development - this is to allow traffic from Strensall Rd to access the A64 quickly and safely without using the A1237 junction - and to reduce the risk of further accidents. Agree that no access to the site should be from the northern section of Scott Moncrief Rd (the first 2 sentences of clause 'xiii' are supported, to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC). Does not agree with officers suggestion that the southern area of Scott Moncrief Rd, connecting the Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks site to Towthorpe Lines should not be improved. The access being taken off the northern part of Scott Moncrief Rd is strongly opposed (to protect the amenity of Strensall Common SSSI/SAC). - clause ix' does not fully address the issues concerning foul sewage and the obsolescence of the existing Severn Trent facility. • The intention to fully protect Strensall Common SSSI/SAC is
--	---

supported & a full Ecological Assessment to be carried out first (Clauses 'i-iii' are supported, as these are critical in protecting the SSSI/SAC).

- Clause 'vii' (retain as many trees as possible) is supported.
- Clause x refers to open space available within the barracks site and the steering group are aware that there are insufficient sports facilities within the parish and would like to see the existing facilities retained and enhanced. The high proportion of public open space on the site (40%) is welcomed - to protect the current open feel of the site and provide much needed play/leisure areas in the village.
- The intention to allocate a new school is supported (an existing building on site may be suitable for conversion to a school) and more retail on site is also supported - Clause 'xi/xii' are supported to achieve these aims.
- Support clause xiv as all the quoted developments will mean increased road traffic, although it does not specifically address the need to address potential issues at the A64/Towthorpe Moor Lane junction.
- Support clause xv as there have been a number of collisions at this junction.
- The existing cycle link to the City is unsafe and a dedicated off road cycle track is requested, which runs along Strensall Road, using developer contributions (Clause 'xvi' is supported);
- Support clause xvii as the noise from the firing range is very noticeable throughout the parish.
- The retention of the Military identity is welcomed (inc screening existing buildings to see if worth designating & retaining - para 3.77 & 3.78). The conversion of some buildings to a care home or hotel may be suitable.
- The suggestion that a completely new drainage system is required is supported.
- Future management of Strensall Common must be confirmed before any development is permitted. Parliament will need to amend or repeal the Strensall Common Act 1884 before any development takes place (it may also be necessary to ensure that the development limit of 250 acres is not exceeded, unless the Act is amended).

- Strensall Ward Cllr Paul Doughty notes the significant growth in Strensall in the past 25 years, and the implications of this on village facilities/infrastructure. Whilst accepting of the use of pre-

developed land in preference to green belt, he raises the following concerns:

- The main village street becomes extremely congested and more traffic would be unsustainable. Access to the site from Towthorpe Moor Lane to mitigate some traffic away from the village;
- There is much concern that Scott Moncrieff Road would be used as the main access point to the QEB development. This is not a solution and would force more traffic through Strensall and down Ox Carr Lane.
- The draft plan indicates there may be a potential rail halt in Haxby - there may be value in providing a P&R style rail halt between Haxby and Strensall which may alleviate parking issues in the villages and encourage a viable bus service. There are no major employers in the village so car borne commuting is inevitable.
- Compensatory amenity provision is required: assuming the site is adopted a second primary school is imperative; supporting facilities including grocers/cafe/open space, sports facilities, appropriate drainage and sewerage; It is essential a safe cycle path to link Strensall through Earswick to Huntington is also provided.
- affordable housing at an appropriate percentage of new homes;

The Education and Skills Funding Agency acknowledges the need for additional school places at the site; its proposals for forward funding schools in large residential developments may be of interest.

Johnson Mowat obo Taylor Wimpey - the site will face challenges in coming forward such as the SSSI. Considering the ecology and provision of a school/shop will impact on viability of the site.

Other comments received include:


- Sites are not yet available for development/deliverable (PB Planning obo landowner)
- Potential to link the site to the railway/new station?
- Queries stated delivery of affordable homes
- Necessary improvements to Strensall Road, including the potential to change crossroads at Strensall to York Road at Towthorpe to a roundabout to combat traffic;
- Provision of an off-road cycle path along Strensall Road from Strensall to the A1237 Ring Road would be of great benefit to this site and adjacent settlements, and installation of such a route should also incorporate appropriate pedestrian / cycle

- underpass at that roundabout.
- Infrastructure capacity concerns: schools, drainage, sewerage, traffic
- Loss of village feel
- Strensall Common's conservation should be a priority
- The Council should be petitioning to save the site rather than planning housing on it
- St Mary's Church, Strensall note that the document does not refer to the specific use of St Wilfred's Church, which is a community asset in Strensall and should remain as such. It should be possible to liaise with the army to secure its future use as a church / community asset

Boundary change Submitted

GVA obo DIO Estates (MOD) ID12655:

An alternative boundary is proposed to include part of the site currently excluded and within the Green Belt; a site plan is provided. It is considered that currently the boundary is illogical and the amendment would fit national policy regarding green belts creating a clear and defensible boundary to the site. It is not considered that this parcel contributes to the Green Belt.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS20: Imphal Barracks

Following the Defence Infrastructure Organisation's disposal of the site by 2031 Imphal Barracks (ST36) will deliver 769 dwellings at this urban development site. Development is not anticipated to commence until the end of the plan period. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles:

- i. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. There are existing issues with traffic congestion in this area. The base traffic situation on the A19 is that it is at or exceeding capacity in the vicinity of Heslington Lane/Broadway. The potential transport implications of the site must be fully assessed both individually and cumulatively with site's ST5 and ST15.
- ii. Deliver a sustainable housing mix in accordance with the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- iii. The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural and historic interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused.;
- iv. The parade ground and other open area which are important to the understanding of the site and its buildings should be retained as open spaces in any development;
- v. If following the City Council's review of the architectural and historic interest of this site, Imphal Barracks is included within the Fulford Road Conservation Area, development proposals would be required to preserve or enhance those elements which have been identified as making a positive contribution to its significance. Address the significance of the site's historic environment, consulting relevant bodies. This includes conserving and enhancing the special character and/or appearance of the adjacent Fulford Road Conservation Area.
- vi. Be of a high design standard, ensuring the development reflects the history of the site and its previous military use. This site does not exist as an army barracks in isolation and has linkages to other military sites across the city and is linked to the development of York as a garrison town and this history should be reflected in the design of any scheme.
- vii. Undertake an archaeological evaluation consisting of geophysical survey and excavation of trenches to identify the presence and assess the significances of archaeological deposits.
- viii. Retain all identified good quality trees, with appropriate distance to tree canopy, unless they pose an unreasonable restriction on development and their contribution to the public amenity and amenity of the development is very limited, and their loss is outweighed by the benefits and mitigation provided by the development.
- ix. Consider in detail the proximity and relationship of the site with Walmgate Stray, including undertaking further hydrological work to assess the potential impact of development on the Stray and to the value of the grassland, and to explore any water logged archaeological deposits. Recreational disturbance/pressure on the Stray and the Tillmire SSSI (individual and

cumulative effects) should be considered.

- viii. Improve connectivity to the existing draining network. There is pressure on this site and the area in general at present in terms of drainage. It would be preferable to go back to base principles in designing a new drainage system for the site and avoid using the existing historical systems that are currently in place. The site would benefit from a comprehensive modern SuDS scheme.
- ix. Create new local facilities as required to meet the needs of future occupiers of the development.
- xii. Retain and enhance recreation and open space for community use to mitigate any potential impacts on the adjacent Walmgate Stray.
- xiii. Deliver sufficient education provision to meet the demand arising from the development. Further detailed assessments and associated viability work will be required.

Supporting Text Changes:

Amendment to para 3.89 to support criteria 1 of the policy in relation to sustainable transport..

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy changes to reflect comments received in relation to recognising the heritage assets and value of the site.

Allocation Imphal Barracks ST36

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	18 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	769 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Post Plan period (years 16-21)	No change

Pre-Publication Boundary




Summary of Reasons for Boundary Change			
No boundary change proposed			
Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 44	Supports: 7	Objections: 28	Comments: 15
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England states that the transport issues are covered well, which need careful consideration due to congestion of very busy roads in area (Fulford Road, A19, A64). Need sustainable options. • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust support protection of Walmgate Stray and ensuring future grazing of grassland. • Suggests additional transport links and improved cycle and pedestrian tracks. • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) supports site for residential use, with open space. Careful design an enhanced landscaping on the eastern boundary will mitigate any impact upon Walmgate Stray. • Need for quality affordable housing in York. • Supports use of brownfield sites. • Close to city centre. • Ecological and biodiversity constraints need top be considered. • CPRE - North Yorkshire supports site. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish council suggests the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Criterion i) should be reworded so that the developer must demonstrate that all transport issues have been resolved and not just addressed so the impacts on the local highway network are not severe. 2) Criterion iii) should be strengthened so that the significant features of the site's historic environment are retained and enhanced. 3) Criterion x) should be strengthened to ensure that existing recreational facilities and areas of open space are retained and made available for community use including the playing fields adjacent to Walmgate Stray. 4) A new criterion should be added which would ensure that the environmental impacts associated with the traffic generation of the proposal are fully addressed and mitigated. • York Travellers Trust highlight that Policy H5 states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsy and Travellers, this is not mentioned in this sites policy. • York Green Party objects to the site due to proximity to Walmgate Stray and Conservation area. There will be a negative impact on the stray due to increased dog walkers. No clear mitigation is mentioned. • Should be identified as mixed use to reflect its current employment and provide accommodation for army personnel. • New development should look at sustainable travel options due 		

	<p>to A19 being above capacity and it being a AQMA – suggests a long term strategy for public transport and rail links.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about traffic on Fulford Road. • Concerned about safety of children walking and cycling to school. • Loss of architectural heritage. Site should remain army barracks due to being a strategic site since roman times. • Several developers state that although the MOD have expressed intention to dispose of site, it is not immediate or certain, so development won't begin till 2033. Will fail to deliver houses in the planning period. • A respondent states that 769 units underestimates potential yield on site. • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) argue that the Habitat Regulation Assessment is wrong – Walmgate Stray is not a SAC or SSSI and therefore not subject to HRA. • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) suggests extending site to proposed alternative site where the green belt to the east is included, which would ensure an enduring green belt boundary. • Disagrees that site is sustainable due to reduced accessibility to public transport, and not being near any large supermarkets.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England suggests policy wording: deleted Policy SS2-, criterion iii, and replace with: "<i>The development of this area must be informed by an assessment of architectural and historic interest of the site and its buildings. Those buildings which are considered to be of historic interest should be retained and reused.</i>"; iv "<i>The parade ground and other open area which are important to the understanding of the site and its buildings should be retained as open spaces in any development.</i>"; v "<i>If, following the City Council's review of the architectural and historic interest of this site, Imphal Barracks is included within the Fulford Road Conservation Area, development proposals would be required to preserve or enhance those elements which have been identified as making a positive contribution to its significance.</i>" • Highways England highlight the potential transport impact of site on the SRN. • Suggest part of sit should be car free with enhanced cycle and pedestrian connections to city. • Fulford Conservation Area's boundaries may reconsider to include this area. • Design should reflect local military history and be in keeping with the conservation area and Walmgate Stray. • Julian Sturdy MP states that the benefits of brownfield sites will only pay dividends if the necessary facilities and infrastructure can be secured. • Cycle track across Walmgate Stray should be brought round to join Fulford Road South.

- GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) state that existing openspace will contribute to provision but is not identified in Openspaces study update (2017).
- Site should be saved for historical importance.
- PB Planning on behalf of a landowner argue that the delayed time in selling of the site will mean the short term need for housing will not be satisfied.
- Should have a mix of housing on site so residents do not have to travel for work, shopping and leisure, otherwise unemployment may increase.
- Efforts to preserve green space and trees appreciated.

Boundary change Submitted

GVA obo DIO Estates (MOD) ID12655- An alternative boundary (previously submitted at Preferred sites consultation) is proposed to include part of the site currently excluded and within the Green Belt to the east; a site plan is provided. It is considered that a revision to the boundary to extend the site would facilitate an enduring Green Belt boundary enduring beyond the plan period. It is considered that this parcel makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS21: Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park

Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (ST26) will provide 25,08033,000 sqm of B1b, B1c, B2/B8 employment floorspace for research and development, light industrial/storage and distribution. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Undertake detailed ecological assessment to manage and mitigate potential impacts. The site is adjacent to two Sites of Local Interest and designated and candidate Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and surveys have indicated there may be ecological interest around the site itself. The site is also within the River Derwent SSSI risk assessment zone.
- ii. Retain and enhance historic field boundaries where possible and reflect in the masterplanning of the site.
- iii. Provide appropriate landscaping/screening to assist in mitigation against the erosion of the existing semi-rural setting of the airfield.
- iv. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. Impacts on Elvington Lane and Elvington Lane/A1079 and A1079/A64 Grimston Bar junctions will need to be mitigated.
- v. Further explore air quality, noise and light pollution and contamination issues.
- vi. Investigate further archaeological deposits on and around the site.
- vii. Address further surface water drainage issues due to the presence of aquifers, dykes and becks in the surrounding area.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Amendment to reflect proposed boundary change and updated employment floorspace proposed.

Allocation: Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (ST26)

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	25,080sqm / 7.6ha	15 ha (approximately 10ha net) / 33,000 sqm
Estimated Yield	N/A	N/A
Phasing	N/A	N/A

Potential Allocation Boundary

Site Ref: 97



Pre-Publication Boundary

Site Ref: 948



Summary of Reasons for Change

Based upon the consultation responses and previous technical evidence submitted, a boundary change to expand the site allocation is proposed.

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 30	Supports: 10	Objections: 14	Comments: 9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Julian Sturdy MP supports B1 and B8 units for light industry as they reflect the rural nature of nearby villages. Elvington Parish Council support the extension proposed but stress the need for detailed archaeological and ecological assessments. Wheldrake Ward Councillor (Cllr Mercer) largely supports development, echoes Elvington Parish Council comments. William Birch & Sons support allocation of land for employment in this location. Six members of the public support the development as it will bring jobs to the area but for half this support was conditional upon a 7.5 tonne weight limit being imposed on Main Street. Others mentioned the importance of B1/B8 restrictions and protecting wildlife in the context of their support. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of the objections from members of the public are related to HGV traffic (thirteen) due to impacts on quality of life, road safety, congestion and pollution. One mentions shortage of school places and another also mentions protecting habitats for wildlife. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William Birch & Sons support expansion of ST26 with an alternative boundary previously submitted to help meet future employment demand. • William Birch & Sons comment on many of the criteria in policy SS21, re criteria ii – there are no historic field boundaries within the site allocation, especially given changes that have been made in the last 20 years. This should be removed, criteria iii, undertaking landscape work to mitigate visual impact is more appropriate. Criterion iv – fundamentally misunderstands the volume and nature of the traffic to be generated as this will be flowing in the opposite direction to peak morning flows. Asks what work is being done to consider cumulative impacts and co-ordinate all junction improvements. Criterion v – this needs to appreciate the nature of existing businesses and those likely to occupy the expansion, they are attracted by the location’s access to the highways network and the lack of sensitive receptors in the immediate area meaning they are able to operate unconstrained (in terms of light and noise pollution) 24/7. It is therefore concerning that criterion v suggests there may be restrictions in future that would make the Business Park unattractive to exactly the type of businesses it wishes to attract. Unclear as to why reference is made to air quality and there is no commentary within the explanation to aid understanding. Any emissions from development would be the subject of a license or permit from either the Council or Environment Agency to ensure they are within reasonable limits, so do not understand the need for any additional consideration. Regarding criterion vii, preliminary investigations and design of a drainage system have been undertaken; the intention is to direct surface water towards the south and the River Derwent. This is instead of taking drainage north through the village of Elvington. It is therefore considered that surface water drainage can be addressed satisfactorily and is not an issue. Technical, environmental and landscape information submitted previously establishes how the land is suitable, available and developable.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Power Grid stress there may be need for network reinforcement for connections to the site but there is not enough detail provided at this stage in the planning process. Recommends developers submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid as soon as they have detail of site location and electrical capacity requirements so a quote for the connection can be provided along with details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. • Elvington Parish Council stress that units should be small, high value businesses consistent with a restriction to B1 and B8 use, as at present, and in line with CYC's economic strategy. A gap should be made between the existing and new estates to allow for a wildlife corridor. The Parish Council’s support is conditional on the imposition of a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Main Street. • Kexby Parish Council stress HGVs should not be permitted to

access the B1228, as the road is unsuitable. HGVs should access the A64 via the proposed link road and onto the A1079, rather than using the B1228 to access the A1079.

- Highways England would not expect development to have a substantial individual impact on the A64 but expect it to combine with other strategic sites to have a cumulative impact on the operation of the A64, A166 and A1079 at Grimston Bar.
- William Birch & Sons believe the site has capacity beyond the current allocation under policy SS21.
- Julian Sturdy MP comments that community representatives generally support the extension, but believe an archaeological assessment should take place before development. Due to existing traffic through the village, particularly on Main Street, a weight limit should be considered.
- Four members of the public also commented in support of a weight limit or restriction / diversion of HGV traffic around the village. A majority of these comments also mention the importance of protecting habitats for wildlife.

Boundary change Submitted

Support for the alternative boundary previously submitted through the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) as an expansion to the ST26 allocation.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy SS22: University of York Expansion

University of York Expansion (ST27) will provide ~~21,500sqm of~~ B1b employment floorspace for knowledge based businesses including research-led science park uses and other higher education and related uses (see Policy ED3: Campus East). A development brief will be prepared for ST27, covering site considerations, including landscaping, design, local amenity, accessibility and transport requirements. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Create an appropriately landscaped buffer between the site and the A64 in order to mitigate heritage impacts and to maintain key views to the site from the south and its setting from the A64 to the south and east.
- ii. The developed footprint (buildings, car parking and access roads) shall not exceed 23% of the total site area.
- iii. Enhance and continue the parkland setting of the existing university campus, with new buildings being of a high design standard.
- iv. Provide additional student accommodation, which is clearly evidenced in terms of demand.
- v. Deliver high quality, frequent and accessible public transport services to York City Centre. It is envisaged such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport.
- vi. Optimise pedestrian and cycle integration, connection and accessibility in and out of the site and connectivity to the city and surrounding area to encourage the maximum take-up of these more 'active' forms of transport (walking and cycling).
- vii. Demonstrate that all transport issues have been addressed, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, to ensure sustainable transport provision at the site is achievable. The impacts of the site individually and cumulatively with site ST15 should be addressed.
- viii. Explore providing access through an enhanced road junction on the A64 to the south of the site. There may also be an opportunity for a further restricted/limited southern access to the University off the A64 in conjunction with ST15 (Land West of Elvington Road). Access to the A64 would require approval of Highways England.
- ix. Exploit synergies with ST15 (Land West of Elvington Road) with regard to site servicing including transport, energy and waste.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

Minor amendment to reflect changes made to site capacity in policy EC1.



ST27: University of York expansion

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	21.5 ha	26 ha

Estimated Yield	21,500 sqm of B1b employment floorspace	B1b employment floorspace for knowledge based businesses including research-led science park uses and related uses including up to 25 ha on this site and the existing Heslington East Campus.
------------------------	---	--

Phasing	N/A	N/A
----------------	-----	-----

Potential Allocation Boundary	Pre-Publication Boundary
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------



Summary of Reasons for Change

Based upon the consultation comments and technical evidence submitted, officers propose including a revised boundary (site 954) increasing the allocation to 26 ha in total to provide approximately 26,000 sqm of employment floorspace based on an approximate 10% employment use along with the provision of 3 x 650 bed student colleges and an academic research facility to meet the needs of the University over the plan period.

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 20	Supports: 4	Objections: 11	Comments: 9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England support, transport issues are covered satisfactorily in key principle (vii). HE welcomes the statement in Para. 7.11 that Site ST27 will be accessed via Hull Road via Campus East. HE's agreement in principle to the provision of a new junction on the A64 to serve site ST15 Land West of Elvington Lane is conditional on there being no access from the A64 northwards towards Campus East. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of York support the principle of allocation for expansion primarily for residential colleges, academic buildings, knowledge based businesses and car parking/infrastructure. Support for employment allocation to meet knowledge-led businesses demand. Support for the site to have restrictions in relation to obligations on the university to encourage student living on campus. • Two members of the public expressed support for the allocation, one welcomed development allocation being moved away from the village but still stressed the importance of protecting Heslington from traffic and student thoroughfare.
<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England object as development so close to the A64 will change the relationship the southern edge of York has with surrounding countryside; it will also alter the perception of the setting of York and the relationship to surrounding villages. • Fulford Parish Council object, noting that the costs of expansion (HMOs, parking, congestion etc.) fall disproportionately on local communities in Heslington, Badger Hill and Fulford. The four policies proposed to deal with the university SS22, ED1, ED2 & ED3 should be rationalised as they duplicate each other and set out similar objectives in slightly different ways. Development would bring large-scale development almost completely up to the A64, replicating the type of harm already seen at Clifton Moor. This would conflict with at least three of the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in NPPF paragraph 80. The site of Proposal ST27 was not intended to be developed by the University when it sought planning permission for Heslington East; instead the site was shown as part of the green buffer around the site. The proposed allocation is for “B1b knowledge businesses” rather than to meet any need identified for further university uses which cannot be accommodated on the existing two campuses, no substantial case has been made which demonstrates a need for further land for knowledge-based businesses beyond that allowed by the 2006 Secretary of State permission. Even if there is such a need, FPC considers that sites would not have to be immediately adjacent to the University. If ST27 is retained, the following alterations should be made: 1) Criterion iv) should be altered to omit “which is clearly evidence in terms of demand” as it is ambiguous in meaning. 2) Criterion v) should be strengthened. High quality sustainable transport is vital to reduce congestion on the local road network and impacts on nearby communities. To ensure this, FPC considers the criterion should be reworded as follows: Deliver high quality frequent and accessible public transport to York City Centre and elsewhere including Campus West. Any proposal must demonstrate that such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport. Monitoring and delivery arrangements will be required in a Section 106 Undertaking to ensure that this policy objective is secured in practice. 3) Criterion vii) should be revised so that it applies the

	<p>stronger NPPF paragraph 32 test as follows: Demonstrate that all transport issues have been resolved, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, so that the residual cumulative impacts on the surrounding highway network are not severe. The cumulative impact of the proposal with other proposals to the south-east of York, including ST4 and ST15, should be addressed. 4) Criterion viii) should be either deleted or strengthened. FPC is opposed in principle to a new access onto the A64 because of its harmful impacts on the environment (see below). However if it is to be provided, it is important that ST27 (and the rest of Campus East) makes use of it to benefit local roads. 5) A new criterion should be added so that only businesses linked to the university should be allowed on the site. Otherwise there is a danger that the site is rapidly developed for businesses not genuinely requiring a location adjacent to the university and a case is made in the future for the release of another similar site. FPC suggests the following: Demonstrate that only knowledge-based businesses genuinely requiring a location on or immediately adjacent to the University campus are allowed to occupy premises on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heslington Parish Council object, development will lead to loss of agricultural land and will disrupt the setting of the campus lake and Heslington village. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that: There should be no direct vehicular or pedestrian access from the site, when developed, into the village other than via Field Lane. If access from a new road from ST15 connects with ST27 Campus East then no “rat run” opportunity should be available that allows traffic through to Heslington village. The Local Plan should stipulate that the land can only be developed for the university’s own academic purposes, and not be designated as general development land. All existing public routes and Rights of Way should be retained in any completed development. • University of York’s main objection relates to the policies which strongly support the University’s continued expansion but are not translated into adequate land allocation for expansion. The 14ha of development space proposed for the next 20 years will not provide the security which the university needs for long term planning and therefore will not meet the Council’s own policies on growth of the University and expansion of the York economy. Taking into consideration space planning it is considered that 23.8 ha of developable land are required to 2032/22 and 28 ha to 2038 to allow for green belt permanence (2014 boundary with landscape buffer). Current allocation therefore hinders ability to respond to future requirements and need. The policy should reference knowledge based business in addition to other higher education and related uses. Object to the boundary proposed in 2017 (Option 2 referred to in response) as they consider that this would require an internal buffer to the A64 (5.5ha) and therefore only allow a 14 ha of developable land. This is likely to
--	--

	<p>put pressure on the Green Belt boundaries in the long-term by inadequately allocating land for the University in the long-term; this would meet 50% of development needs. The three alternative boundaries suggested show that there is little difference between the sites in terms of visual effects. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Considered that this would have a weaker relationship to campus given only part developed on the south eastern part of the lake. Western edge includes 2ha of land outside of university control. Would mean smaller scale development with only one area of open space - limited parkland setting. Detailed landscape principles are recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of York object to the disparity between the existing planning permission on campus east for up to 25ha of employment floorspace (likely to be 5.75ha / 57,500 sqm single storey) to 21,500 sqm (equating to 2.33 0 3.16 ha) in policy SS22 and ED3. The policy needs to be altered to clarify that the existing permitted 25 ha of business at 23% footprint on campus East stands plus 21,5000 sqm at the extension. Wording suggested that with agreement of the Council, the University can restrict the B1b provision on Campus East, in order to make equivalent provision on the extension, to a total of 25 ha across both sites. This could facilitate a cluster of knowledge- led businesses taking advantage of A64 location. The contradiction between ED3 and EC1 needs to be clarified to allow the campus extension. • Several members of the public objected, mainly due to the development on green space obstructing or ruining views, disrupting the setting of York and concerns about traffic through Heslington.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England stress that it will be essential for an assessment to be made of the traffic impact of the site both individually and cumulatively with site ST15 in a Transport Assessment. • Northern Power Grid stress there may be need for network reinforcement for connections to the site but there is not enough detail provided at this stage in the planning process. Recommends developers submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid as soon as they have detail of site location and electrical capacity requirements so a quote for the connection can be provided along with details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. • University of York mention the importance of the University to York's economy and detail recent expansion and plans for the future. Changes to government funding have resulted in the university planning more specifically for the future. Key to size are growing departments, growth in international foundation

	<p>programmes for internal students and growing long distance learning. Projected need for the future for student accommodation includes 2 colleges in the short-term and 3 more in the long-term to 2032; extra 3 colleges cannot be accommodated on existing campus. Employment use buildings such as The Catalyst need car parking within close proximity. Access from the A64 in conjunction with ST15 may be attractive for business users. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development as per the Campus East. Confident that car parking across Campus East and the new extension will be accommodated within the existing planning permission as only 27% of maximum of current permission provided. Supportive of connectivity to the A64 alongside ST15. No vehicle access proposed through Heslington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heslington Village Trust movement of the site away from the village is welcome but as with ST15 the village must be protected from both vehicular traffic and students coming through the village. Any new access from ST15 must run closely adjacent to the A64 to minimise harmful impacts on open farmland and views to / from Heslington. • York Ramblers note that at the eastern edge of the site there is an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Esrick. They would appreciate maintaining a green way alongside the site rather than a path along boundary buildings, same applies to Green Lane which leads down to Grange Farm. There should certainly be a green buffer and trees to screen the development somewhat from the A64, agree that the 23% footprint should include car parking and access roads. • Three comments from members of the public are all concerned with access to the site, one supporting direct access to the A64, another asking how traffic through Heslington will be restricted and the final one asking how the site will be accessed from Hull Road.
--	--

Boundary change Submitted


University of York propose three alternate site boundaries:

- Option 1 - 2014 version of 28ha with an external buffer of around 30ha. This would provide 26ha of developable land and negates need for landscape buffer in allocation. Preferred option thought to be most successful to meet the University's needs in the long-term. 2ha remains outside of university control. Likely to have a strong landscape scheme with high quality open parkland setting with wide southern buffer area. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. No impacts on views to Heslington although some panoramic views. Also likely to have strong green belt boundaries along historic field pattern. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting

key to mitigating landscape changes similarly to Campus East. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.



- Option 2 – version in the current plan that above response if referring to.



- Option 3 - 32 ha extending the 2017 allocation further south including a landscape buffer of 7.5ha. This would incorporate a 7.5 ha buffer leaving 22.5 ha of developable land. 2ha remains outside of university control. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Relationship to campus is similar to the current boundary although larger scale development and open parkland setting likely to be accommodated. A major inhibitor would result from the proximity to the A64 and visibility; a considerable buffer/ noise barrier to the A64 would be required providing glimpsed views to campus. The views to Heslington would not be interrupted. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting key to mitigating landscape changes. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.



Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
Policy SS23: Land at Northminster Business Park

Land at Northminster Business Park (ST19) will provide 49,500sqm across the B1, B2, B8 uses based on a split of approximately 40/60 B1a to B2/B8 which is the current ratio at the existing business park. In addition to complying with the policies within this Local Plan, the site must be delivered in accordance with the following key principles.

- i. Provide for a sustainable business park to help meet the city's employment needs, ensuring that its composition reflects the economic vision of York.
- ii. Develop a comprehensive scheme which is linked to the existing business park.
- iii. Provide access to the site via the existing Northminster Business Park entrance to the A59.
- iv. Promote sustainable transport solutions linking the proposed site to the Park & Ride.
- v. Optimise integration, connectivity and access through the provision of new pedestrian, cycle, public transport and vehicular routes to ensure sustainable movement into, out of and through the site. The site is in a sustainable location with access to the Poppleton Bar Park & Ride offering frequent bus routes to the city centre, access to Poppleton Rail Station and vehicular access to the A59.
- vi. Provide a high quality landscape scheme in order to mitigate impacts and screen the development providing an appropriate relationship with the surrounding landscape. Attention should be given to the site's relationship with the countryside to the west of the site, to the southern boundary of the site, with Moor Lane (bridleway) and the village of Knapton.
- vii. Ensure that the residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties is maintained.
- viii. Prepare a desk based archaeological assessment to inform the site masterplan

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A


Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change

Allocation: Land at Northminster Business Park (ST19)

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	N/A	No Change
Estimated Yield	49,500sqm across B1, B2 & B8 use classes	No Change
Phasing	N/A	N/a

Pre-Publication Boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No boundary change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no of respondents: 19		Supports: 2	Objections: 16	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northminster Business Park supports allocation of land to support expansion of the business park for economic activity. Concerned that the council does not intend to safeguard land so commercial development will be constrained in the future due to the lack of available land for businesses outside the green belt. Carter Jonas (on behalf of client) support the designation of this land as a strategic employment land. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee object to expansion of the business park into green belt land. The narrow country lane cannot take more traffic and the conversion of many offices around York indicates that there is no need for additional office space. There is spare land within York Business Park that should be developed before green belt land. Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council recognises that an extension to Northminster Business Park would provide significant job 			


	<p>opportunities but the proposed scale is too large. A smaller expansion like that in PSC 2016 might be acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine members of the public voice strong objections for some or all of the following reasons: 1. The site is directly at odds with the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan. The site is not suitable for expansion beyond its existing boundary. 2. Loss of residential amenity for the residents on Northfields Road. 3. It conflicts with Green Belt policy and harms the Green Belt. 4. It conflicts with Policy GI3: Green Infrastructure Network. Expansion of ST19 would close the crucial green corridor further and allow coalescence. It will affect the local wildlife. 5. Northfields Lane is unsuitable to support traffic for such a major expansion. 6. Additional traffic will be dangerous for both residents and road users. 7. There is no requirement for the expansion as some of the existing business properties appear empty. 8. Loss of grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land.
<p>Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northminster Business Park feel the criteria are too general to provide real guidance at the planning application stage. Criteria only repeats the premise behind the actual allocation of the land which is already stated in the policy. Suggests rewriting for further clarity and to include substance to shape development. No need for criteria 4.5 as the business park is within walking distance of park and ride and new development would be too. 4.7 criteria (v) and (vi) could be simplified to clarify meaning. Also points out that the Business Park has additional capacity beyond the land currently allocated. • Highways England would not expect this to have a substantial individual impact on the operation of the A64 but expect it to combine with the other larger sites around the A1237 to have a significant traffic impact on the A64/A1237 junction west of York • Historic England have no objection to the principle of development provided that, in order to retain separation between the business park and nearby villages, the southern extent of this area should not extend any further south than the existing car park to the south of Redwood House. Without this reduction development would threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which would be just 250m from the southern boundary of the area. • Northern Power Grid note the potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. HV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required. • A member of the public has concerns that extending the Business

Park would lose prime farmland and green belt. Doubling the size of the site will also cause traffic and safety issues on a North End lane, a single road.

Boundary change Submitted

Directions Planning OBO Northminster Ltd

Believe Northminster Business Park has additional capacity beyond the land currently allocated under Policy SS23, and as shown on the Proposals Map. Previous submissions have included an indication of the land available for development that would be suitable to form the next phase of expansion of the business park - happy to discuss the opportunity with the Council further.



Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Boundary Change Proposed – Site has planning permission			
Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 5	Supports: 1	Objections: 2	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autohorn support the allocation for B8 storage use at Whitehall Grange, this is a logical progression following the granting of planning permission for B* storage in April 2017. (Please note that site has been wrongly labelled ST27 on some pdf/paper versions of the proposals map.) 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England object, recommending deletion of the site on the basis that the site forms part of the green wedge that extends into the north of the City, which is centred on Bootham Stray. Although there are a handful of buildings on this site, it is clearly perceived as a part of this open area. The loss of this site and its subsequent redevelopment would result in the considerable narrowing of this wedge and harm one of the key elements identified in the Heritage Topic Paper as contributing to the special character and setting of York. One member of the public objects on the grounds that any development here that was too big would cause the sight line of the Minster from the edge of the ring road to be lost. 		
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England has no particular concern with this site except for its potential to combine with the other larger strategic sites around the A1237 to have an impact on the two junctions of the A1237 with the A64. One member of the public also commented to say they were also concerned about potential traffic on the northern ring road (A1237). 		
Boundary change Submitted			
No alternative boundary proposed			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy EC1: Provision of Employment Land**

Provision for a range of employment uses during the plan period will be made on the following strategic sites (those over 5ha):

Site	SizeFloorspace	Suitable Employment Uses
ST5: York Central	61,000sqm/3.33ha 100,000 sqm	B1a
ST19: Northminster Business Park (15ha)	49,500sqm/ 45ha	B1c, B2 and B8. May also be suitable for an element of B1a.
ST27: University of York	21,500sqm/21.5ha	B1b knowledge based activities including research-led science park uses.
ST26: South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (15 ha)	25,080sqm/7.6ha 33,000 sqm	B1b, B1c, B2 and B8.
ST37: Whitehall Grange, Autohorn, Wigginton Road (10.1 ha)	33,330sqm/ 10.1ha	B8
ST27: University of York (26 ha)	B1b employment floorspace for knowledge based businesses including research-led science park uses and related uses including up to 25 ha on this site and the existing Heslington East Campus.	

York City Centre will remain the focus for main town centre uses (unless identified above). Proposals for main town centre uses for non city centre locations will only be considered acceptable where it can be demonstrated that they would not have a detrimental impact on the city centre's vitality and viability and the sustainable transport principles of the Plan can be met.

Provision for a range of employment uses during the plan period will be made on the following other sites:

Site	SizeFloorspace	Suitable Employment Uses
E8: Wheldrake Industrial Estate (0.45ha)	1,485sqm/ 0.45ha	B1b, B1c, B2 and B8.
E9: Elvington Industrial Estate (1ha)	3,300sqm/ 4ha	B1b, B1c, B2 and B8.
E10: Chessingham Park, Dunnington 0.24 ha)	792sqm/ 0.24ha	B1c, B2 and B8.
E11:Annamine Nurseries. Jockey Lane (1 ha)	3,300sqm/ 4ha	B1a, B1c, B2 and B8.
E16: Poppleton Garden Centre (2.8 ha)	9,240sqm/ 2.8ha	B1c, B2 and B8. May also be suitable for an element of B1a.
E18: Towthorpe Lines, Strensall (4 ha)	13,200sqm/ 4ha	B1c, B2 and B8 uses.

See also Policy SS1, ED3

Supporting Text Changes:			
N/a			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Amendments to policy to reflect consultation comments and technical evidence submitted through consultation. Also reflects changes made to policy SS22.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 19	Supports: 2	Objections: 5	Comments: 14
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homes and Communities Agency is generally supportive of the policy and welcome its inclusion in the Plan. Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership comment that the allocated land for employment will support sustainable economic activity with a focus on allocating enough sites to satisfy demand. They also consider that the methodology used places employment sites where the historic character of the city can be preserved and good transport links provided. Pleased with overall increase in requirement for employment, specifically B1a Office use, and greater use flexibility being applied to a broad range of sites. The reduction in allocation at York Central set against a general increase in requirement for B1a, makes flexibility at other sites of greater importance. Changes to allocations and the flexible approach on use classes applied to sites including those at the University of York, Northminster, and Elvington will help to address some of this. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce and representation from Northminster Business Park as well as other businesses object as they consider that land allocated is insufficient to meet York's future need and will constrain economic growth. This view is given in tandem with support for a higher housing target. Copmanthorpe Parish Council is disappointed to note that the employment land designated in the emerging Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan on New Moor Lane has not been included in the Draft Local Plan. Believe that the provision of local employment is important in reducing number of vehicle journeys and in providing opportunities for employment for local residents. Representation on behalf of the Design Outlet object to the Designer Outlet not being allocated as a Strategic Economic Development site. A member of the public objects due to lack of employment allocations in Haxby. Disconnect between the amount of land allocated for B1a employment use (64k sqm) and the projected demand across the plan period (107k sqm). Also, the majority of the allocated land being contained within one single site with serious risk and 		

	<p>viability concerns (ST5 York Central) undermines the policy, this will not allow flexibility or choice for businesses looking to locate or expand in York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O’Neills state the policy needs to clarify / reference the capacity of Campus East to accommodate up to 25ha of knowledge-led businesses. • William Birch & Sons and Northminster Business Park both stress the need for more employment allocations to match the likely increased housing allocations. • McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet object to the Designer Outlet not being allocated as a Strategic Economic Development site. • Picton Capital objects to the Plan seeking to safeguard existing employment provision at Clifton Moor, this approach is not justified given the CYC evidence base considers office space in Clifton Moor not to meet the quality required by the market. • York Green Party stress that small windfall sites should be considered for employment allocations where they can be demonstrated to meet a local need.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIO Estates (MOD), York Central Partnership and National Railway Museum all stress that the policy defines strategic employment sites as those over 5 hectares, then lists York Central’s employment land area as 3.33ha. Reference to scale of strategic sites required amending or clarification is needed specifically referencing York Central. • Would like an additional sentence stating “small windfall will be considered for employment where they can be demonstrated to meet a local need and not cause adverse impacts”. • Further potential to add flexibility within areas of the city located close to the A64, this would offer opportunity for further commercial development at sites which are well connected to major trunk roads, and can provide opportunity to deliver short to medium term solutions across all use classes. • Wigginton Parish Council comments that there are minimal work opportunities in Wigginton. Future plans must include light industrial opportunities. The future housing should not be for long-distance commuters . • York TUC notes that the cost of housing is already impinging on companies and public services abilities to recruit staff leading also to a major loss of employment sites (especially city centre offices and Clifton Moor Sites) due to the imbalance between housing and employment land values caused by a housing shortage. Also the Governments removal of permitted development rights of offices changing to residential. A policy should be introduced to protect residual offices in the city centre/gain exemption from the relaxed rules at least until high quality offices are provided on York Central. A more generous allocation of York Central land for this purpose should be provided.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy EC2: Loss of Employment Land				
<p>When considering proposals which involve the loss of land and/or buildings which are either identified, currently used or were last used for employment uses, the council will expect developers to provide a statement to the satisfaction of the Council demonstrating that:</p>				
<p>i. the existing land and or buildings are demonstrably not viable in terms of market attractiveness, business operations, condition and/or compatibility with adjacent uses; and</p> <p>ii. the proposal would not lead to the loss of an an deliverable employment site that that is necessary to meet employment needs during the plan period.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
E x p l a n a t i o n				
<p>Inserting text to clarify the evidence required: <i>“When considering the loss of employment land and/or buildings the Council will expect the applicant to provide evidence <u>proportionate to the size of the site, of effective marketing the site/premises for employment uses for a reasonable period of time...</u>”</i></p>				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Minor change to clarify loss of employment land circumstances.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 6		Supports: 1	Objections: 2	Comments: 4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York TUC support policy but also suggest that measure be introduced to protect residual offices in the city centre / gain exemption from the relaxed rules at least until high quality offices are provided on York Central. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picton Capital / Carter Jonas both state the word ‘and’ between the two numbered requirements should be replaced by ‘or’. Picton Capital objects to the plan seeking to safeguard existing employment provision at Clifton Moor. It is considered that this approach is not justified given the CYC evidence base considers office space in Clifton Moor not to meet the quality required by the market. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIO Estates (MOD) state the Policy may be too restrictive as a particular site may not be suitable for employment uses due to local circumstances, particularly around failure to attract suitable employment interest in a site. This should take into account ‘compelling evidence of the local market context’. Carter Jonas comments on how at present the policy covers both existing employment land and buildings and land identified as employment land. Criterion (i) should apply only to the former and criterion (ii) only to the latter. The evidence requirement should be proportionate to the amount of employment land in question - this should be clear in the supporting text Member of the public asks if an article 4 direction will be implemented across the city centre to prevent conversions from office space to residential use. 			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy EC3: Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas			
Proposals for new or to extend or change the use of existing business and industrial premises within residential areas will only be permitted where they will not significantly harm the amenity of the surrounding area.			
Where appropriate, improvements will be sought which enable:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> harmful uses within the site to be relocated further away from residential areas or removed altogether; the appearance of existing buildings to be improved; boundary screening to be provided or improved; and site layout, parking and access to be altered. 			
Planning conditions or legal agreements will be used, to ensure that any improvements are implemented before the new development is brought into use.			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 1	Supports: 0	Objections: 0	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Supports made to this policy. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Businesses within 'residential areas' can sometimes add life and animation to otherwise quiet areas of town. 'Sanitising' urban areas can be harmful. 		

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy EC4: Tourism			
Tourism in York will contribute to a diverse economy. This will be achieved by supporting proposals that relate to the following:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintaining and improving the choice and quality of visitor accommodation to encourage overnight stays, particularly by higher spending visitorsthe improvement of visitor facilities and accommodation, particularly the development of quality 4* and 5 * hotels to encourage overnight and overseas business/ leisure visitors; • new and improved business, conferencing and events facilities particularly in the city centre; • the provision of quality visitor attractions <u>including temporary structures</u> throughout the year especially ones with a national/international profile, in locations which are easily accessible by a variety of transport modes and complement York's existing cultural heritage; • <u>the retention and growth of existing visitor attractions;</u> • <u>maintaining and improving the choice and quality of business, conferencing and events facilities to encourage business visitors;</u> • <u>the enhancement of the built environment and public realm, particularly around access to the river and showcasing York's built heritage;</u> and • the establishment of a more diverse evening economy. 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Amendments made to reflect representations and the Interim Tourism Strategy.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 5	Supports: 3	Objections: 2	Comments: 4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both National Railway Museum and York Central Partnership support the intent of the policy to encourage the provision, retention and growth of existing visitor attractions. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party asks why the focus on 4 and 5 star hotels? Would prefer 'Encourage development of a wide range of accommodation to suit all pockets and thereby encourage overnight stays.' Surely B&Bs are struggling in York and yet retain far more money in the local economy than corporately owned hotels. • York Racecourse object to the policy in its current form, feeling it should be more explicit/flexible in its support for the development of hotels at existing tourism venues, such as the racecourse, who have future aspirations to locate overnight accommodation on site. Amendment to first bullet point suggests policy should place more emphasis on the importance of the Racecourse in the Local Plan, and to supporting its local economic contribution. "...business/ leisure visitors, particularly in the city centre and areas that provide locally significant visitor attractions, such as York Racecourse". Reference to York Racecourse as a 		

	<p>conferencing venue in supporting text does not pay enough attention to its contribution to tourism industry and local economy. Amended wording proposed is: "<i>Uses of international and/or national importance and the buildings and sites that accommodate them will be protected and supported throughout the City of York. Sustainable growth for the benefit of the local area will be encouraged by the enhancement of existing visitor attractions, particularly York Racecourse (and other significant sites as appropriate)</i>". This policy is also in conflict with policy SS2, York's Green Belt, which in its current form would restrict development and change at the racecourse.</p>
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy does not mention nature tourism, this could be promoted and relevant websites given. • National Railway Museum is generally supportive of the policy but consider that it could be enhanced to encourage growth of tourist related functions. Explicit support for the extension and improvement of existing tourist attractions should be included. Bullet point 3 should be amended to state that temporary physical structures related to the visitor attractions will be supported in principle. • York Racecourse makes a significant contribution to the vibrancy of the local area, generating economic, cultural and social benefits to York and broader area. The language of policy EC4 and how it seeks to promote the tourism sector runs counter to the designation of the racecourse in the green belt and therefore restricting its limits on development. Suggests wording to highlight the importance of the racecourse, and the aspirations for the development of a hotel.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy EC5: Rural Economy			
<u>In addition to the allocation in villages in Policy EC1,</u> York's rural economy will be sustained and diversified through:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation through policy EC1 of suitable sites for employment uses in villages. • Supporting appropriate farm and rural diversification activity including office and leisure development (Use Classes B and D). • Permitting camping and caravan sites for holiday and recreational use where proposals can be satisfactorily integrated into the landscape without detriment to its character, are in a location accessible to local facilities and within walking distance of public transport to York, and would not generate significant volumes of traffic. • <u>Attaching a seasonal occupancy condition to permissions for visitor accommodation where it is not suitable for year-round occupation by nature of its location, design or proximity to a habitat that needs extra protection at certain times of the year.</u> • 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
Cross reference to Policy GB1 added to clarify that development in line with this policy still needs to satisfy green belt policy See also Policy EC1 <u>and GB1</u>			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Minor policy amendment to clarify allocations set out in policy EC1.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 8		Supports: 2	Objections: 0
		Comments: 7	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party supports diversification of the rural economy. • Campaign to Protect Rural England welcome the statement that CYC intend to control the development of caravan/chalet style holiday accommodation through occupancy conditions to ensure the tourist industry is supported and that units do not become sole places of residence via policy EC5. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee all stress that the removal of green belt status through farm diversification activities needs to be addressed. Policy needs greater clarification. Inconsistencies between this policy and EC1 and GB1. This concern is also shared by Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant, asks if is it intended that development which is supported by EC5 will not have to pass the test of maintaining the openness of the Green Belt? • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group comment that the policy must be enforced to ensure residential use of such properties is not allowed and properties are 		

	<p>identified for seasonal occupancy only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Farmers Union comments to emphasise the contribution rural businesses make to the city's tourism offering. Diversification into tourism related activities is beneficial to agricultural businesses giving farm income base to be spread resulting in a more viable farm business - such diversification such be supported by the planning system - reuse of existing farm buildings for business and leisure purposes bring jobs to the rural economy.
--	---

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy R1: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach**

The vitality and viability of the city centre, district and local centres and neighbourhood parades will be maintained and enhanced. The existing network will form the focal point for uses, services, and facilities serving the surrounding population. The scale, character and role of the centres defines their position within the hierarchy. The network of centres within the district is as follows:

- York City Centre;
- district centres;
- local centres; and
- neighbourhood parades.

In order to safeguard and enhance the established retail hierarchy any proposals for additional retail provision outside the defined city, district and local centres will be subject to the requirements set out in Policy R4.

Main town centre uses will be directed to the city, district and local centres defined in this policy and in accordance with other Local Plan policies in relation to specific uses.

Proposals for main town centre uses outside a defined city, district or local centre must be subject to an impact assessment where the floorspace of the proposed development exceeds the following thresholds:

- outside York city centre: greater than 1,500 sqm gross floorspace.
- outside a district centre: greater than 500 sqm gross floorspace.
- outside a local centre: greater than 200 sqm gross floorspace.

Advice should be sought from the Council in relation to which defined centre/s the impact is likely to be on, which will be linked to the nature of the proposal and proximity to defined centre/s. Applicants should seek to agree the scope of the impact assessment which should be appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposed development and to identify any specific local issues.

An impact assessment may be required below these thresholds where a proposal would have an independent or cumulative impact on the vitality and viability including local consumer choice and trade on a defined centre nor have a significant impact on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in defined centres.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 4	Objections: 0	Comments: 8
--------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Yorkshire County Council supports the general approach to focus retail development in the City Centre and reduce future development at out of town locations. • There is support for this policy from Historic England, Fulford Parish Council and York Green Party. • Historic England support the intention to maintain the city centre as the main focus for retail and commercial activity. The continued vitality and viability of the heart of the city is essential if its historic environment is to be maintained. • Fulford Parish Council support that main town centre uses will be directed to the city, district and local centres and not out-of-town locations such as the Designer Outlet.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nether Poppleton, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee indicate that there is no provision made at sites ST1 or ST2 for retail space. Should consider a shopping parade in ST1. • Rachael Maskell MP highlighted that new developments must not draw further trade away from the city centre and small communities, but rather encourage more people into the city centre and suburbs like Front Street in Acomb. • Policies R1 currently require all A1-retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area (PSA), specifically including York Central (ST5), to be subject to a sequential and impact assessment. Whilst this is strictly in accordance with the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such an approach could harm the ability of York Central Partnership to allow for a comprehensive and sustainable development [at ST5] that meets the needs of its future community, including its residents and workforce. • North Yorkshire County Council, whilst supporting the general thrust of policy, notes that the general approach to retail could be more robust to resist significant further out of town retail development. In addition the plan might go some way to acknowledge the changing face of town centre retailing.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy R2: District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades			
<p>For development proposals for main town centre uses within any of the district and local centres and neighbourhood parades regard will be had to enhancing the function, vitality and viability of the centres and parades. Development proposals for main town centre uses will be considered acceptable in principle providing that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consolidates, maintains or improves upon the function, vitality and viability of the centre or parade in relation to its retail, cultural and community facilities; • is of an appropriate scale and nature to the existing centre or parade and the retail hierarchy, maintains or enhances the character and environmental quality of the centre or parade; • contributes positively to the range of services on offer; and • does not have a significant detrimental impact upon local residents or the historic and natural environment. <p>Development proposals for main town centre uses outside defined district and local centres that would result in significant adverse impact on the continued or future function, vitality and viability of a centre will be refused.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 2	Supports: 1	Objections: 0	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for this policy from York Green Party. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that the Council needs to work with local organisations to find ways to bring life and economic vitality to local centres like Acomb. 		

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy R3: York City Centre Retail

The vitality and viability of the city centre is supported and enhanced, with the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) as shown on the proposals map and allocated sites providing the primary focus for any new retail floorspace. The PSA is defined as the area where retail development is concentrated and covers all primary shopping frontages and those secondary shopping frontages that are contiguous and closely related to the primary shopping frontage. New floorspace and support for existing retailers will be achieved through:

- the allocation of Castle Gateway as an area of opportunity, promoted for high quality mixed use development, including main town centre uses to support and enhance the offer within the PSA;
- supporting additional retail provision on secondary frontages in Hungate and the Stonebow area;
- the reuse, reconfiguration and development of existing units (subject to historic building and conservation considerations) to create additional floorspace and enable existing retailers to adapt to social and economic trends;
- ensuring the efficient use of land and buildings and support and provision of managed changed in the PSA to concentrate retailer uses towards prime areas within the PSA;
- supporting Newgate Market and occasional / festival markets in York;
- managing the provision of parking and public transport within the city to ensure that it supports the vitality of the centre; and
- improving the quality and appearance of the city centre, through the provision of improvements to public realm and city centre management of areas within the city centre.

In the PSA, proposals for new retail floorspace (use class A1) will be supported. Proposals for other main town centre uses (including food, drink and entertainment uses as part of a vibrant evening economy) will be supported where they:

- are complementary to the PSA's retail function and contribute to the vitality and viability of the city centre;
- have active frontages to reflect the character of the PSA; and
- would not have a detrimental impact on the overall character and amenity of the PSA in accordance with other relevant policies in the plan.

Primary Shopping Frontages

The concentration of A1 uses in the primary shopping frontages, as defined on the proposal map, will be safeguarded and enhanced. Proposals that would involve the loss, by change of use or redevelopment, of ground floorspace class A1 shops will generally be resisted. However, proposals for other uses may be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:

- i. the proposal has an active frontage and contributes to the vitality and viability of the primary shopping frontage; the proposed uses will provide a service direct to members of the public and can demonstrate a comparable footfall generation

- to an A1 use;
- ii. the proposal will have an attractive shop front which contributes positively to the appearance of the street;
 - iii. the proposal would not result in non-retail uses being grouped together in such a way that would undermine the retail role of the street;
 - iv. a minimum of 70% A1 uses will be required unless it can be demonstrated that it would be beneficial to the vitality and viability of the primary shopping frontage;
 - v. the proposal does not prevent upper floors from being effectively used, including the possibility of independent use; and
 - vi. there are not a large proportion of vacant ground floor premises in the immediate street.

Secondary Shopping Frontages

In secondary frontage areas, changes to non-retail use at ground floor level will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that the proposal:

- a. would not result in an over-concentration of non-retail uses where the cumulative impact would lead to a negative impact on the shopping character and function of the secondary shopping frontage;
- b. would not result in an over concentration of similar non-retail uses that would lead to amenity problems;
- c. will have active and attractive shop frontages which contributes to the appearance of the street;
- d. would not result in the creation of dead frontage not in use during the normal trading day;
- e. is compatible with adjoining land uses; and
- f. does not prevent upper floors from being effectively used, including the possibility of independent use.

York Central

Ancillary Retail uses at ST5: York Central will be supported in order to support the wider city centre and as part of a large strategic mixed use site. Proposals for non-ancillary retail uses on ST5 will be subject to sequential and impact tests.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amended to reflect change in policy SS4: York Central.

Consultation Responses

Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
11	4	3	9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England support the requirement that permission for the reuse, reconfiguration and redevelopment of existing buildings would be subject to there being no historic building or conservation constraints. The rich townscape and the still largely intact urban grain with its narrow plots that characterise the city centre have been identified as contributing to the special character of the city. Economic growth has to be consistent with the conservation of this distinctive character of the City. Support for the intention to improve the appearance of the city centre through improvements to the 		

	<p>public realm. There are several areas within York which fall well short of what would be expected within a historic city of this importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party support, particularly the clauses aimed at controlling the balance of retail and non-retail establishments in the city centre and addressing the potential negative effects of cumulative impact of non-retail premises. The party suggest the following should be added to the first list of bullet points: 'Explore the extension and consolidation of the footstreets, leading to a largely car free city centre and a world class pedestrian environment, to support city centre businesses by providing an attractive and welcoming environment for residents and visitors.' • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership and GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) give general support for the policy and welcomes its inclusion within the Local Plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) states that the policy requires A1-retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area (PSA), specifically including York Central (ST5), to be subject to a sequential and impact assessment. Whilst this is strictly in accordance with the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such an approach could harm the ability of York Central Partnership to allow for a comprehensive and sustainable development [at ST5] that meets the needs of its future community including its residents and workforce. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) suggest the policy should be amended so that the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community, both within and around the site, is recognised and weighs in favour of a future planning application. • Concern over the proliferation of tearooms, restaurants and cafes in the centre of York hasn't been fully addressed.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Railway Museum suggest that the policy could be amended to recognise the importance of an appropriate amount of retail development necessary to support the local community both within and around the ST5 site. • Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee note that the loss of shopping from the city centre and increasing number of vacated shops is a disgrace and will deter visitor footfall. Possible temporary art exhibitions or displays from schools/colleges would be better than empty premises. They comment on the work done by the Civic Trust to bring the historic value of sections of the city to everyone's attention. • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership give general support for policy R3 but suggest some modifications to the policy would improve it. Supportive of policy proposals which enable retail to be delivered on the York Central site. Suggest the need for clarity on

	<p>the final sentence of the policy which requires proposals for retail uses on ST5 to be subject to the sequential test and impact tests. It is indicated that this needs to be explored further and as it is currently drafted would be overly prescriptive approach. Suggest it is not appropriate to refer explicitly to the need for these tests as this is covered in Policy R1. Retail and leisure uses are specifically defined as part of the York Central allocation in Policy SS4. Further sequential and impact testing for a site allocated for such purposes would be contrary to national policy guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The definition of 'Primary Shopping Area' should be loosened to also reflect principal gateway streets into the "primary shopping frontage". This would include Gillygate and Bootham in the definition arguably they should already be included as contiguous with High Petergate - suggest all the footstreets are "primary shopping frontage".• Suggestion that a cycle park combined with free loans of wheeled shopping bags and pushchairs would support this policy and benefit city centre businesses. It would also benefit tourism, making it easier / cheaper to visit attractions and people would stay in the city centre for longer.• Mixed use development in Castle Gateway needs to be treated with care, given the feedback from the community engagement process.
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy R4: Out of Centre Retailing**

Proposals for out of centre retailing will only be permitted where it:

- cannot be accommodated in a sequentially preferable location in accordance with Policy R1;
- will not result in a significant adverse impact on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in York City Centre, and other relevant defined centres in the catchment area of the proposed development; and
- will not result in an individual or cumulative (significantly adverse) impact on the vitality and viability of any defined centre including local consumer choice and trade in the centre and wider area up to five years from the time the application is made.

Restrictions on floorspace or goods sold will be secured by condition to prevent out of centre proposals having a negative impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 5	Supports: 4	Objections: 1	Comments: 3
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England supports this policy as this approach causes lesser traffic growth on the A64. • York Green Party support the policy and think the following new bullet point should be added: 'Will not add significant additional congestion to existing stress points on the highway network.' • NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet support the removal of the Designer Outlet from the Green Belt, support its expansion and consolidation and support the Designer Outlet being classed as part of the main built up area on the key diagram. They also support the recognition at paragraph 4.39 that York Designer Outlet provides a wider role within the catchment area of York, and that it provides economic benefits to the wider City. Support recognition that the City Council will support development at the York Designer Outlet will consolidate its function as a specialist retail location.
---------	--

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet suggest recognition should be given to the parking issues identified at the York Designer Outlet which are restricting its ability to reach its potential economic contribution to York and the City's growth aspirations. It has a significant impact on traffic and parking management and will be further exacerbated by extension plans and an increase to park & ride. It is suggested that a solution would be to remove the 20 acre site to the south of the Designer Outlet from the Green Belt and allocate it for enhance/relocated park & ride and York Designer Outlet parking facilities.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulford Parish Council supports the principles of Policy R4 on Out-of-Centre retailing. However it considers that the reference in paragraph 4.37 to bulky goods retailing being potentially appropriate in out-of-centre locations should be deleted, especially as paragraph 4.38 extends the definition of bulky goods to items widely sold in and around the City Centre, including household appliances, audiovisual equipment and bicycles. The NPPF makes no such exception for bulky goods retailing. Fulford Parish Council considers that the last sentence of paragraph 4.39 should be deleted. Although ambiguous in its meaning, it could be used to justify further significant development in out-of-centre locations contrary to the intentions of Policy R4 (and national policy). In the alternative, the York Designer Outlet should be excluded from its provisions as the Designer Outlet is not a specialist location for the "sale of bulky comparison goods or other restricted comparison goods." Its main retail offer is in fashion goods and it directly competes with the City Centre in this regard. Any significant increase in its retail offer (or as a leisure destination) would inevitably be to the detriment of the City Centre. NTR Planning obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet state their continued support for the need for York to have an up to date Local Plan which delivers the best possible future for the City. The York Designer Outlet has an important role to play in delivering the Council's aspirations in the Plan, providing an important economic and tourist location, employing 1600 people and attracting over 4.5 million visitors per year. . If out of centre retail developments are harming the city centre, why allow them?

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy H1: Housing Allocations**

In order to meet the housing requirement set out in Policy SS1 the following sites, as shown on the proposals map and set out in the schedule below are proposed for residential development.

Planning applications for housing submitted for these allocations will be permitted if in accordance with the phasing indicated. An application on an allocated site in advance of its phasing will be approved if:

- the allocation's early release does not prejudice the delivery of other allocated sites phased in an earlier time period;
- the release of the site is required now to maintain a five year supply of deliverable sites; and
- the infrastructure requirements of the development can be satisfactorily addressed.

Where developers are seeking revisions to existing planning permissions and associated conditions and S106 agreements, changes in market conditions will be taken into account

Where sites contain existing openspace this will be an important consideration in the development of the site and the open space needs of the area will need to be fully assessed.

This policy applies to all the sites listed in the Table 5.1 overleaf:

Table 5.1: Housing Allocations

Allocation Reference	Site Name	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Yield (Dwellings)	Estimated Phasing
H1	Former Gas Works, 24 Heworth Green (Phase 1)	2.87	271	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 510)
H1	Former Gas works, 24 Heworth Green (Phase 2)	0.67	65	Medium Term (Years 6-10)
H3**	Burnholme School	1.90	72	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H5**	Lowfield School	3.64	162	Short to Medium term (Years 1 - 10)
H6	Land R/O The Square Tadcaster Road	1.53	0*	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
H7**	Bootham Crescent	1.72	86	Short to Medium Term

				(Years 1 - 10)
H8	Askham Bar Park & Ride	1.57	60	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H10	The Barbican	0.96	187	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H20	Former Oakhaven EPH	0.33	56	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H22	Former Heworth Lighthouse	0.29	15	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H23	Former Grove House EPH	0.25	11	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H29	Land at Moor Lane Copmanthorpe	2.65	88	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
H31	Eastfield Lane Dunnington	2.51	76	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
H38	Land RO Rufforth Primary School Rufforth	0.99	33	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10 5)
H39	North of Church Lane Elvington	0.92	32	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10 5)
H46**	Land to North of Willow Bank and East of Haxby Road, New Earswick	2.74	104	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10 5)
H52	Willow House EPH, Long Close Lane	0.20	15	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H53	Land at Knapton Village	0.33	4	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H55	Land at Layerthorpe	0.20	20	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H56**	Land at Hull Road	4.00	70	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H58	Clifton Without Primary School	0.70	25	Short Term (Years 1 - 5)
H59**	Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Howard Road, Strensall	1.34	45	Medium to Long Term (Years 6-15) Short to Medium term (Years 1-10)
ST1**	British Sugar/Manor School	46.3	1,200	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1-16)
ST2	Former Civil Service	10.40	266	Short to

	Sports Ground Millfield Lane			Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
ST4	Land adj. Hull Road & Grimston Bar	7.54	211	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
ST5	York Central	35.0	1,500 <u>1,700</u>	Lifetime of the Plan and Post Plan period (Years 1-21)
ST7	Land East of Metcalfe Lane	34.5	845 <u>975</u>	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1 - 16)
ST8	Land North of Monks Cross	39.5	968	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1 - 16)
ST9	Land North of Haxby	35.0	735	Lifetime of the Plan (Years 1 - 16)
ST14	Land to West of Wigginton Road	55.0	1,348 <u>1672</u>	Lifetime of the Plan and Post Plan period (Years 1 - 21)
ST15	Land to West of Elvington Lane	159.0	3,339 <u>3,900</u>	Lifetime of the Plan and Post Plan period (Years 1 - 21)
ST16	Terrys Extension Site – Terry's Clock Tower (Phase 1)	2.18	22	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-5)
ST16	Terry's Extension Site – Terry's Car Park (Phase 2)		33	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)
ST16	Terry's Extension Site – Land to rear of Terry's Factory (Phase 3)		56	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)
ST17	Nestle South (Phase 1)	2.35	263	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 - 10)
ST17	Nestle South (Phase 2)	4.70	600	Medium to Long Term (Years 6 – 15)
ST31	Land to the South of Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe	8.10	158	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)
ST32	Hungate (Phases 5+)	2.17	328	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)
ST33	Station Yard, Wheldrake	6.0	147	Short to Medium Term

				(Years 1-10)
ST35**	Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall	28.8	578500	Medium to Long Term (Years 6-15)
ST36**	Imphal Barracks, Fulford Road	18.0	769	Post Plan period (Years 16-21)
Supporting Text Changes:				
Explanatory text and documents to be updated to reflect potential changes to sites.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Amendments to table to reflect proposed changes to strategic sites and updates following development timescales confirmed through consultation responses.				
Consultation Responses				
NB: site specific consultation responses are captured under individual H site proformas.				
Total representations: 32		Supports: 5	Objections: 32	Comments: 9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highways agency support policy statements in relation to an allocated site only coming forward in advance of the phasing where infrastructure requirements are addressed. North Yorkshire County Council supports the recognition and inclusion of windfall development within Policy H1 in addition to allocations as a means of achieving additional flexibility for housing delivery. York Green party strongly support phasing of development but note that the majority are phased from Year 1. CPRE welcome this policy and the criteria against which applications will be approved. They also welcome that York does not need to make additional land available to address shortfall elsewhere. However, the impact of housing developments elsewhere will impact detrimentally upon the setting and infrastructure provisions of the City. Developers generally concur that strategic sites can provide a significant source of housing as part of a wider mix of sites including smaller sites. They generally also support increased density on these sites. Support for the policy was received in general. 			
Objection	<p>General objection to the policy was received in relation to the exclusion of previously allocated and discounted sites.</p> <p>The NHS have concerns over the location of population growth and</p>			

	<p>that primary care facilities at garden villages will need to be considered early.</p> <p><u>Supply / Trajectory/ Phasing</u></p> <p>The majority of site developers disagree with the policy/portfolio of site allocations because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no real certainty over delivery rates on strategic sites as they are complex to deliver. • Additional allocations are required that can deliver homes in the first 5 years of the plan period, which will assist in addressing the shortfall between the housing requirement and housing supply; • Additional sites are required to ensure greenbelt permanence. • More detail is needed in relation to the housing trajectory. Details of lead-in times, annual delivery rates and density assumptions is required supporting the 5 year land supply position. • The way in which the Plan notes housing delivery beyond the Plan period of 2033 is considered confusing and not in conformity with the NPPF. • Several agents consider that the policy is so heavily caveated with instances where permission may be granted for sites ahead of the identified phasing - the policy is very unlikely to be effective. <p>Windfalls should not be identified as a source of supply across the whole plan period; they should be treated as flexibility no supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear how many housing will be delivered in the plan period and post plan period. • The plan is reliant on higher densities provided by apartment living to make a significant contribution to overall supply even though the SHMA identifies that this is not the main type of dwelling required. • There is no supporting evidence to show how the capacities of the proposed allocations have been calculated and if specific site characteristics have been taken into account. Without these details it is impossible to ascertain whether site yields are realistic. <p><u>Commitments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 10% non-implementation rate should be applied to commitments. • Student housing should not be included in the commitment figure.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England comment that any allocation that contains playing fields or sport facilities needs to be consistent with policies HW3 and GI5 and para 74 of NPPF. • CPRE consider that it is essential that any alteration to phased development will not prejudice delivery that may detrimentally

	<p>impact on the 5-year housing supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of detailed housing trajectory makes comparison of the supply against the OAHN/ housing target difficult. However, 'Phasing' should be replaced with timescales.• Allocating a wider range of general housing allocations at a wider range of locations would help to deliver 5 year supply (short-term).• Build out rates on Strategic housing sites listed in Table 5.1 should be linked to any necessary capacity enhancements on the A64 and its junctions with the local primary road network.• The policy should highlight more that previously developed land is the priority.• The ability of some strategic sites such as ST35, to come forward in the short-term should be acknowledged.
--	---

See also comment on Policy SS1 in relation to Housing growth.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy H2 : Density of Residential Development**

To ensure the efficient use of land and help maintain local services and public transport provision, housing developments will be expected to achieve the following net densities:

- 100 units/ha within the city centre
- 50 units/ha within the York urban area
- 40 units/ha within the suburban area and Haxby/ Wigginton
- 35 units/ha in the rural area and villages

Within 400m of a high frequency public transport corridor (current extent illustrated at Figure 5.3) or adjacent to an existing or proposed transport hub, higher density development will also be supported where it complies with other plan objectives.

On strategic sites the specific master planning agreements that provide density targets for that site may override the approach in this policy, which should be used as a general guide.

Delivering densities that support the efficient use of land requires good design that responds to its context, an appropriate mix of house types and should be informed by the local character of the area. In conservation areas the density of any proposed housing development should also have regard to any relevant guidance contained in the appraisal of the conservation area.

See also Policy D1, D4 ~~and~~ T1 and T6

Supporting Text Changes:

Explanatory text updated to reflect policy amendment:

5.17 Densities proposed have been tested through the work carried out to ensure the viability and deliverability of housing across the district. Delivering development at this range of densities will help maintain local 'walkable' services within communities and provide opportunity to secure the levels of public transport patronage that will ensure services are economically viable, present a realistic alternative to using the private car and can be maintained in the long term. The policy also recognises that that the availability of public transport capacity may enable development density to be increased as development in the vicinity of public transport facilities, particularly transport hubs or interchanges, enables more sustainable trips to be made on the radial and orbital public transport networks.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amendment proposed to address change made in policy T6.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 27	Supports: 7	Objections: 14	Comments: 7
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England welcome the requirement that density of sites should be informed by the character of the local area and that in conservation areas density should be guided by the 		

	<p>appraisals detailed for that area – this will help to ensure new housing schemes will sensitively reflect the distinctive character of each area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party supports the principle of site specific flexibility in this policy and the principle that good design and density are intrinsically linked. More could be made of good sustainable design that can facilitate high density development that can still deliver a good quality of life including green open spaces. The mix and densities in garden villages and Greenfield sites could be considered further to allow for higher densities so long as accompanied by ambitious sustainable transport provision. • CPRE North Yorkshire support Policy H2, referring to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and welcome the potential densities set out that will ensure the most efficient use of land. • Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council support the policy with a maximum of 35 dph within the Parish. • GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and DIO Estates (MOD)) and Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey) both supported the policy and welcomed the details provided on net density, however, further clarification of net and gross density calculations is required.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Home Builders Federation considers that development densities of 100 dph within the city centre along with 50 dph in the urban area to be overly optimistic. This density would result in small garden sizes, no garages and little parking space and houses hard to market. Lower densities would make developments more marketable and the policy should be amended to allow for more flexibility. • Rapleys LLP (on behalf of British Sugar Plc) believe the density guidelines should not be viewed as a ceiling, rather a base level that can be exceeded where appropriate and justified and have suggested the policy be reworded to reflect this. • Lichfields (on behalf of Keyland Developments, Linden Homes and Bellway Homes) point out that this policy sets out expected density levels throughout the different areas of the city. However, there is no supporting evidence to show how the capacities of the proposed allocations have been calculated and if specific site characteristics have been taken into account. Without these details it is impossible to ascertain whether site yields are realistic. The proposed densities are over ambitious and will not be achieved on sites throughout the City. 50 dph on a site of 1+ha at a net developable area of 95% is not seen as realistic. More appropriate net density assumptions should be used for net/gross ratios. Family housing will not be achieved at the levels suggested. • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states this policy/identified zones are too prescriptive. Whilst on larger strategic sites density targets may be set aside, on smaller sites it is likely that rigidly sticking to density targets will result in

	<p>a development not responding to site and local constraints or meet a range of housing needs. The policy needs deleting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPP Planning (on behalf of Shepherd Homes and Landowner) objects to the change of rural density calculation that has taken place between Preferred Options and Pre-Publication Draft. Villages and rural areas should be at 30 dph. Higher density levels are not evidenced or justified. • GVA (on behalf the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) believe that for consistency with the remainder of the Plan the wording of the policy should be amended to '100 units/ha within the city centre and York Central (ST5)'. • Carter Jonas (on behalf of Picton Capital Ltd) consider that there should be a degree of flexibility within the policy citing a proposed alternative site at Kettlestring Lane represents a density of 58 dph that should be acceptable within an accessible and well connected location. • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes) suggest that a caveat be added to the policy to ensure there is flexibility regarding the proposed housing density targets. • A general objection was made to the high density development that could damage the sense of space and limit the levels of amenities that could be provided within sites.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gladman Developments suggest that an element of flexibility should be added to the policy. In the case of rural areas and villages 35 dph is out of keeping and a lower density figure may be more appropriate. • Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) comment that on large strategic sites the master planning may produce density targets that could override the approach in this policy. Densities should be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area and should be considered on a site by site basis. Higher densities would be appropriate in city centre brownfield sites that would make efficient use of land. • Arup (on behalf of the York Central Partnership) are in favour of the general guideline on densities but points out that York Central represents a highly sustainable brownfield site and flexibility in the policy would provide the possibility for delivering densities that reflect the nature of the site. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Redrow Homes, Linden Homes and Landowners) welcome the reference to net densities in this policy as this is often overlooked, though further clarification would be beneficial. • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes and Equibase Ltd) comment that CYC outline proposed densities that it states ne developments will be expected to achieve that vary in different areas within the district. This approach is encouraged to provide certainty for developers, however, the policy should remain flexible and be used as a guide to define densities as each site has unique

	characteristics that may reduce the developable area and affect potential density levels.
--	---

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy H3: Balancing the Housing Market**

The Council will seek to balance the housing market across the plan period and work towards a mix of housing identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Proposals for residential development will be required to balance the housing market by including a mix of types of housing which reflects the diverse mix of need across the city. This includes flats and smaller houses for those accessing the housing market for the first time, family housing of 2 to 3 beds and homes with features attractive to older people.

The housing mix proposed should have reference to the SHMA and be informed by:

- Up to date evidence of need including at a local level; and
- The nature of the development site and the character of the local surrounding area.

The final mix of dwelling types and sizes will be subject to negotiation with the applicant. Applicants will be required to provide sufficient evidence to support their proposals. Proposals will be supported that are suitable for the intended occupiers in relation to the quality and type of facilities, and the provision of support and/or care. Housing should be built as flexible as possible to accommodate a broad cross section of society to help meet a wide range of needs.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 30	Supports: 7	Objections: 13	Comments: 16
---------------------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lichfields (on behalf of Bellway Homes and Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) are supportive of this policy in principle and meeting the housing mix as set out in the SHMA. • Arup (on behalf of the York Central Partnership) support the need to balance the housing market by including a mix of housing types and are supportive of the final mix of dwelling types and sizes being subject to negotiation. • GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) welcome the policy approach. • CPRE North Yorkshire supports the policy aim to ensure there is a balanced housing mix across development and is in accordance with the SHMA. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey) are supportive of this policy but consider that there needs to be an element of flexibility included within it suggesting that a size threshold is used against which evidence of demand and need is required. • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes) welcome the flexibility that is included within the Plan that states that the final mix of dwelling types and sizes would be subject to negotiation.
---------	--

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation note that this policy is based on evidence set out in the SHMA, however, they state this will only identify current deficits and reflect a snapshot in time. The HBF would like to ensure greater flexibility within the policy to acknowledge that the mix will vary geographically and over the plan period. Flexibility should also reflect market demand and aspirations – not just housing need. • Lichfields (on behalf of Bellway and Linden Homes) believe a geographical dimension should be incorporated into this policy to reflect the mix found at a local level such as larger family housing in and around existing settlements. Flats are better suited on sites within the main urban area where higher densities are more acceptable. There may also be gaps within the local housing offer that require addressing. • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes and Equibase Ltd) objects to family homes being defined as only 2/3 bed properties as outlined within the policy. There is no justification for excluding 4/5 bed properties from the definition of family homes and there is a need for this type along side smaller homes to ensure choice within the market. The Policy as worded is not justified or effective, therefore unsound. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey) objects to this policy as it fails to present a case for both need and demand. • A general objection to this policy was received citing that York provides very poor availability of family homes and that more provision should be made for this type of housing rather than 1 and 2 bed flats.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nether & Upper Poppleton Parish Councils believe that the policy should stipulate that outside the urban area homes of more than two storeys should be discouraged and that more bungalows are required. Sheltered housing and assisted living units should feature in areas where more than 500 homes are to be built. Parking space for two cars within the curtilage on new homes should be considered. • Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) support the policy in principle but believe it should recognise the scope for flexibility on a site by site basis. • Rachel Maskell MP comments that it is vital to ensure that housing provision keeps pace with economic demand and that housing tenure should be prioritised to address economic need. High value homes have lowest demand whilst low cost housing to buy or socially rent has the greatest need. • Several developers believe that the policy needs to maintain a degree of flexibility as the SHMA considers only ‘need’ as opposed to ‘demand’. • General comments to this policy include the prioritising of affordable housing for first time buyers/young families and smaller properties for the elderly looking to downsize. There should be less emphasis on buy to let and large detached

	<p>properties. Two and three bedroom properties should be focused upon whilst studio and 1 bed apartments should be discouraged as they are not adaptable for families to visit. The building of terraced, low cost, affordable housing would help to provide a better balance of housing.</p>
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy H4: Promoting Self and Custom House Building				
<p>As part of meeting housing need, proposals for self and custom house building, to be occupied as homes by those individuals, will be supported where they are in conformity with all other relevant local and national policies.</p> <p>On strategic sites (sites 5ha and above) developers will be required to supply at least 5% of dwelling plots for sale to self builders or to small/custom house builders subject to appropriate demand being identified. Plots should be made available at competitive rates, to be agreed through Section 106 agreements, which are fairly related to associated site/plot costs. In determining the nature and scale of provision the Council will have regard to viability considerations and site-specific circumstances</p> <p>These schemes will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be individually designed employing innovative approaches throughout that cater for changing lifetime needs; • provide for appropriate linkages to infrastructure and day to day facilities; and • include a design framework to inform detailed design of the individual units where more than one self/custom build unit is proposed. <p>Where a developer is required to provide self and custom build plots the plots should be made available and marketed for at least 12 months. Where plots have been appropriately marketed and have not sold within this time period these plots may be built out as conventional plots for market housing by the developer.</p> <p>Communities preparing Neighbourhood Plans will be encouraged to consider the identification of sites for self and custom build projects within their neighbourhood plan area.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/a				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 16		Supports: 3	Objections: 7	Comments: 8
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support was shown for this policy by the Green Party and Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) both supporting the principle of this policy for planning a range of housing types to meet the identified need including the demand for self build plots. The viability and site circumstances should be taken into account when determining the nature and scale of provision. • Arup (on behalf of the York Central Partnership) are generally supportive of the principles of Policy H4. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selby District Council query the viability of this policy and await further evidence before providing any additional comments on 			

	<p>how it may impact on Selby District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP (on behalf of British Sugar Plc) state there is no provision for self and custom build made within the outline application for ST1 and that it should be made clear that this policy does not relate to ST1. New wording is suggested to reflect this. • Integrated Built Environment Ltd have made objections to this policy stating that despite changes to legislation encouraging uptake of self and custom build housing nationally, CYC appears to be operating under outdated practices regarding this policy and that very little has been done to advertise the self and custom build register. • Whilst the Home Builders Federation are supportive of self and custom build homes, it believes CYCs approach is restrictive rather than permissive as it requires the inclusion of such housing on strategic sites of 5ha and above and would not help to boost housing supply as is only changes the house building mechanism from one type of builder to another. HBF would like to see the evidence that shows support for those wanting to self-build would actually consider building within the larger sites. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Redrow Homes, Taylor Wimpey and landowners) object to the need to inset custom build housing on larger sites – those traditionally seeking to build their own homes do not do so on a housing estate and believe that sites of up to 10 dwellings with affordable housing commuted off site are the best vehicle for this approach. • A general objection raised the point that the policy does not mention that the plots should be serviced which is vital as plot buyers will have difficulties gaining self build mortgages if not provided. Government guidance states plots should be provided fully serviced.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarification was also requested by Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant and questions the meaning of 'available at competitive rates' and plots being made available and marketed for 'at least 12 months' wording within the policy. • Gladman Developments comment that it would be difficult to assess how self build plots on allocated sites will be implemented given the issues around working hours, site access and health and safety associated with large scale development sites. • Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) support the principle of this policy for planning a range of housing types to meet identified need. They agree that viability and site circumstances should be taken into account when determining the nature and scale of provision. However, they also point out that it is important that onsite provision of plots for self/custom build would not be appropriate for some sites such as apartment block developments and the policy needs to be amended to contain sufficient flexibility to reflect this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Arup (on behalf of the York Central Partnership) supports this policy in principle but greater emphasis is needed to reflect that the policy may not be deliverable in urban areas and on brownfield sites which are challenging to bring forward. The policy states that on strategic sites developers will be required to supply at least 5% of dwelling plots to self builders, Arup are concerned how this would be achievable on brownfield sites. CYC would need to consider the implications of requesting both Policy H4 and H5 in tandem on a brownfield urban site.• GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) are concerned that the requirement of 5% of dwelling plots on strategic sites to be available for self/custom build housing would not be feasible on brownfield land where remediation and infrastructure costs can be prohibitive.• York Central Action believes the 5% requirement for self/custom build plots should be raised to 10%.• A general comment was received in connection with this policy stating that proposals for self build will only work if CYC establishes an appropriate support framework to assist with technical/design/legal/financial issues and simplifies the planning requirements.
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy H5: Gypsies and Travellers

Safeguarding Existing Supply

Proposals which fail to protect existing Gypsy and Traveller sites or involve a loss of pitches/plots will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required or equivalent alternative provision can be made. Existing Gypsy and Traveller sites are shown on the proposals map, and are listed below:

- James Street, Layerthorpe;
- Water Lane, Clifton; and
- Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick;

Meeting Future Need

In order to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, provision will be made in the following ways:

a) Within Existing Local Authority Sites

In order to meet the need of Gypsies and Travellers that meet the planning definition, 3 additional pitches will be identified within the existing three Local Authority sites.

b) Within Strategic Allocations

In order to meet the need of those 44 Gypsies and Traveller households that do not meet the planning definition:

Applications for larger development sites of 5 ha or more will be required to:

- provide a number of pitches within the site; or
- provide alternative land that meets the criteria set out in part (c) of this policy to accommodate the required number of pitches; or
- provide commuted sum payments to contribute towards to development of pitches elsewhere.

The calculations for this policy will be based on the hierarchy below:

- 100 - 499 dwellings - 2 pitches should be provided
- 500 - 999 dwellings - 3 pitches should be provided
- 1000 - 1499 dwellings - 4 pitches should be provided
- 1500 - 1999 dwellings - 5 pitches should be provided
- 2000 or more dwellings - 6 pitches should be provided

c) Planning Applications

In addition to the above allocated sites, development for Gypsy and Traveller sites will be permitted where proposals:

- i. do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhance York's historic and natural environment. This includes the city's character and setting and internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites,

- green corridors and areas with an important recreation function;
- ii. ensure accessibility to public transport and services;
 - iii. are suitable in terms of vehicular access and road safety including internal space for adequate parking and turning;
 - iv. ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable levels of congestion, pollution, and air quality for surrounding residents and future occupiers; and
 - v. appropriately manage flood risk.

In addition, proposals will be expected to:

- vi. provide adequate provision for storage, recreation space, amenity provision and utility services;
- vii. ensure that the size and density of pitches/plots are in accordance with best practice guidance;
- viii. incorporate appropriate landscape proposals to have a positive influence on the quality and amenity of the development;
- ix. ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance or overlooking; and
- x. ensure future occupiers would not be subject to significant adverse environmental impacts.

Any permission granted for a Gypsy and Traveller development will be subject to a condition limiting occupation to Gypsies and Travellers, as appropriate.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 21		Supports: 3	Objections: 11	Comments: 7
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England and Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council support the requirement that sites for gypsies and travellers will only be permitted where they do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhancing the historic environment including the city's character and setting. • Green Party supports the policy. • The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups welcome the fact that the Plan recognises the needs of those Gypsies who do not meet the revised definition. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Travellers Trust propose a change to ensure that the occupation of permitted sites is limited to G&T as defined in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and for those who do not meet that definition, together with any future changes in that definition. • Fulford Parish Council states that part b) of the policy should be deleted as there is no provision in national policy that links general housing proposals for the settled community with pitches for gypsies and travellers and part c) should be amended to make clear that traveller/gypsy developments are inappropriate 			

	<p>anywhere within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers object to the requirement to address gypsy and traveller provision through the strategic sites. • British Sugar plc states that no provision for gypsies and travellers is made within the outline application of ST1. It should be made clear that this does not relate to ST1. • York Travellers Trust indicates that Policy H5 of the Plan states that large housing sites are required to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches, land or commuted sums. This represents a significant and essential requirement that needs to be built into the planning of the individual strategic sites, yet it is not mentioned in this site specific policy.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selby District Council have requested some clarification as the policy does not state if large scale non-residential sites will be expected to provide for Gypsies and Travellers. • Dunnington Parish Council supports the policy but are surprised there is no mention that gypsy and traveller sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. • York Travellers Trust welcomes acknowledgement that that appropriate accommodation is needed for both G&Ts who meet definition, and those who do not. CYC should have in place a supply of sites for both groups as they have the same needs and should include sites removed from Green Belt. • Two developers/agencies highlight that there is no detail on how the commuted sum for developers of strategic sites would be calculated, the policy is unlikely to satisfy the locational needs of the G&T community and could have a significant impact on the deliverability of development on brownfield land.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople

Safeguarding Existing Supply

Proposals which fail to protect existing Travelling Showpeople yards or involve a loss of pitches/plots will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required or equivalent alternative provision can be made. Existing Travelling Showman yards are shown on the proposals map, namely The Stables, Elvington (temporary permission until 2020).

Meeting Future Need

There is a total need of 3 Showpeople plots over the plan period (this includes the plot with temporary planning permission at The Stables). This is split into 2 plots in years 2016-21, and 1 plot in the period 2032.

a) Allocated Sites

In order to meet the need of Travelling Showpeople that meet the planning definition, 3 plots will be allocated on the following site:

SP1: The Stables, Elvington: 3 plots

b) Travelling Showpeople Yards within Employment Sites

Travelling Showpeople yards will be permitted on existing and allocated employment sites provided development would not lead to the loss of land that that is necessary to meet both immediate and longer term requirements over the plan period in both quantitative and qualitative terms and unacceptable environmental problems exist.

c) Planning Applications

In addition to the above allocated sites, development for Showman sites will be permitted where proposals:

- i. do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhance York's historic and natural environment. This includes the city's character and setting and internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites, green corridors and areas with an important recreation function;
- ii. ensure accessibility to public transport and services;
- iii. are suitable in terms of vehicular access and road safety including internal space for adequate parking and turning;
- iv. ensure that development does not have an undue impact on the residential amenity of current residents and future occupiers, including leading to unacceptable levels of congestion, pollution, and air quality-for surrounding residents and future occupiers; and
- v. appropriately manage flood risk.

In addition, proposals will be expected to:

- vi. provide adequate provision for storage, recreation space, amenity provision and utility services;
- vii. ensure that the size and density of pitches/plots are in accordance with best

- practice guidance;
- viii. incorporate appropriate landscape proposals to have a positive influence on the quality and amenity of the development;
- ix. ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance or overlooking; and
- x. ensure future occupiers would not be subject to significant adverse environmental impacts.

Any permission granted for a Travelling Showpeople development will be subject to a condition limiting occupation to Travelling Showpeople, as appropriate.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amendment to reflect comments in relation to residential amenity as a result of any permitted applications for travelling showpeople.

Allocation: The Stables, Elvington, SP1

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.5ha	N/A
Estimated yield	3 plots	N/A
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	N/A

Pre-publication boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No boundary changes proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 45	Supports: 16	Objections: 26	Comments: 6
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England support the requirement that sites for gypsies and travellers will only be permitted where they do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhancing the historic 		

	<p>environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travelling showpeople's family on site have integrated well into the community. Site is proportionate to the needs of the family. • Site is well screened, tidy and unobtrusive. • York Green Party supports site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council would like part C of this policy reworded as follows: Concerned that Policy does not reflect national policy and also does not include sufficient safeguards to protect existing communities in York from potentially harmful development. Part b) of the policy should be deleted. There is no provision in national policy that links general housing proposals for the settled community with pitches for gypsy and traveller caravans nor is there any local factor that could justify such a link. Part c) should be amended. In particular, : In line with national policy (2015) criterion i) should be altered to make clear that traveller/gypsy developments are inappropriate anywhere within the Green Belt and will only be allowed in very special circumstances. Criterion iv) should state: Ensure that the development does not harm the amenity of nearby existing residents, including by loss of outlook or the creation of unacceptable traffic patterns, noise, disturbance, pollution or air quality. A further criterion should be added requiring reasonable levels of amenity for future occupants. • Planning inspectorate allowed temporary use of site for 5 years, then site should be returned to green belt to prevent harm to green belt objectives. Special circumstances no longer apply. • Previous objections ignored. • An alternative brownfield site should be found for this proposal for example, part of ST26.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions why travellers continue to dwell there when site was rejected as residential development. • Planning inspectorate ruled that site should return to green belt in June 2016 • Supports use of the Stables site. Objects to the idea that the site is green belt as has been developed on before, site is kept tidy. Access road to the site is already used by HGVs so the sites trailers and vans will add little congestion.
Boundary Changes Submitted	
No alternative boundaries suggested	

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
--

Policy H7: Student Housing

The University of York and York St. John University must address the need for any additional student housing which arises because of their future expansion of student numbers. In assessing need, consideration will be given to the capacity of independent providers of bespoke student housing in the city and whether it is economically prudent to provide additional student accommodation. To meet any projected shortfall, provision by the University of York can be made on either campus. Provision by York St. John University is expected to be off campus but in locations convenient to the main campus.

SH1: Land at Heworth Croft, as shown on the proposals map, is allocated for student housing for York St. John University students.

Proposals for new student accommodation will be supported where:

- i. there is a proven need for student housing; and
- ii. it is in an appropriate location for education institutions and accessible by sustainable transport modes; and
- iii. the development would not be detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents and the design and access arrangements would have a minimal impact on the local area.

Conditions will be used to ensure the proper management of the accommodation in the interests of the amenity of adjacent properties and that any development remains occupied by students in perpetuity, unless and until an alternative use is approved by the Council.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 15	Supports: 1	Objections: 3	Comments: 11
---------------------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for this policy was expressed from York St John University.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulford Parish Council objected to this policy and suggest that either the first part of Policy H7 is deleted as it simply duplicates other policies (ED1, ED2, ED3, and ED4) or is replaced by 'The University of York and York St John University' which must meet the need for any additional student housing which arises because of their future expansion of student numbers. In assessing need account should be taken of firm proposals by independent providers for bespoke student housing in the City. To meet any projected shortfall, provision by the University of York can be made on either campuses. Rachel Maskell MP objects to the policy as the number of student accommodation units planned for Site SH1 is not

	included.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Nether and Upper Poppleton Parish Councils commented that there was no mention of increases to student housing at Askham Bryan College yet the college boast increasing numbers significantly in its business plan. • York Green Party suggests amendment to the first paragraph of the policy and insertion of ‘Whenever possible the first recourse for additional purpose built student accommodation should be on campus’ – further amendments to the policy were suggested along with the insertion of ‘where the cumulative impact of purpose built student accommodation in an area can be shown to be un-balancing the local community’ as point iv. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Redrow Homes, Linden Homes, Taylor Wimpey and other Landowners) commented that student housing should fall outside the OAN and housing supply. • General comments were made stating that York University should be encouraged to provide more new accommodation on campus and there should be a minimum percentage of full time students based on campus set at a level above the status quo (ref policies ED1 and ED2).

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy H8: Houses in Multiple Occupation				
Applications for the change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to HMO (Use Class C4 and Sui Generis) will only be permitted where:				
i. it is in a neighbourhood area where less than 20% of properties are exempt from paying council tax because they are entirely occupied by full time students, recorded on the Council's database as a licensed HMO, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning consent or are known to the Council to be HMOs; and ii. less than 10% of properties within 100 metres of street length either side of the application property are exempt from paying council tax because they are entirely occupied by full time students, recorded on the Council's database as a licensed HMO, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning permission or are known to the Council to be HMOs; and iii. the accommodation provided is of a high standard which does not detrimentally impact upon residential amenity.				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 2		Supports: 1	Objections: 1	Comments: 0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Green Party support the policy. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulford Parish Council considers that the thresholds for restrictions on new HMOs should be reduced from 20% to 10% for neighbourhood areas and from 10% to 5% for lengths of street. FPC considers the policy should contain a restriction on extensions to existing and proposed HMOs. Such extensions are often unsightly and out-of-scale with the original house, giving an institutional air to the property. The following is suggested: Extensions to existing and proposed HMOs will only be permitted where it will improve living conditions for residents (such as larger bathrooms and kitchens) and not to provide additional living units. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment. 			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy H9: Older Persons Specialist Housing				
<p>The City of York Council and its partners will work together to enable the delivery of specialist (supported) housing and registered care housing for vulnerable people including for the ageing population, such as extra-care accommodation. Developments specifically designed to meet the accommodation needs of older people will be supported where they:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. contribute to meeting an identified need; ii. are well designed to meet the particular requirements of residents with social, physical, mental and/or health care needs; and iii. are in an accessible location by public transport or within walking distance to a range of community facilities including shops, medical services and public open spaces or these are provided on-site. 				
<p>Strategic sites (over 5ha) should incorporate the appropriate provision of accommodation types for older persons within their site masterplanning. For sheltered/extra care accommodations a mix of tenures will be supported.</p>				
<p>Where development falls within Use Class C3, affordable housing provision will be required.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 21		Supports: 7	Objections: 2	Comments: 12
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the policy was provided by York Green Party, Arup (on behalf of the York Central Partnership) and Lichfields (on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd) also supported the policy commenting it should have some flexibility taking into account site characteristics. • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes) support CYCs intention to deliver specialist accommodation for older persons. • Support was also given to the policy by GVA (on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)) as is the inclusion on major sites including York Central (ST5) albeit with further clarity on how older persons housing and affordable housing will be considered on a site specific basis to ensure sites remain viable would be beneficial. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support Policy H9 and comment that following examination of existing buildings on the QEII Barracks Site there may be potential to adapt a current building for older person's specialist housing. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to this policy was provided by Rapleys LLP (on behalf 			

	<p>of British Sugar Plc) stating that it has been agreed that predominantly family housing will be delivered on ST1 and that these unit types can provide suitable accommodation for older persons. The British Sugar site should not need to provide specialist housing for older persons and new wording is suggested to the policy to reflect this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Wilmore (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes) advise that the policy should be caveated to state that it is subject to there being a demonstrated need for such accommodation in the relevant area and subject to viability.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper and Nether Poppleton Councils have passed comment that the policy is good at suggesting the basis for measurement of housing need for the elderly though this has been overlooked when permitting new old peoples homes – generally these have been sited in or close to business/industrial parks which is inappropriate. • Johnson Mowat (on behalf of Redrow Homes, Linden Homes, Taylor Wimpey and landowners) believe the policy needs further clarification on what is required in terms of numbers and types of homes (Use Class 3 or 2). While house builders can provide elderly persons housing under C3, the provision of extra care housing as a C2 use is more complex. The suggestion is made that reference to strategic sites providing homes for elderly needs to reference C3 uses only and the supporting text at paragraph 5.58 needs to inform that C2 development will not count towards the housing supply in the OAHN. • The Home Builders Federation need clarity in the wording of this policy making it clear whether proposals for strategic sites (over 5ha) to incorporate provision of accommodation types for older persons refers to Use Class C2 or C3 provision. • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that this policy appears to consider 2 types of housing: 1) General housing suitable for older people (bungalows?), and 2) Specialist housing for older people with particular social, physical or healthcare needs. Is this the case or is it just for older people with specific 'extra' needs? • Comment was received from Arup (on behalf of York Central Partnership) giving general support to the approach in this policy. However, further clarity was requested as to how the delivery of both older persons specialist housing and affordable housing delivery will be considered on a site specific basis to ensure that the site remains sufficiently viable and deliverable. • A general comment agreed that provision for older persons housing should be made within the plan.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy H10: Affordable Housing

To help improve-maximise affordability across the housing market, the Council will support residential schemes for 2 or more dwellings which:

- i. reflect the relative viability of development land types in York by providing affordable housing percentage levels for site thresholds as set out in Table 5.4 overleaf:

Table 5.4: Affordable Housing Site Thresholds

Threshold	Target
Brownfield sites = > 15 dwellings	20%
Greenfield sites = > 15 dwellings	30%
Urban sites < 15 dwellings	0%
Rural sites 11-14 dwellings that have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000sqm	Off site financial contribution = £33,208.40 per unit (20%)
Rural sites 5-10 dwellings that have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000sqm	Off site financial contribution = £24,906.30 per unit (15%)
Rural sites 2-4 dwellings that have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000sqm	Off site financial contribution = £16,604.20 per unit (10%)

Threshold	Target
<u>Brownfield sites = > 15 dwellings</u>	<u>20%</u>
<u>Greenfield sites = > 15 dwellings</u>	<u>30%</u>
<u>Urban, Suburban and Rural sites 11-14 dwellings</u>	<u>20%¹</u>
<u>Urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u>	<u>15%¹</u>
<u>Urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u>	<u>15%</u>
<u>Urban brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings²</u>	<u>6%¹</u>
<u>Urban greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings²</u>	<u>6%</u>
<u>Sub-urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u>	<u>10%¹</u>
<u>Sub-urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u>	<u>15%¹</u>
<u>Sub-urban brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings²</u>	<u>2%¹</u>
<u>Sub-urban greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings²</u>	<u>7%¹</u>
<u>Rural brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u>	<u>11%¹</u>
<u>Rural brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings² that</u>	<u>3%¹</u>

<p><u>Rural greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings²</u></p>	<p><u>17%¹</u></p>
<p><u>Rural greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings²</u></p>	<p><u>8%¹</u></p>
<p><u>Notes to Table</u> <u>1 This is the target percentage to be used in the off-site financial contribution calculation following sub-clause (iii) below</u> <u>2 For sites that have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000sqm</u></p>	
<p>ii on sites of 40-15 homes and above on-site provision will be expected, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of equivalent value can be robustly justified.</p> <p>iii. on rural sites of 2–15 homes an off site financial contribution (OSFC) is required in accordance with the approved formula set out below:</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Average York Property price – Average York Fixed RP Price x % Target = OSFC per dwelling</p>	
<p>iv. make provision which reflects tenure split in terms of social renting and intermediate housing, as set out in the most up to date SHMA. The current SHMA (2016) illustrates an 80:20 ratio.</p> <p>v. fully integrate the affordable housing by pepper potting throughout the development with no more than two affordable dwellings placed next to each other. The size and type of homes should be a pro rata mix of the total homes provided on site, taking into account current assessments of local need where on-site provision is required. The affordable housing should be visually indistinguishable from the open market dwellings.</p>	
<p>A vacant building credit (VBC) will be applied to appropriate development where a vacant building is either converted or demolished and is necessary to incentivise the scheme. This credit will be equivalent to the gross floorspace of the building to be demolished or brought back into use. This credit does not apply when a building has been ‘abandoned’.</p>	
<p>The affordable housing should remain affordable in perpetuity, through use of a planning condition or obligation or if these restrictions are lifted, for subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing. On completion, the affordable housing must be transferred to a Registered Provider approved by the Council.</p>	
<p>Where a developer believes the criteria set out in this policy cannot be fully met, they have the opportunity through open book appraisal to demonstrate through open book appraisal to demonstrate to the Council’s satisfaction that the development would not be viable</p>	
<p>See Policy GB4</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Supporting Text Changes:</p>	

- 5.61 Given the conclusions reached in the City of York Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010) and Annex 1 (2011) (AHVS) and the City of York Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (~~Draft~~ 2017(2018), developments within York should be able to provide the target levels of affordable homes approved for development management purposes. Therefore no individual site assessment will be required where submissions achieve these targets and this is to be encouraged in order to reduce time on further analysis and negotiation.
- 5.69 The commuted sum is calculated using the following formula and will be updated annually:

$$\text{Average York Property price} - \text{Average York Fixed RP Price} \times \% \text{ Target} = \text{OSFC per dwelling}$$

Table 5.5: Commuted Payment Calculation

<u>Dwelling threshold</u>	<u>Average York property price (Land Registry March 2017)</u>	<u>Average York fixed RSL price</u>	<u>% target</u>	<u>Commuted payment</u>
<u>Urban, Suburban and Rural sites 11-14 dwellings</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>£33,208.40</u>
<u>Urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>£24,906.30</u>
<u>Urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>TBD (15%+)</u>	
<u>Urban brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>£9,963</u>
<u>Urban greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>TBD (6%+)</u>	
<u>Sub-urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>£16,604.20</u>
<u>Sub-urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>£24,906.30</u>
<u>Rural brownfield sites 5-10</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>£18,265</u>

<u>dwelling¹</u>				
<u>Rural brownfield sites 2-4 dwelling¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>£4,981</u>
<u>Rural greenfield sites 5-10 dwelling¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>£28,227</u>
<u>Rural greenfield sites 2-4 dwelling¹</u>	<u>£241,042</u>	<u>£75,000</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>£13,283</u>
<u>Note</u>				
<u>1</u>	<u>For sites that have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000sqm</u>			

Summary of Reasons for Change

Table 5.4: Affordable Housing Site Thresholds has been revised to reflect the viability evidence contained in the latest Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment. The supporting text has been amended to match the revised policy.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 50	Supports: 12	Objections: 24	Comments: 16
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amongst others Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council and the Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy • CPRE is supportive of the recognition that even sites of two units could deliver a financial contribution • Rapleys LLP obo British Sugar PLC support the Council's aspirations to secure 20% affordable housing on Brownfield sites of 15 dwellings or more. A tenure split of 70:30 for Social Rent and Social Discount Sale Dwellings have been agreed for the site. Criterion v. support for the concept of pepper-potting affordable development throughout the development. • Lichfields support the inclusion of an open book assessment in instances where the developer believes the policy criteria cannot be fully met. • Carter Jonas support the inclusion of a direct reference to vacant building credit (VBC) • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) supports the Policy recognising that development on brownfield land is likely to be able to contribute proportionally less than its greenfield equivalents • Amongst others GVA and Rapleys LLP support the concept of pepper-potting affordable housing throughout the development • Linden Homes note the policy's allowance for open book appraisal to demonstrate that development would not be viable 		

	<p>in instances where a developer believes the policy criteria cannot be fully met.</p>
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents state that the policy is not sufficient to meet the acute need for social rented housing or ensure enough affordable housing is built. • The House Builders Federation (HBF) note that the aspiration for affordable housing is not included within the overall housing requirement • Rapleys LLP obo British Sugar PLC advocates that the policy should be amended to make it clear that the affordable housing requirement does not relate to ST1, and that the current proposal of no more than two affordable dwellings placed next to one another is overly prescriptive. • HBF and Johnson Mowat state the policy makes no reference to the Government's intention to deliver starter homes as part of the affordable homes mix. • Johnson Mowat also advocate 25% affordable housing on sites over 5 Ha • On respondent seeks a higher affordable housing target of 50% on all sites • York Green Party advocate that the affordable housing target should apply to sites under 15 dwellings in both rural and urban sites. • ELG Planning objects to the approach to calculating the commuted sum for off site affordable housing provision on non-rural sites. • GVA on behalf of the HCA and ARUP on behalf of York Central Partnership (YCP) advocate amending the policy so that the SHMA is used as guidance only in determining the mix of dwelling types and a wider range of tenure is considered. • Amongst others GVA and Rapleys LLP state that in relation to pepper-potting the policy is too restrictive and should be more flexible. • One respondent expresses concern that there is only one other policy – Exceptional sites in the Green Belt – relating to developments of 2-14 dwellings and that if land can be found it will be only for affordable housing and not a mix of housing
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents state that affordable housing (including social housing) is much needed • One respondent states that affordable housing for owner-occupancy not buy-to-let must be the priority. • Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council state that Development in the parish is not suitable for rented affordable housing due to the lack of services and infrequent public transport. • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant queries the meaning the introduction to the policy and criterion (i) • One respondent questions how the plan will provide social and affordable housing to the current and prospective residents of the city.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One respondent questions whether affordable housing numbers will be met as developers will not want to lose profit.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy HW1: Protecting Existing Facilities				
<p>The Council will work with local communities and voluntary sector organisations to help preserve and re-use existing community assets.</p> <p>Development proposals which involve the loss of existing community facilities, or facilities last used for community purposes, will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> facilities of equivalent or greater capacity and quality (in terms of function, accessibility, adaptability and variety of use) are provided elsewhere on the site; or facilities of equivalent or greater capacity and quality (as defined above) are provided off-site, in a location that equivalently or better serves the local community's needs; or the facilities no longer serve a community function and demonstrably cannot be adapted to meet other community needs; or in the case of commercial facilities, evidence is provided that demonstrates the facilities are no longer financially viable. <p>Developers must consult with the local community about the value of the asset and the impact that a loss of facilities may have. If facilities are to be provided elsewhere, a clear commitment to replace them in a timely manner must be evidenced, in order for planning permission to be granted.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
N/A				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 6		Supports: 4	Objections: 0	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several organisations support this policy. Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the re-use of existing community assets. In particular on the QE Barracks site, the community building at Hurst Hall is included and its current usage should be promoted following the departure of the MOD. St Wilfrid's Church is used by the community and its use should be retained. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections made to this policy. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership states the policy should be evidenced with an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan and be modified to remove superfluous requirements in alignment with the Planning Practice Guidance. It was stated that there is no mention of public houses in plan, which are a national concern and need support from 			

	<p>development policies. NPPF has planning laws supporting the retention of community pubs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• General supports received in relation to facilities being retained and enhanced.
--	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy HW2: New Community Facilities			
<p>Applications for _residential<u>strategic residential</u> developments of 10 or more dwellings must be accompanied by an audit of existing community facilities and their current capacity, <u>prepared by the applicant</u>. Developments that place additional demands on existing services will be required to provide proportionate new or expanded community facilities, to meet the needs of existing and future occupiers. <u>These should be provided on site or -D</u>developer contributions will be sought to provide these additional facilities.</p> <p>As the population grows and population demographics change over the plan period, new facilities will be required. The Council will work with communities and other partners to help address deficits in community facilities.</p> <p>The Council will support applications for new community facilities when an existing deficit or future need has been identified. Where appropriate, facilities should be designed to be adaptable and multi-purpose, in order to future-proof services and enable a wide range of community uses. Any new or expanded facilities must be accessible and well-served by public transport, footpaths and cycle routes.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
<p>Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.</p> <p>Cross reference will be included to clarify what community facilities are.</p> <p>Under Para 6.6 include reference to pharmacies as a community facility which benefit health and well-being. Link also to standard that all residents should be within 10 minute drive of a pharmacy.</p>			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
<p>Amendment was made to clarify expectations for applicants in relation to the production of an audit of community facilities.</p> <p>The threshold for producing an audit of community facilities has been amended to refer to strategic residential developments rather than a threshold of 10 dwellings and above. This amendment reflects the requirement for strategic sites to provide facilities commensurate to the population in new communities through understanding existing services and facilities.</p>			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 22	Supports: 6	Objections: 10	Comments: 9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several organisations support the policy • York Green Party especially support the requirement for an audit of existing community facilities and their current capacity. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support this policy should the need for additional facilities be 		

	identified.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC suggests deleting wording on the provision of new community facilities. Provision of such a facility must accord with CIL Regulation 122 and directly relate to the development, therefore meeting the needs of existing occupiers is not appropriate. • Lichfields on behalf of Linden Homes states that it is not clarified in the policy or explanatory text whether the audit of community facilities would be undertaken by the Council or the applicant. If it is the applicant, they object. • Several developers object to the requirement for all developments of >10 dwellings to be accompanied by an audit of existing community facilities and their current capacity, which is impractical. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) state that either on-site provision or financial contributions towards off-site provision can be provided dependent on the specific needs of the development and the availability of off-site facilities.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wigginton Parish Council comments that there is no library facility in Wigginton or Haxby. Funds have been raised for a new library but CYC needs to ensure that this priority is delivered, especially with the potential increase in population in the area. • National Railway Museum support the intent of policy to provide new community facilities, wording could be made clearer. • YEF states that walking and cycling routes need to be evaluated by locals rather than planners. Suggests that cycle racks should be made a requirement at venues and bus stops. • A resident states that community facilities should have equality policies, minimise paved land, use planted land for edible plants and that developers should support community work. • Gladman Developments state that it is important for the evidence base for the local plan to properly assess the viability of all the Plan's policy requirements to ensure consistency with the NPPF. • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) argue that an audit of community facilities should not be a planning application requirement. • Some respondents ask who will be running/ funding new community facilities. • Rachel Maskell MP states that new developments must have a community centre located within them.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy HW3: Built Sport Facilities**

The Council will support development that enables residents to enjoy and make use of built sports facilities.

Developments that place additional demands on existing built sport facilities will be required to provide proportionate new or expanded facilities, to meet the needs of future occupiers. Developer contributions will be sought to provide these additional facilities.

~~Enhanced~~ For strategic sites facilities should be provided on-site, where possible. If off-site provision is necessary, facilities should still be accessible to residents ~~within the areas of deficiency~~; be well served by public transport; and be easy to reach on foot and by bike.

The loss of built sports facilities (either currently or last used for sports activities) will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where:

- a needs assessment provided by developers, and in accordance with the most up to date Built Sports Facilities Strategy, identifies an over-provision in the area; or
- the development only affects part of the site and does not impact on its value for sport; or
- it would be replaced by a facility of equivalent or better quality and capacity, in a location that still serves the same community which is accessible by public transport, foot and bicycle and that has adequate management arrangements.

Development for new or expanded built sports facilities will be supported where a deficiency in current provision has been identified, and when it is well located, accessible to all, and when suitable infrastructure exists or can be created to manage and maintain the facility. Development of new sports facilities should be co-located with other health and community facilities and schools, where possible, to encourage participation in exercise. Any future demand should, in the first instance, be met through extensions and expansion of existing high-quality sustainable sites.

Supporting Text Changes:

Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Amendments to policy to reflect comments made through consultation. The policy has been clarified to state that strategic sites are expected to provide built sport facilities on site where possible. The requirement for enhancing facilities has been removed.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 13	Supports: 5	Objections: 1	Comments: 8
---------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several organisation support the policy. • Sport England recognises that the policy is consistent with the
---------	---

	NPPF.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership objects to needing an audit of existing built sports facilities. Policy should be evidenced through an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan and be modified to remove superfluous requirements in alignment with the Planning Practice Guidance.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YEF supports access to facilities but stresses that buses on weekends and evenings are poor and developers should influence bus companies. Cycle path need joining up and priority given to cyclists at junctions. Current standards for cycling and buses need adjusting. Buses and cycle paths need to be extended at community stadium if it is to be accessible to anyone without a car. • An objector states that participation in sport is not determined by physical facilities alone, the text recognises this to an extent but does not go on to develop a policy of community recreation. Small grants, community development work and access to shared insurance would increase participation of women in particular. • Gladman Developments state that it is important for the evidence base for the local plan to properly assess the viability of all the Plan's policy requirements to ensure consistency with the NPPF. • Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd states that the policy requires developers to make a contribution towards new or expanded facilities, however no detail is provided on how this would be calculated. Further clarity is needed and will provide more comments when this detail is available. • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group states that the availability of sports facilities currently used by the MOD must be retained and enhanced for the use of the community.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy HW4: Childcare Provision				
The Council will support development that helps meet the city's need for childcare provision.				
All <u>new</u> strategic sites will be expected to conduct an audit of existing childcare facilities and their current capacity. If increased demand from new residents would be expected to exceed the existing capacity of facilities in the vicinity, additional facilities must be incorporated into the masterplanning of the site and supported by developer contributions <u>unless it can be demonstrated that this is not viable or deliverable</u> .				
Proposals which fail to protect existing childcare facilities will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the provision is no longer required, no longer viable, or if equivalent replacement facilities can be provided elsewhere.				
Applications for new childcare provision should be accompanied by an assessment that demonstrates the need for additional childcare provision in the locality. The Council will work with schools, parents and carers to ensure that their needs are understood.				
Any proposed new or replacement childcare facilities should be sited in accessible locations within or near to the areas of identified need, they should be well-served by public transport, and be easily accessible by walking and by bike.				
Supporting Text Changes:				
Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Following consultation comments, clarification is given to make clear that the requirement for an audit of existing childcare facilities relates to new strategic sites only. The amended policy also makes clear that provision is required unless it can be demonstrated otherwise.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 16		Supports: 5	Objections: 6	Comments: 7
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several organisations support the policy. • York Green Party especially supports 'All strategic sites will be expected to conduct an audit of existing childcare facilities and their current capacity.' • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consider that existing childcare provision in the parish will need to be enhanced as the population increases. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers object to impractical requirement for all strategic sites will be expected to conduct an audit of existing childcare facilities. It should be deleted or amended to refer only to strategic sites > 5ha. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of organisations states that it must be recognised that 			

	<p>pre-school childcare provision is provided for by the private sector and therefore it may not be possible to provide specific facilities on sites where a private provider does not wish to open a facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• YEF states that the policy should mention that potential sites for new childcare facilities should have their air quality evaluated, the impact of extra traffic calculated and then compared to the threshold at which air pollution starts to damage the health of small children. Development should not be allowed if pollution is above this threshold.• Gladman Developments state that evidence base should assess the viability of all the Plan's policy requirements to ensure consistency with the NPPF.• GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) consider that an audit should not be a requirement as provisions on site could be determined by liaison with CYC.• Rachael Maskell MP believes that nurseries should be placed in closer proximity to new developments.
--	---

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy HW5: Healthcare Services

Primary Care

The Council will work closely with GPs and the NHS Vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group (or any successor organisation) to understand the current and projected primary care needs of communities. The Council will support the provision of new or enhanced primary care services when there is an identified need.

Improved, enlarged or additional primary healthcare facilities will be required to support residential developments that place additional demands on services beyond their current capacity, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Developer contributions will be required to support the increase in provision. An assessment of the accessibility and capacity of existing primary care services will be required at the ~~pre~~-application stage.

Proposals which fail to protect existing primary care services, or involve the loss of services, will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated the facilities are no longer required or that relocating facilities would better meet the community's needs.

Any new primary care facilities must be easily accessible by public transport, walking, and cycling.

Secondary Care

The Council will work closely with the York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, and with Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust (or any successor organisations), to understand their needs; help ensure their sites are fit for purpose; and enable them to provide safe, effective and sustainable healthcare, for the plan period and beyond.

York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

The Council will support the redevelopment of York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (as identified on the Proposals Map) to enable it to expand its capacity; to uphold and improve the quality of secondary care it delivers; and ultimately to remain on its existing site for the long term, ensuring the optimum delivery of secondary care services in York.

The Council will support the redevelopment of the staff car park on the existing York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust site to meet its immediate need for increased capacity in Accident and Emergency. The Council will work with York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation to develop a new Travel Plan, to ensure that the loss of car parking facilities will not compromise access or care.

To enable the Trust to expand existing clinical facilities. the Council will support the development of the extension to York NHS Hospital Trust site (as shown on the Proposals Map as HC1), for health and social care purposes, such as a GP practice or short-term residential care. The Council will continue to work with the Trust to help them make additional changes to their site as their needs change over the plan period.

Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust				
The Council will support Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust in the relocation of services previously provided at Bootham Hospital to a new site on Haxby Road, in order to provide the best patient care (as shown on the proposals map as HC2). Future consideration of the Bootham Park Hospital site must follow a full appraisal of the significance of the historic buildings, landscape and archaeology on site. Any redevelopment proposals must arise out of this understanding, in order to enhance or better reveal their significance into the long term.				
Supporting Text Changes:				
Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.				
Additional text added to paragraph 6.37 in relation to pharmacies.				
6.37 Any new medical facilities should be easily accessible by foot, bike and public transport, in line with Policy T1 'Sustainable Access'. Co-location of new health facilities with other community and sports facilities will be encouraged. The development of new primary and secondary care facilities should be guided by the design considerations set out in Health Building Note 11: Facilities for Primary and Community Care Services (2013) produced by the Department of Health. Currently 100% of the York population can access pharmaceutical services within a 10 minute drive time. The provision standards for pharmacy's will be set out in the forthcoming City of York Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2018-2021.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Minor amendments made following consultation comments to ensure correct names and stages of the process detailed.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 17		Supports: 6	Objections: 5	Comments: 7
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several organisations support the policy. • Support is given to HC1 - expansion of York District Hospital - with York growing we need a bigger and better hospital that can cope with this increase. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group recognise that Primary care facilities in the parish will need to be enhanced as the population increases. • NHS Vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group particularly supports the statement at paragraph 6.39 "any new healthcare facilities that are required as a result of additional residential development must be supported through developer contributions". 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC state that there is no requirement for contributions towards improved health facilities on ST1. • Several developers object to the requirement that a developer is required to undertake an assessment of accessibility and 			

	capacity at the pre-application stage. This should be provided by the health service.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York St John University state that if site HC2 is not brought forward for a new mental health facility, the University would like to maintain proposals that site should be allocated as an open space for its sporting activities. • Gladman Developments state that it is important for the evidence base for the local plan to properly assess the viability of all the Plan's policy requirements to ensure consistency with the NPPF. • A respondent questions why there are no extra healthcare provisions at ST9. • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership state that the policy should be evidenced with an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan and be modified to remove unnecessary requirements in alignment with the Planning Practice Guidance. • Rachael Maskell MP highlights that the York Teaching Hospital campus is under strain, and while it is proposed that there is a greater emphasis on community care, this does not mitigate against the need to ensure that there is adequate health care provision in the city. • Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust state that the preferred site for their new mental health hospital should be attributed to the Trust, Tees Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust, and not to the local acute Trust, York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. • A respondent suggests that the hospital should be expanded or another built.

Potential changed to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy HW6: Emergency Services**

The Council will work closely with Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust, North Yorkshire Police, and North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, to ensure that their changing needs are understood. The Council will support the development of new emergency service facilities, where there is a demonstrable need, and in appropriate locations that enable them to meet necessary response times.

The Council will support the Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust's new 'Hub and Spoke' estate model. Hubs provide essential clinical and maintenance and facilities, while spoke facilities provide additional opportunities for ambulances to be stationed close to areas of demand. The Council will support the development of additional sites for ambulances at key points in densely populated areas, close to major highways.

The following sites have been identified as requiring additional spoke facilities:

- ST7: Land East of Metcalfe Lane
- ST8: Land North of Monks Cross
- ST9: Land North of Haxby
- ST15: Land West of Wigginton Road
- ~~ST16: Terry's Extension Sites 1 and 2~~

Such facilities would need to provide:

- A 6 x 3m serviced building with water, electricity and drainage.
- Parking facilities for two ambulances.

These facilities would need to be located within the development and close to the main highway.

Supporting Text Changes:

Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.

Summary of Reasons for Change

The list of sites requiring spoke facilities has been updated to exclude ST16: Terrys extension sites 1 and 2. This change removes this requirement on the extension sites to acknowledge the existing planning permission on the wider former Terrys factory site in line with consultation comments received.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 12	Supports: 3	Objections: 5	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, National Railway Museum, and York Green Party support the policy 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Poppleton Parish Council, Nether Poppleton Parish 		

	<p>Council, and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee question why ST1 has been left out list as there is no alternative provision for emergency services in west York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELG Planning on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Ltd recognise that ST16: Terry's Extension Sites 1 and 2 has been identified to provide a 'spoke' facility. It is considered that this use at this location would be unsound. Reference to all SS14 Terry's sites should be removed from the policy.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • Some representations question the need for a new spoke base as there is an existing ambulance base in town.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy HW7: Healthy Places

Proposals for residential developments must provide a statement, proportionate to the size of the development, showing how the following design principles have been adequately considered and incorporated into plans for development:

- well-designed streetscapes that encourage residents to spend time outdoors; and
- the provision of safe, easy to navigate and attractive public footpaths and cycle paths between dwellings, to encourage physical activity; and
- good connections to neighbouring communities and green spaces, in the form of footpaths and cycle routes, including the extension and protection of public rights of way, where appropriate; and
- spaces for communities to come together; and
- adaptations to buildings and public spaces for those with limited mobility; and
- considerations for how the design may impact on crime or perception of safety; and
- buildings that are adaptable to the changing needs of residents.

Details of how these principles have been considered should be noted in the Design and Access Statement accompanying the proposal.

All **new** strategic sites must complete a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) prior to the submission of a planning application. HIAs are a means to systematically assess the potential health risks and benefits of new developments on existing and future communities. They promote the development of actions to mitigate negative impacts and maximise community benefit.

Supporting Text Changes:

Explanatory text at the beginning of section will be included to refer to the production of a supplementary planning document for all policies relating to Health and Well-being.

Summary of Reasons for Change

The policy has been amended to clarify that only new strategic sites must complete HIA. This excludes existing allocations in the plan which are part developed.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 15	Supports: 5	Objections: 7	Comments: 4
---------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several organisations support the policy. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group state that the masterplan for the QE barracks site must take account of these design principles.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ripleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC argue that a Health Impact Assessment is not required as part of ST1 • Several developers object to the requirement to provide a HIA on the basis that sites are selected on the grounds of being sustainable, the need for such an assessment is negated by allocation. Policy should be amended so this requirement relates solely to strategic sites >5ha.

Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yorkshire Wildlife Trust state that a mention of access to semi natural green space should be included in this policy. Suggested amendment to bullet point given to include semi-natural.• Sport England suggest that the policy should include a criterion relating to active design in developments. Sport England has produced Active Design Guidance; this builds on the original Active Design (2007) objectives of improving accessibility, enhancing amenity and increasing awareness, and sets out the ten principles of Active Design.• Gladman Developments state that the evidence base should properly assess the viability of all the Plan's policy requirements to ensure consistency with the NPPF.
----------	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ED1: University of York

To ensure the continuing development of the University of York, the following range of higher education and related uses will be permitted on the University's campuses, as identified on the Proposals Map:

- academic, teaching, research and continuing professional development uses;
- housing for staff and students;
- arts, cultural, sports and social facilities ancillary to higher education uses;
- conferences;
- knowledge based businesses including research led science park; and
- any other uses ancillary to the university including support services for the uses identified above.

The University of York must address the need for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers. Provision will be expected to be made on campus in the first instance. In assessing need, consideration will be given to the capacity of independent providers of bespoke student housing in the city and whether it is economically prudent to provide additional student accommodation.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 3	Supports: 1	Objections: 2	Comments: 0
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy which ensures that a university education is available to all.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council considers that Policies ED1, ED2 and ED3 should be consolidated into one policy. This policy: 1. Does not allow the development of conference facilities unrelated to the university. Policy ED1 currently permits such uses which could significantly intensify usage of the University site to the detriment of surrounding communities. 2. The statement on student housing in Policy ED1 should be significantly strengthened. Instead of simply addressing the need (which in plain English only means looking at and understanding the issue) the University should meet the need arising from future expansion of student numbers. Also there should be no 'let-out clause' about economic prudence in the provision of student housing. The University should meet the needs it is generating in the same way as other forms of development, such as housing. The cost should not fall on nearby local communities. Fulford Parish Council recommends the following rewording: The

	<p>University of York must demonstrate how the need will be met for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers. Provision will be expected to be made on campus in the first instance but account can be taken of firm proposals by independent providers of bespoke student housing elsewhere in the City. 3. There should be no maximum limit on the provision of car-parking at the University, at least until the problem of parking on nearby residential roads has been resolved. Fulford Parish Council considers that the main way of doing this is an enforceable Travel Plan which actively discourages the use of private car. Fulford Parish Council suggests the following addition to the ED1: As part of any new significant proposals, the University shall enter into a Travel Plan with enforceable monitoring and delivery arrangements which discourages the use of the private car by staff, students and visitors and promotes the use of public transport. 4. The reference to Proposal ST27 should be deleted as this is a separate policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce notes a disconnect between the broad ambitions in the plan and how they are to be delivered. The Background and Vision acknowledges the importance of the City's two universities to the City's economic strength but later fails to allocate the land the University of York says it requires to accommodate its future growth. The Chamber fundamentally disagrees with the cautious approach to using the baseline forecast to inform the employment land requirements of the Plan.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments made on this policy.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ED2: Campus West

To maintain the character of Campus West, proposals for extension and redevelopment of existing buildings and the construction of new buildings will be allowed within the following parameters:

- the developed footprint (buildings and car parking only) shall not exceed 23% of the total site area, unless for an agreed temporary period during the implementation of proposals;
- the heights of buildings shall be appropriate to their surroundings and not exceed the height of any adjacent mature tree canopies unless a greater height can be justified in relation to a proposed iconic or landmark building;
- the landscape is conserved and enhanced;
- general car parking (excluding accessible parking spaces) shall not exceed 1,520 spaces;
- maintenance of an adequate internal cycle and pedestrian network which links to entrance points and bus stops; and
- the level of student housing capacity is retained at no less than 3,586 bed spaces unless the spaces are re-provided on Campus East.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses

Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
4	1	3	0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy which ensures that a university education is available to all. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council considers that Policies ED1, ED2 and ED3 should be consolidated into one policy. This policy: 1. Does not allow the development of conference facilities unrelated to the university. Policy ED1 currently permits such uses which could significantly intensify usage of the University site to the detriment of surrounding communities. 2. The statement on student housing in Policy ED1 should be significantly strengthened. Instead of simply addressing the need (which in plain English only means looking at and understanding the issue) the University should meet the need arising from future expansion of student numbers. Also there should be no 'let-out clause' about economic prudence in the provision of student housing. The University should meet the needs it is generating in the same way as other forms of development, such as housing. The cost should not fall on nearby local communities. Fulford Parish Council recommends the following rewording: The University of York must demonstrate how the need will be met for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers. Provision will be expected to be made on campus in the first instance but account can 		

	<p>be taken of firm proposals by independent providers of bespoke student housing elsewhere in the City. 3. There should be no maximum limit on the provision of car-parking at the University, at least until the problem of parking on nearby residential roads has been resolved. Fulford Parish Council considers that the main way of doing this is an enforceable Travel Plan which actively discourages the use of private car. Fulford Parish Council suggests the following addition to the ED1: As part of any new significant proposals, the University shall enter into a Travel Plan with enforceable monitoring and delivery arrangements which discourages the use of the private car by staff, students and visitors and promotes the use of public transport. 4. The reference to Proposal ST27 should be deleted as this is a separate policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England notes the increased recognition being given to University of York campus as an example of post-war university campus development (ref Pevsner) advocates change to policy as follows: <i>"Proposals for the redevelopment of existing buildings must be informed by an assessment of their architectural and historic interest and their contribution to the original campus design. Those buildings which are considered to be of architectural or historic interest should be retained or reused."</i> • A respondent states that the following statement in Policy ED2 is too modest: "maintenance of an adequate internal cycle and pedestrian network which links to entrance points and bus stops;" For the University to be safe, accessible, and non-polluted and, critically for pedestrian and cycle networks to be used second only to public transport , they need to be future-proofed ie <i>"maintenance of an ambitious and future-proof internal cycle and pedestrian network which links to entrance points and bus stops;"</i>
Comments	No comments made to this policy.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ED3: Campus East

The continuing development of University of York Campus East is supported alongside the expansion site at ST27 (University of York Expansion). Development will be permitted in accordance with the uses outlined in Policy ED1 and the following parameters:

- the developed footprint (buildings, car parking and access roads) shall not exceed 23% of the 65ha area allocated for development;
- total car parking shall not exceed 1,500 spaces subject to reserved matters approval by the Council;
- the maintenance of a parkland setting;
- ~~up to 25ha of knowledge based businesses including research led science park uses;~~
- additional student housing shall be provided to cater for expansion of student numbers which is clearly evidenced in terms of demand. Any additional student housing provision on Campus West (over and above the existing 3,586 bed spaces) shall be taken into account when assessing need; and
- an annual student accommodation survey shall be submitted to the Council.

As shown on the proposals map, ~~26-21.5~~ha of land to the south of the existing Campus East site is allocated for the future expansion of the university during the plan period (ST27: University of York Expansion). ~~In addition to the uses listed in Policy ED1, the existing e~~Campus East and ST27 will ~~deliver~~ across both sites deliver up to 25ha of B1b knowledge based businesses including research led science park uses identified in the existing planning permission for Campus East.

ST27 must create an appropriately landscaped buffer must be created between development and the A64 in order to mitigate heritage impacts in terms of the historic character and setting of the city and to maintain key views.

A development brief will be prepared for ST27, covering site considerations, including landscaping, design, local amenity, accessibility and transport requirements.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

Changes to policy to reflect proposed allocation amendments to include revised extension to south (ST27) following consideration of consultation comments and technical evidence.

Consultation Responses

Total representations:5	Supports: 1	Objections: 4	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy which ensures that a university education is available to all. • O'Neill Associates on behalf of University of York support the principle of allocation for University of York expansion primarily for residential colleges, academic buildings, knowledge based businesses and car parking/infrastructure. Support for employment allocation to meet knowledge-led businesses demand. Support for the site to have 		

	<p>restrictions in relation to obligations on the university to encourage student living on campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents support the allocation & policy and welcome the movement of land allocated to the University development away from the village. In the same way that the village is protected from the effects of ST15 it should also be protected from this development. In this case the village should be protected not only from vehicular traffic, but also from large numbers of students coming through the village. This need was recognised in the design of Campus East using the lake as a barrier and had been largely successful. Suggested addition <i>'Retain Low Lane as a route for local traffic only. It is essential that there is no vehicular transport or other access from the University to Heslington village along Low Lane to ensure that the setting of Heslington village is to be maintained.'</i>
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heslington Parish Council states that Heslington still preserves its unique village character despite great pressures from the surrounding expansion of the university. A great deal of care was taken to preserve the character of Heslington and its setting in Green Belt by the creation of a buffer zone between the village and the campus and the creation of a barrier between the campus and the access to the village via Low Lane. This was achieved by careful landscaping of the lakes. Its current use as agricultural land complements the undoubted high environmental status of the university lake and the ground-nesting habitat alongside the lake. This will be lost if the land is developed. The Inspector in his report from the Public Inquiry for the current University expansion particularly comments that the lake and wetland area will provide a positive limit to built development to the south of the Heslington East site. If this allocation were to be approved then its use and access must be conditioned so that: There should be no direct vehicular or pedestrian access from the site, when developed, into the village other than via Field Lane. If access from a new road from ST15 connects with ST27 Campus East then no "rat run" opportunity should be available that allows traffic through to Heslington village. The Local Plan should stipulate that the land can only be developed for the university's own academic purposes, and not be designated as general development land. All existing public routes and Rights of Way should be retained in any completed development.

- Fulford Parish Council objects in principle to Proposal ST27. The site of this proposed allocation is an important part of the green buffer along the A64 and as such contributes significantly to the setting and special character of York. It would bring large-scale development almost completely up to the A64, replicating the type of harm already seen at Clifton Moor. Its development would conflict with at least three of the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in NPPF paragraph 80. FPC must respectfully point out that the site of Proposal ST27 was not intended to be developed by the University when it sought planning permission for Heslington East from the Secretary of State. Instead the site was shown as part of the green buffer around the site. It is unclear why the University has changed its mind over such a short period of time, especially as there has been no change in the environmental value of the land. FPC does note that the proposed allocation is actually for “B1b knowledge businesses” rather than to meet any need identified for further university uses which cannot be accommodated on the existing two campuses. To FPC’s knowledge, no substantial case has been made which demonstrates a need for further land for knowledge-based businesses beyond that allowed by the 2006 Secretary of State permission. Even if there is such a need, FPC considers that sites would not have to be immediately adjacent to the University. If ST27 is retained, the following alterations should be made: 1) Criterion iv) should be altered to omit “*which is clearly evidence in terms of demand*” as it is ambiguous in meaning. 2) Criterion v) should be strengthened. High quality sustainable transport is vital to reduce congestion on the local road network and impacts on nearby communities. To ensure this, FPC considers the criterion should be reworded as follows: Deliver high quality frequent and accessible public transport to York City Centre and elsewhere including Campus West. Any proposal must demonstrate that such measures will enable upwards of 15% of trips to be undertaken using public transport. Monitoring and delivery arrangements will be required in a Section 106 Undertaking to ensure that this policy objective is secured in practice. 3) Criterion vii) should be revised so that it applies the stronger NPPF paragraph 32 test as follows: Demonstrate that all transport issues have been resolved, in consultation with the Council and Highways England as necessary, so that the residual cumulative impacts on the surrounding highway network are not severe. The cumulative impact of the proposal with other proposals to the south-east of York, including ST4 and ST15, should be addressed. 4) Criterion viii) should be either deleted or strengthened. FPC is opposed in principle to a new access onto the A64 because of its harmful impacts on the environment (see below). However if it is to be provided, it is important that ST27 (and the rest of Campus East) makes use of it to benefit local roads. 5) A new criterion should be added so that only businesses linked to the university should be allowed on the site. Otherwise there is a danger that the site is rapidly developed for businesses not genuinely requiring a location adjacent to the university and a case is made in the future for the release of another similar site. FPC suggests the following: Demonstrate that only

	<p>knowledge-based businesses genuinely requiring a location on or immediately adjacent to the University campus are allowed to occupy premises on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, Fulford Parish Council considers that Policies ED1, ED2 and ED3 should be consolidated into one policy. This policy: 1. Not allow the development of conference facilities unrelated to the university. Policy ED1 currently permits such uses which could significantly intensify usage of the University site to the detriment of surrounding communities. 2. The statement on student housing in Policy ED1 should be significantly strengthened. Instead of simply addressing the need (which in plain English only means looking at and understanding the issue) the University should meet the need arising from future expansion of student numbers. Also there should be no 'let-out clause' about economic prudence in the provision of student housing. The University should meet the needs it is generating in the same way as other forms of development, such as housing. The cost should not fall on nearby local communities. FPC recommends the following rewording: The University of York must demonstrate how the need will be met for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers. Provision will be expected to be made on campus in the first instance but account can be taken of firm proposals by independent providers of bespoke student housing elsewhere in the City. 3. There should be no maximum limit on the provision of car-parking at the University, at least until the problem of parking on nearby residential roads has been resolved. FPC considers that the main way of doing this is an enforceable Travel Plan which actively discourages the use of private car. FPC suggests the following addition to the ED1: As part of any new significant proposals, the University shall enter into a Travel Plan with enforceable monitoring and delivery arrangements which discourages the use of the private car by staff, students and visitors and promotes the use of public transport. 4. The reference to Proposal ST27 should be deleted as this is a separate policy. • Historic England states that further consideration needs to be had as to how the growth of this important institution might be delivered in a manner which best safeguards the elements which contribute to the setting of this important historic City. • Additionally, Historic England states that the future expansion of the University should be restricted to within the Campus East and consideration should be given to the expansion of the university in a northerly direction onto site ST4 instead. Notwithstanding stated policy caveats, development could harm 2 elements which contribute to the special character and historic setting of the City, notably: the site's prominence in relation to the A64 - development would fundamentally change the relationship which the southern edge of York has with the countryside to its south. It will alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the city within an area of open space, and may not be successfully mitigated through 'landscaping' (previously amounting to alien earth bunding); the expansion would alter the relationship of York to its surrounding
--	---

villages, in terms of distance, scale and the fact that they are free-standing and clearly definable settlements. The development would reduce the gap between the city and ST15 to 1.6km.

- York Green Party questions the sustainability of the expansion site ST27 and adding to current parking pressures. 'Upwards of 15% by public transport' is far too low a target even allowing for walking and cycling for more local trips around the university area. Direct access from the A64 (in conjunction with ST15) is likely to promote a higher level of trips by car, again exacerbating parking pressures. It would be preferable to explicitly state that this allocation will be dependent on a public transport link as part of a master plan for both sites (ideally a tram connection to serve the new garden village, the extension and campus east linking in due course to campus west and the city centre.
- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York objects to the disparity between the existing planning permission on campus east for up to 25ha of employment floorspace (likely to be 5.75ha / 57,500 sqm single storey) to 21,500 sqm (equating to 2.33 - 3.16 ha) in policy SS22 and ED3. The policy needs to be altered to clarify that the existing permitted 25 ha of business at 23% footprint on campus East stands plus 21,5000 sqm at the extension. Wording suggested: *"up to 25 ha of knowledge-based businesses including research-led science park uses are permitted on the existing campus plus 21,500 sqm of such uses on the extension. With the agreement of the City Council, this capacity can be located across either or both the campus and extension"*. The contradiction between ED3 and EC1 needs to be clarified to allow the campus extension. Also the size of the allocation should revert to 2014 position (28 ha - option 1 presented).
- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York suggests an alternative ST27 boundary - (Option 1) 2014 version of 28ha with an external buffer of around 30ha. This would provide 26ha of developable land and negates need for landscape buffer in allocation. Preferred option thought to be most successful to meet the University's needs in the long-term. 2ha remains outside of university control. Likely to have a strong landscape scheme with high quality open parkland setting with wide southern buffer area. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. No impacts on views to Heslington although some panoramic views. Also likely to have strong green belt boundaries along historic field pattern. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting key to mitigating landscape changes similarly to Campus East. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.
- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York suggests an alternative ST27 boundary - (Option 3) 32 ha extending the 2017 allocation further south including a landscape buffer of 7.5ha. This would incorporate a 7.5 ha buffer leaving 22.5 ha of developable land. 2ha remains outside of university control. Principally the campus will

be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Relationship to campus is similar to the current boundary although larger scale development and open parkland setting likely to be accommodated. A major inhibitor would result from the proximity to the A64 and visibility; A considerable buffer/noise barrier to the A64 would be required providing glimpsed views to campus. The Views to Heslington would not be interrupted. Detailed landscape principles are recommended. Parkland setting key to mitigating landscape changes. Site would cater for 3 x residential colleges and research-led business activity linked to the university.

- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York's main objection relates to the policies which strongly support the University's continued expansion are not translated into adequate land allocation for expansion. The 14ha of development space proposed for the next 20 years will not provide the security which the university needs for long term planning and therefore will not meet the Council's own policies on growth of the University and expansion of the York economy. Taking into consideration space planning it is considered that 23.8 ha of developable land is required to 2032/22 and 28 ha to 2038 to allow for green belt permanence (2014 boundary with landscape buffer). Current allocation therefore hinders ability to respond to future requirements and need. The policy should reference knowledge based business in addition to other higher education and related uses.

Object to the boundary proposed in 2017 (Option 2 referred to in response) as they consider that this would require an internal buffer to the A64 (5.5ha) and therefore only allow a 14 ha of developable land. This is likely to put pressure on the Green Belt boundaries in the long-term by inadequately allocating land for the University in the long-term; this would meet 50% of development needs. Alternative boundaries suggested show that there is little difference between the sites in terms of visual effects. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the A64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development. Considered that this would have a weaker relationship to campus given only part developed on the south eastern part of the lake. Western edge include 2ha of land outside of university control. Would mean smaller scale development with only one area of open space - limited parkland setting. Detailed landscape principles are recommended.

Evidence submitted includes location plans and visual assessment for alternative options and masterplan document.

- A number of other representations were received, covering a number of issues. The University has not yet used up available space at Heslington East campus. There is more than sufficient undeveloped land on that site to meet its needs. Conditions on the permission for Heslington East campus should still apply, i.e. a buffer zone

	<p>maintained between the campus and Heslington - these have been breached by permission to allow a health centre, shops and food outlets in the buffer zone. Allowing employment space on land adjacent to the A64 is breaching the buffer zone again. Employment space on this land adjacent to the A64 suggests the possibility of a separate access/egress point to this road and could lead to traffic entering Heslington along an improved Low Lane and using the Village as a short cut. Heslington would be almost completely enclosed by the campus and its environs - the pleasure of the countryside and rural feel would be lost to its inhabitants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Inspector's report to the Heslington East Public Inquiry states that development expansion of the University on Heslington East should not cross Low Lane in order to protect Heslington Village. Further removal of Green Belt/prime agricultural land in this area seriously compromises this open land setting. • Any new access from the proposed new development site West of Elvington Lane must run closely alongside the A64 to avoid harming open farmland or views to and from Heslington village. • The proposed student housing will impact on the historic individuality of York. The View from the A64 is already denigrated by the new University building. Nothing will reduce the eyesore of student accommodation infill up to the road. • CYC needs to consider the impact on the setting and special character of the City. The cumulative impact of developments like this one will be disastrous. York already has a serious traffic / congestion issue. York's special character is just related to the walled City or conservation areas - views from the outer ring road are also important particularly where they include views of the Minster. ST27 is an important part of the green buffer along the A64 and contributes to the special character of York. Additionally, the development would result in increased noise and disturbance in an area greatly valued by local residents. The combined result would destroy the character of the Green Belt, and significantly increased traffic congestion - large scale development would be almost up to the A64, the A19 is already near max capacity and the special character of Fulford Conservation Area would be damaged.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Neill Associates on behalf of University of York states that University growth supports economic growth in York as set out through the policy by increasing numbers of staff and businesses on campus. • Heslington Village Trust states that movement of the site away from the village is welcome but as with ST15 the village must be protected from both vehicular traffic and students coming through the village (a need that was recognised in the planning consent granted for Heslington East where using the new lakes as a barrier has been successful). Any new access from ST15 must run closely adjacent to the A64 to minimise harmful impacts on open farmland and views to / from Heslington.

- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York states that the university campus East has permission for 65 ha of development land of which 35ha has been developed over the last 10 years and 30 ha remains undeveloped. Proposals for 5ha of further development is anticipated in the next 5 years. The University is a long-term presence and requires land for expansion over the time frame of the plan. Uptake of employment uses on 25ha allocated in Campus East to date has been slow. Growth in students over the last 10 years has been from 5300 to 16000 and it is likely to keep growing. the university supports 3,900 staff. Changes to government funding have resulted in the university planning more specifically for the future. Key to size are growing departments, growth in international foundation programmes for internal students and growing long distance learning. Continued success of the university is fundamental to York's economy. Projected need for the future for student accommodation includes 2 colleges in the short-term and 3 more in the long-term to 2032; extra 3 colleges cannot be accommodated on existing campus. Employment use buildings such as The Catalyst needs car parking with close proximity. Access from the A64 in conjunction with ST15 may be attractive for business users. Principally the campus will be seen from the south east although the 64 corridor acts as a visual barrier. Accepted that there will be significant change in landscape character at Heslington East from open agricultural land to areas of large scale built development as per the Campus East.
- O'Neill Associates on behalf of the University of York is confident that car parking across Campus East and the new extension will be accommodated within the existing planning permission as only 27% of maximum of current permission provided. University of supportive of connectivity to the A64 alongside ST15. No vehicle access proposed through Heslington.
- Northern Power Grid states that the potential need for network reinforcement for connections to this proposed development site to accommodate the additional load but the level of detail available in the plan is not sufficient to quantify the extent at this stage of development. EHV infrastructure reinforcement may be required for this site. This may have impacts on development timescales so it is advisable that as soon as developers have details of their developments location and electrical capacity requirements they submit an application for connection to Northern Power Grid so they can provide a quotation for the connection and details of any reinforcement and/or diversion works that may be required.
- York Ramblers state that at the eastern edge of this site there is an outer urban footpath link from Hopgrove to Escrick. Would appreciate maintaining a green way alongside the site rather than a path along boundary buildings. Same applies to Green Lane which leads down to Grange Farm. There should certainly be a green buffer and trees to screen the development somewhat from the A64. Agrees that the 23% footprint should include car parking

	<p>and access roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A number of respondents commented regarding access to ST27 and asking what measures are proposed to ensure access to the site will be limited to Para 3.96 page 71. Also, questions were raised about the site will be accessed from Hull Road. Several access points were suggested. It was also noted potential link to ST27 via A64. Would support a new junction beside ST27 rather than anything further west as minimises destruction of farmland and provides University with direct link to A64.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy ED4: York St. John University Lord Mayor's Walk Campus			
<p>The development and redevelopment of York St John University's Lord Mayor's Walk campus will be permitted provided that it is limited to higher education and related uses and its design takes into account the sensitive location of the campus and its setting.</p> <p>York St. John University must address the need for any additional student housing which arises because of their future expansion of student numbers. In assessing need, consideration will be given to the capacity of independent providers of bespoke student housing in the city and whether it is economically prudent to provide additional student accommodation. To meet any projected shortfall, provision will be expected to be off campus but in locations convenient to the main campus. The reduction of on-campus student provision will be supported subject to adequate provision being made off campus.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
Cross reference added to include D10 in response to Historic England response.			
See also Policy H7, ED5, D3, D4, D5, and D6 and D10.			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Change			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations:	4	Supports:	3
		Objections:	2
		Comments:	0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St John University supports this policy Historic England supports the requirement that future development needs to take account of its sensitive setting (opposite the City Walls, partly in Conservation area and including a number of listed buildings). Note that supporting text should also reference Policy D10. Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy which ensures that a university education is available to all. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Green Party states that whenever possible the first recourse for additional purpose built student accommodation should be on campus. Not convinced that on-campus student provision should be reduced. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments made to this policy. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ED5: York St. John University Further Expansion

To support the continued success of York St. John University the following sites, as shown on the proposals map, are allocated for the uses below:

Sport uses:

- Land at Northfield, Haxby Road.

Student Housing:

- SH1: Land at Heworth Croft

Supporting Text Changes:

Reference to the conservation area added in supporting text to reflect Historic England's response.

Student Housing

7.18 There is insufficient capacity at the existing York St. John University campus to accommodate student housing needs. SH1: Land at Heworth Croft is allocated for student housing to support the university in meeting its students' accommodation needs. High quality, purpose built student accommodation that it is designed and managed in a way that attracts students to take it up can free up accommodation suitable for wider general housing needs. Development will be permitted at the allocated site in accordance with Policy H7 'Student Housing' and will also need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the conservation area are not harmed.-

Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change to policy site sites allocations.

Consultation Responses


NB: consultation comments specifically in relation SH1 are provided overleaf.

Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
1	1	0	0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York St. John University supports policy ED5 and the allocation of student housing (SH1) at Heworth Croft. • HCA support the policy's general intent. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent objects to more student accommodation (SH1 – Land at Heworth Croft). • One respondent states that the replacement sports provision has been double counted for this site and H56, there is not enough land at Haxby Road to replace H56 alone or (H56 & SH1). Also wishes to participate in any public inquiry in order to put concerns to the inspector directly about the unsound plan. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England has no objection to the principle of allocating the site (SH1 – Land at Heworth Croft). Policy should state that development proposals for the area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the Heworth Green/East Parade/Huntington Road Conservation Area are not harmed. 		

Allocation SH1: Land at Heworth Croft

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	N/a	No Change
Estimated Yield	N/a	No Change
Phasing	N/a	No Change

Allocation boundary



Consultation Responses for SH1

Total number of respondents: 4 no.	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: 2 no.	Comments: 1 no.
Support	York St John University support this site (together with Policy ED5: York St John University Further Expansion))		
Objection	There was an objection received to the replacement sports		

	provision being double counted for this site and H56: Land at Hull Road. It was also argued that there is not enough provision at Haxby Road to replace that which exists at H56 and SH1.
Comments	Historic England do not object in principle to the site provided that the development proposals do not harm the elements that contribute to the significance of the Heworth Green/East Parade/Huntington Road Conservation Area.
Boundary change suggested	
No alternative boundary submitted	

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ED6: Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education

The provision of sufficient modern education facilities for the delivery of preschool, primary and secondary school education to meet an identified need and address deficiencies in existing facilities will be facilitated. Subject to detailed viability and deliverability work as part of site master planning, this will include new provision to support strategic housing allocations (as identified in the Spatial Strategy) alongside any future developments of existing educational facilities which reflect the aspirations of local communities.

New or enhanced education facilities will be permitted if they:

- i. are in locations that are accessible by sustainable means of transport from the communities they are intending to serve and not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring property;
- ii. have sufficient and appropriate playing field provision or take opportunities to deliver additional playing fields for existing schools identified as having a deficiency, as part of new developments immediately adjacent to or near the schools; and
- iii. provide community access, through good design and modifications, to their facilities in areas where there are deficiencies of community leisure and sports facilities.

As shown on the proposals map, land at Manor Church of England Academy is allocated as new open space complimenting the existing educational establishment designation.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 4	Objections: 1	Comments: 4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amongst others, York Green Party and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy, with the latter adding that the policy ensures sufficient pre-school, primary and secondary education facilities including open space and sports areas are available to the growing population. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) support the intent of the policy in encouraging the optimum density for housing. • Rapleys LLP stated it is committed to the provision of suitable on-site educational facilities and off-site contributions as necessary in accordance with the CIL Regulations 122 on ST1 • The Education & Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) welcomes the inclusion of policy which addresses the issue of providing new 		

	schools.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESFA advocates the policy should be expanded to outline access to good schools and range of schools to choose from. • Johnson Mowat states that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership (YCP) has a concern about the lack of up to date evidence for school planning which should be demonstrated in an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Arup on behalf of the YCP Seeks further clarity as to the intent and purpose of the policy and whether it is intended to deliver educational facilities as part of its strategic sites.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy ED7: York College and Askham Bryan College			
<p>The continued success of York College and Askham Bryan College is supported, including any further expansion of their teaching, administration, research operations and student accommodation at their existing sites and campuses as shown on the Proposals Map.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change. Clarification of the extent of the boundary on the proposals map proposed in line with consultation comments.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations:	5	Supports:	2
		Objections:	1
			Comments:
			4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions Planning on behalf of Askham Bryan College supports policy ED7, recognising the contribution Askham Bryan College makes to economic growth, creating a quality educational offer within York. The college has had a programme of expansion over recent years which will add to its growth and increasing number of students attending the college, and provide extra courses. The college is also expanding its current programme of wildlife conservation. • Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy which ensures a wide range of further education is available to provide the growing need for different courses such as apprenticeships etc. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions Planning Consultancy on behalf of Askham Bryan College are concerned with the extent of the Askham Bryan College designation on the Proposals Map, which are out of date, following planning permissions granted over the last few years and the extent of the College's campus. The area between the yellow shading and the A64 now has planning permission for a Wildlife and Animal Conservation Management area, which include a number of permanent buildings on site, as well as being a teaching area for College students and schools. Therefore, it should be within the College designation. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions Planning on behalf of Askham Bryan College welcome the recognition within the Plan, within paragraph 1.57, policy DP1 and policy ED7, of the contribution Askham Bryan College makes to economic growth, addressing imbalances in the demographics of the district, and creating a quality educational offer within York. The wording of Policy ED7 is therefore supported. However, we are concerned with the extent of the designation shown on the Proposals Map, which we feel is out of date given the planning permissions that have been granted over the last few years and the actual extent of development on the College's campus. In particular, the area shown on the Proposals Map between the yellow shading and the A64 now has planning permission for a Wildlife and Animal Conservation Management. This area has a number of animal houses that are 		

	<p>buildings of a permanent nature. There are proposals to extend the number of animal houses in the future. The area is an important teaching resource for students, because it provides them with the opportunity to learn, and care, for a wide variety of species. It also provides an opportunity for schools to access the teaching resource. This area is, therefore, an important element of the existing teaching facilities of the College, and so it should be included within the extent of the campus designation shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy ED8: Community Access to Sports and Cultural Facilities on Education Sites			
Community use of new/extended education facilities will be expected and should be incorporated into the design in a way that allows for and optimises their potential use.			
Through the development process, agreements for wider community access to existing sports and cultural facilities on all education sites will be secured, unless a local sufficiency can be demonstrated.			
The loss of existing community access will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that there is no continuing demand from the community for the facilities or alternative provision in the area of benefit can be made.			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No changes.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 4	Supports: 1	Objections: 0	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the use of education facilities for the community. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D1: Placemaking

Development proposals will be supported where they improve poor existing urban and natural environments, enhance York's special qualities and better reveal the significances of the historic environment. Development proposals that fail to take account of York's special qualities, fail to make a positive design contribution to the city, or cause damage to the character and quality of an area will be refused.

Development proposals should adhere to the following detailed design points:

i. Urban Structure and Grain

- Enhance, respect and complement the historic arrangement of street blocks, plots and buildings, where possible restoring old patterns of urban grain where these have been damaged or obscured.
- Enhance and complement the character and appearance of landscape, city parks, landforms, open space, planting and boundary treatment.

ii. Density and Massing

- Demonstrate that the resultant density of a development proposal will be appropriate for its proposed use and neighbouring context.
- Demonstrate that the combined effect of development does not dominate other buildings and spaces, paying particular attention to adjacent buildings or parks of architectural or historic significance.

iii. Streets and Spaces

- Promote ease of public pedestrian and cyclist movement and establish natural patterns of connectivity with the fabric of the city. Spaces and routes must be attractive, safe, and uncluttered and clearly prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles.
- Promote legibility through development by providing recognisable routes, hierarchy of routes, intersections, incidental spaces and landmarks.
- Are designed to improve the quality of the public realm and the wider environment for all.
- Provide a pattern of continuity and enclosure, dependant on circumstances, to reflect the need for different types of space for different types of activity including clearly defining private from public space, and mediate between the two.
- Designed to reduce crime and the fear of crime and promote public safety throughout the day and night.

iv. Building Heights and Views

- Respect York's skyline by ensuring that development does not challenge the visual dominance of the Minster or the city centre roofscape.
- Respect and enhance views of landmark buildings and important vistas.

v. Character and Design Standards

- Ensure proposals are not a pale imitation of past architectural styles.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure appropriate building materials are used. • Meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion. • Demonstrate the use of best practice in contemporary urban design and place making. • Integrate car parking and servicing within the design of development so as not to dominate the street scene. • Create active frontages to public streets, spaces and waterways. • Create buildings and spaces that are fit for purpose but are also adaptable to respond to change. • Create places that feel true to their intended purpose. • Maximise sustainability potential. 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change – suggested references to local best practice are welcomed and will inform emerging site specific masterplans where appropriate.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 13	Supports: 5	Objections: 1	Comments: 9
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Civic Trust supports the policy context, essential for a city of the global and historic significance of York. Suggests that some of the specific wording of para 1.52 could strengthen the impact of policy wording. • Historic England supports policy approach, ensuring elements which contribute to the special character of the City are safeguarded. Particularly welcome the requirement that development proposals that fail to take account of York's special qualities, fail to make a positive contribution to the City, or cause damage to the character or quality of an area will be refused. • York Green Party Strongly support this broad approach. Regarding Iv Building Heights and views, add "<i>In general existing tall buildings will not be modified to include more modern additional accommodation on top of existing roofscape unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this is essential for the viable conversion of the building to its new use.</i>" • Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd support the need to achieve high quality design on development schemes in York. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy and would expect the contents of the policy to be incorporated into a masterplan for the QE barracks site. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC objects to no clear definition within the policy in supporting text of York's special qualities or the significance of the historic environment, leaving it ambiguous and unclear. Deleted wording suggested. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Georgian Society and Conservation Areas Advisory Panel suggest that, as the Plan promotes garden villages as part of its development strategy, policy should reference best practice as 		

	<p>exemplified at New Earswick reflecting the first Garden Village movement. Example should be included in "The study of adjacent settlements in particular New Earswick...in the area should be undertaken." Also, pg 145 point v 'Character and Design standards' - alter 'appropriate building materials' to 'compatible building materials'. Pg 147 alter "Suitable building materials" to "Compatible building materials". Note other detailed comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Standards Paragraph (Para 8.11) excellence in workmanship should be added as a requirement. Should include encouragement for proposed developments over a certain size to consult the Yorkshire and Humber Design Review Panel before submitting a planning application to ensure the best design possible. • Questions what the intended function of 'City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance 2014. Is it intended to be an SPD under D1 iii)? • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) states clarity should be provided to define the level of detail required at outline planning application stage for sites adjacent to conservation areas in terms of 'Full design details' required. • York Minster support emphasising the visual dominance of Minster. • CPRE - North Yorkshire state place making should apply to all development proposals and will be essential in the development management process to aid sustainable development and to protect and enhance the special character of York.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D2: Landscape and Setting

Development proposals will be encouraged and supported where they:

- i. demonstrate understanding through desk and field based evidence of the local and wider landscape character and landscape quality relative to the locality, and the value of its contribution to the setting and context of the city and surrounding villages, including natural and historic features and influences such as topography, vegetation, drainage patterns and historic land use;
- ii. conserve and enhance landscape quality and character, and the public's experience of it and make a positive contribution to York's special qualities;
- iii. demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the interrelationship between good landscape design, bio-diversity enhancement and water sensitive design;
- iv. create opportunities to enhance the public use and enjoyment of existing and proposed streets and open spaces;
- v. recognise the significance of landscape features such as mature trees, hedges, and historic boundaries and York's other important character elements, and retain them in a respectful context where they can be suitably managed and sustained;
- vi. take full account of issues and recommendations in the most up to date York Landscape Character Appraisal;
- vii. include sustainable, practical, and high quality soft and hard landscape details and planting proposals that are clearly evidence based and make a positive contribution to the character of streets, spaces and other landscapes;
- viii. create a comfortable association between the built and natural environment and attain an appropriate relationship of scale between building and adjacent open space, garden or street. In this respect consideration will be also be given to function and other factors such as the size of mature trees; and
- ix. avoid an adverse impact on intrinsically dark skies and landscapes, townscapes and/or habitats that are sensitive to light pollution, keeping the visual appearance of light fixtures and finishes to a minimum, and avoiding light spill.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 12	Supports: 5	Objections: 2	Comments: 5
---------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support

- York Civic Trust and Historic England support the proposed policy approach.
- York Green Party welcome this policy and the cross reference to Green Infrastructure
- Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports policy and expect the contents of the policy to be incorporated into a masterplan for the QE barracks site.
- CPRE - North Yorkshire states that the recognition of the

	importance of landscape and setting via this policy is especially welcomed.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC state there is no clear definition within the policy or supporting text as to the meaning of York's special qualities. The mature landscaping has been retained in relation to British Sugar where possible in the context of the re-profiling remediation works. • Gladman Developments Policy states policy should be reworded in order to be fully compliant with the NPPF as the impact on the landscape is one factor that should be considered by the decision maker when determining planning applications.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canal & River Trust welcome the inclusion of water sensitive design, though believe should expand on what this is to make the policy effective. Suggests adding: <i>'Development should improve access to, along and from the waterway/ Development should optimise views and natural surveillance of the waterway/ Development should not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the waterway by virtue of noise, odour or visual impact'</i>. • Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson, Linden Homes, Taylor Wimpey and G M Ward Trustees state they have been unable to locate the York Landscape Character Appraisal mentioned. This needs to be made available in the evidence base documents. • It cannot be presumed that the removal of trees and hedgerows can be offset by planting new ones as the ecology of these can take decades to develop and new ones may not have the same ecology.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D3: Cultural Provision

Cultural wellbeing is identified as one of the twelve core planning principles underpinning both plan-making and decision-making in the National Planning Policy Framework. Development proposals will be supported where they are designed to sustain, enhance, and add value to the special qualities and significance of York's cultural character, assets, capacity, activities, and opportunities for access.

- i. Development proposals will be supported where they:
- Enable and promote the delivery of new cultural facilities and/or activities and services such as permanent and temporary public arts
 - Provide facilities, opportunities, and/or resources for cultural programmes and activities, during an/or after the development period
 - Do not cause the loss of cultural facilities, activities, or services
 - Do not cause the loss of venues or spaces, including in the public realm, that deliver cultural opportunities, activities, or services
- ii. ~~The masterplanning~~ Development proposals for ~~on~~ all strategic sites, ~~of whatever scale,~~ will need to demonstrate that include an assessment of future cultural provision has been considered ~~the current status and need relating to culture and its provision.~~ This assessment should be included in a Cultural Wellbeing Plan, ~~which should also~~ describ~~inge~~ how the four criteria of above ~~in section~~ (i) are satisfied. ~~In addition to demonstrating enablement of cultural facilities and/or services, the Plan can also refer to:~~

~~Citizenship through participation
Encouragement through leadership
Fostering long term benefits
Encouragement of diversity~~

Supporting Text Changes:

~~Explanation~~

~~Culture can and does contribute positively to York's local character by responding to the underlying structure, distinctive patterns and forms of development and local culture. Development should deliver a multi-functional public realm comprising streets and spaces that can accommodate a range of appropriate arts and cultural uses and activities both now and in the future, providing animation, vitality and inclusion. Major development schemes and significant schemes at whatever scale should also enable the delivery of permanent and temporary public arts, promoting a~~

~~multi-disciplinary approach to commissioning artists in the design process itself. Facilities and resources, including funding, for arts and cultural activity both within and beyond the development period itself (for example via a legacy trust), will also be supported.~~

~~Cultural facilities add value and support to community participation, wellbeing and development. The City of York's residents demonstrate pride in their cultural diversity. The City of York is keen to protect these capacities to engender community cohesion and civic pride. As part of good place-making, cultural quality, assets, and opportunities can also add to the attractiveness and value of development schemes.~~

~~When a new cultural facility or programme is required, it should be accessible for local residents as well as visitors, and be a place where cultural diversity can be explored and enjoyed. Furthermore, to build on existing opportunities, proposed developments which have a significant impact, at whatever scale and those directly related to the cultural industries, will be required to contribute towards enhancing public realm through the promotion of the public arts, cultural diversity and provision of additional facilities and activities where appropriate.~~

~~Where needed to manage and promote cultural wellbeing, the council will seek to work with stakeholders as appropriate in the preparation of sustaining, enhancing and adding value to cultural wellbeing in York.~~

Culture can and does contribute positively to York's local character by responding to the underlying structure, distinctive patterns and forms of development and local culture. Development should deliver a multi-functional public realm comprising streets and spaces that can accommodate a range of appropriate arts and cultural uses and activities both now and in the future, providing animation, vitality and inclusion. Major development schemes and significant schemes at whatever scale should also enable the delivery of permanent and temporary public arts, promoting a multi-disciplinary approach to commissioning artists in the design process itself as part of design and masterplanning teams. Facilities and resources, including funding, for arts and cultural activity both within and beyond the development period itself (for example via a legacy trust), will also be supported.

Arts and Cultural facilities add value and support to community participation, wellbeing and development. The City of York's residents demonstrate pride in their cultural diversity. The City of York is keen to protect these capacities to engender community cohesion and civic pride. As part of good place-making, cultural quality, assets, and opportunities can also add to the attractiveness and value of

development schemes.

When a new arts and cultural facility or programme is required, it should be accessible for local residents as well as visitors, and be a place where cultural diversity can be explored and enjoyed. Furthermore, to build on existing opportunities, proposed developments which have a significant impact, at whatever scale and those directly related to the cultural industries, will be required to contribute towards enhancing public realm through the promotion of the public arts, cultural diversity and provision of additional facilities and activities where appropriate.

In the defining, promoting and facilitating of cultural wellbeing, the Council will seek to work in partnership with developers, stakeholders, and the arts and cultural sector to sustain and enhance York's cultural capacity and character. The Council will produce an SPD outlining the requirements of the Cultural Wellbeing Plan.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amended to provide additional clarity.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 12		Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
		4	7	2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Civic Trust, Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership and the National Railway Museum support policy. York at Large sub-group support the recognition of the concepts of cultural wellbeing, cultural capacity and the requirement on significant sites for a Cultural Wellbeing Plan. These would potentially place York in the forefront of national best practice. Suggest further collaborative working to articulate, refine and make practicable the ideas and policies within the current Plan. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lichfields on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd state he policy implies that it is the responsibility of the developer to undertake an audit of existing facilities to determine whether additional provision is required. This is the responsibility of the council. Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PL, ELG Planning on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Ltd and Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership state it is not considered necessary for a Cultural Wellbeing Plan to be undertaken on all strategic sites. It should be done on a plan wide level. Policy should be amended so this requirement applies only to strategic sites > 5 			

	<p>ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes, K Hudson, Linden Homes, Taylor Wimpey and G M Ward Trustees object to request that strategic sites will need to assess current status and need relating to culture and provision as this is a task that only the Council can perform.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York lacks public art. It would be beneficial to actively require the provision of public art for new developments of a certain size / value. This is perhaps reflected in D3 but could be strengthened. • Does not understand the thought process behind this policy, it appears unclear and easy to meet as majority of developments will already meet the last two points (3 and 4).

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D4: Conservation Areas

Development proposals within or affecting the setting of ~~conservation areas~~ a conservation area will be supported where they:

- i. are designed to ~~conserve and~~ preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the conservation area and would enhance or better reveal its significance;
- ii. ~~leave qualities intrinsic to the wider context unchanged,~~ and respect important views; and
- iii. are accompanied by an appropriate evidence based assessment of the conservation area's special qualities, proportionate to the size and impact of the development and sufficient to ensure that impacts of the proposals are clearly understood.

Outline planning applications for development within or ~~adjacent to~~ affecting the setting of a conservation areas will only be supported if full design details are included, sufficient to show the likely impact of the proposals upon the significance of the Conservation Area.

Changes of use will be supported when it has been demonstrated that the primary uses of the building can no longer be sustained, and where the proposed new use would not significantly harm the special qualities and significance of the place conservation area, ~~and where proposed changes of use will enhance its significance.~~

~~Demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to a Conservation Area will be resisted.~~

Harm to buildings, open spaces, trees, views or other elements which make a positive contribution to a Conservation Area will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Conservation Area will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 3	Objections: 3	Comments: 3
--------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Civic Trust and York Green Party support policy approach. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group state any development must enhance existing conservation areas and consideration should be given to the unique development at Strensall Park adjacent to the QE Barracks site
---------	--

	<p>in order to protect its heritage and history.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England support policy but note that it does not reflect the advice of NPPF; suggests replacing with "<i>Development proposals within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be supported where they: i) are designed to preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the Conservation Area; ii) it would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area or would help secure a sustainable future for a building of risk within it; iii) are accompanied by an appropriate evidence based assessment of the conservation area's special qualities, proportionate to the size and impact of the development and sufficient to ensure that impacts of the proposals are clearly understood. Outline planning applications for development within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area will only be supported if full design details are included sufficient to show the likely impact of the proposals upon the significance of the Conservation area. Changes of use will be supported where it has been demonstrated that the original use of the building is no longer viable or appropriate and where the proposed new use would not harm the significance of the area. Harm to buildings, open spaces, trees, views or other elements which make a positive contribution to a Conservation Area will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Conservation Area will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.</i>" • Gladman Developments state policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets. • Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes suggest part (i) of the policy is not the correct test for assessing development which affects a conservation area. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that developments within conservation areas should "preserve or enhance" the asset. The policy states that "outline planning applications for development within or adjacent to conservation areas will only be supported if full design details are included". This should be deleted from the policy.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Georgian Society and Conservation Areas Advisory Panel suggest inserting in the last sentence of Pg 152, para 8.26 "<i>Alteration and conversion schemes should respect the scale...</i>" • This policy should include more NPPF wording relating to changes of use and loss of community benefit (See Historic England Guidance: Heritage Listing Advice Note 7)

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D5: Listed Buildings

Proposals affecting ~~the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings (designated heritage assets)~~ a Listed Building or its setting will generally be supported where they:

- i. ~~preserve, enhance or better reveal the significance and heritage values of the building those elements which contribute to the significance of the building or its setting. The more important the building, the greater the weight that will be given to its conservation;~~ and
- ii. help secure a sustainable future for a building at risk;
- iii. are accompanied by an appropriate, evidence based heritage statement, assessing the significance of the building evidence based heritage statement and justification.

~~Proposals affecting the setting of a listed building will be supported where they protect its setting, including key views, approaches and aspects of the immediate and wider environment that are intrinsic to its value and significance. Changes of use will be supported where it has been demonstrated that the original use of the building is no longer viable and where the proposed new use would not harm its significance.~~

Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Listed Building or its setting will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss of a Listed Building will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.

~~Alterations and extensions to listed buildings will generally be supported when they do not harm the special architectural or historic interest of the building or its setting, and when proposals have clear and convincing justification.~~

~~As the purpose of listing a building is to conserve it for future generations, demolition should be wholly exceptional, requiring the strongest justification.~~

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 7	Supports: 2	Objections: 3	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and York Green Party support. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Civic Trust supports policy. Suggests rewording: "...will be generally supported only where they: i. can be shown..."; further 		

	<p>text to be added to ii) to strengthen 'understanding': <i>"...are accompanied by a heritage statement that clearly sets out the evidence for the historical and architectural significance of the building. Only where the asset is thoroughly understood can the impact of the proposals be judged and a justification for them made."</i>. Cite Conservation Principles at para 8.29; deposit heritage statements with the HER; amend para 8.30 by changing the wording to <i>"like for like repairs in terms of precise design and proportions and materials"</i>; given recent cases, make explicit reference to the need for Listed Building Consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports policy but it does not reflect the advice of the NPPF, suggests replacing with :- <i>"Development proposals affecting a Listed Building or its setting will be supported where they: i) preserve those elements which contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the building or its setting. The more important the building, the greater the weight that will be given to its conservation; ii) would enhance or better reveal the significance of a Listed Building or will help secure a sustainable future for a building at risk; and iii) are accompanied by an appropriate evidence based assessment of the significance of the building, proportionate to the size and impact of the development and sufficient to ensure that impacts of the proposals are clearly understood. Changes of use will be supported where it has been demonstrated that the original use of the building is not longer viable or appropriate and where the proposed new use would not harm its significance. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Listed Building or its setting will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss of a Listed Building will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits."</i> • Gladman Developments states policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that Listed Buildings are used and maintained to stop them becoming derelict and that new development maintains the setting of Listed Buildings. • York contains a high number of highly graded buildings, Historic England should therefore be identified as a key delivery partner.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D6: Archaeology

Development proposals that affect archaeological features and deposits will be supported where they are:

- i. they are accompanied by an evidence based heritage statement that describes the significances of the archaeological deposits affected and that includes a desk based assessment and, where necessary, reports on intrusive and non-intrusive surveys of the application site and its setting; including characterisation of waterlogged organic deposits, if present;
- ii. they will not result in harm to the significances of the site or its setting; and
- iii. they are designed to enhance or better reveal the significances of an archaeological site or will help secure a sustainable future for an archaeological site at risk
- iv. harm to archaeological deposits is unavoidable, detailed mitigation measures have been agreed with City of York Council that include, where appropriate, provision for deposit monitoring, investigation, recording, analysis, publication, archive deposition and community involvement.

Explanation

8.31 The deep, wet, anoxic sub-surface archaeological features and deposits within the historic core of the City of York are designated as an Area of Archaeological Importance under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and are of international importance and significance. The vast majority of these archaeological deposits are of equivalent significance to scheduled ancient monuments. Within the historic core, substantial harm is defined as greater than 5% disturbance to buried archaeological deposits through foundation design and infrastructure development as described in the York Development and Archaeology Study (1990). Within the historic core, substantial harm to nationally-important remains will be permitted only where it meets this target and where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits. This policy approach has been adopted to ensure both the continued economic vitality of the city centre and the preservation in-situ of these highly significant deposits. In all other parts of the City of York, substantial harm to or loss of designated or undesignated features or deposits of national importance will be will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.~~resisted.~~

8.32 The important and complex picture of the development of human settlement and exploitation in the City of York area is constantly being amended and elaborated as a result of archaeological investigations and research. Understanding this picture and the significance of these assets, both designated and undesignated, are fundamental to their conservation, enhancement and management. Development proposals will always need to be accompanied by a heritage statement that is proportionate to the size and impact of development proposals and the nature of

archaeological evidence. In all circumstances the City of York Historic Environment Record (HER) must be consulted and advice and guidance sought from the council's historic environment specialists. The significance and value of archaeological remains must always be appropriately assessed as part of a statement of significance drawn up with reference to Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008), which the Council considers to be appropriate guidance on this matter. The heritage statement may also need to be accompanied by the results of more detailed analysis involving building assessment, deposit monitoring, including characterisation of waterlogged deposits and their hydrological setting, below ground evaluation and documentary research. The Council will expect the heritage statement to examine the potential impacts of development proposals on significance and value using appropriate evidence and analysis. Where harm to archaeological features and deposits is unavoidable, development proposals will be expected to provide detail on appropriate mitigation measures agreed with City of York Council. Where development sites contain deep, wet, archaeological deposits, these mitigation measures may include provision for installation of and data recovery from deposit monitoring devices. Where mitigation measures include physical excavation of deposits, provision must include adequate resources for excavation, analysis, publication, and archive deposition with the Yorkshire Museum. Development proposals will also be expected to demonstrate the public benefits including community engagement, and lasting educational value through research, publication and display. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

8.33 Copies of all heritage statements and reports on archaeological interventions, whether pre- or post determination of an application, must be deposited with the City of York HER. Physical interventions into heritage assets through standing building assessment or below ground archaeological investigations should be led by appropriately qualified individuals and organizations preferably accredited by nationally recognised professional institutes or organizations.

8.34 On some sites, discoveries made during archaeological evaluations or excavations may create opportunities for the permanent display of features, structures and finds. Such displays can deliver significant public benefit and add value to the finished development. Where such circumstances arise, City of York Council will encourage developers to incorporate features, structures, finds and displays into the finished development.

Delivery

- Key Delivery Partners: City of York Council; developers and Historic England ~~English Heritage~~.
- Implementation: Planning applications; and heritage statements

Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 7	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
--------------------------	-----------	-------------	-----------

	4	2	1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Civic Trust and York Green Party Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support. • GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) supports the need for a heritage statement to describe the significance of archaeological remains and request that it should be clear that this requirement should be to support a planning application only. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports policy but does not reflect the advice of the NPPF. Suggests deleted policy and replacing with:- <i>"Development proposals that affect archaeological features and deposits will be supported where they are: i) accompanied by an evidence-based heritage statement that describes the significance of the archaeological deposits affected and includes a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, reports on intrusive and non-intrusive surveys of the application site and its setting; including characterisation of waterlogged organic deposits, if present; ii) would not result in harm to the significance of the site or its setting; iii) designed to enhance or better reveal the significance of an archaeological site or will help secure a sustainable future for an archaeological site at risk. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Scheduled Monument or other nationally important remains will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss of a Scheduled Monument or other nationally-important remains will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal could bring substantial public benefits. Harm to archaeological remains of less than national importance will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the archaeology. In those cases where development affecting an archaeological site is acceptable in principle, detailed mitigation measures will need to be agreed with the City of York Council that include, where appropriate, provision for deposit monitoring, investigation, recording, analysis, publication, archive deposition and community involvement"</i>. • Gladman Developments states policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentions D6: iii - use of the word unavoidable - should this be <i>'outweighed by the public benefit of the development'</i> or similar? Harm is always avoidable through refusing development. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D7: The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Development proposals will be encouraged and supported where they are designed to sustain and enhance the significance of York's historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets.

The significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings should be assessed in development proposals against the following criteria, namely the:

- special architectural or vernacular interest; and/or
- townscape and landscape significance; and/or
- historic interest; and/or
- artistic significance; and/or
- archaeological significance; and/or
- age and rarity; and/or
- community significance.

Development which would remove, harm or undermine the significance of such assets, or their contribution to the character of a place, will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and significance of the heritage asset.

Prior to the demolition, alteration, extension or restoration of heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) appropriate building recording relevant to the asset's significance and the scope of works will be undertaken

Supporting Text Changes:

8.35 The National Planning Policy Framework(2012) encourages Local Authorities to consider the significance of all heritage assets. The concept of describing and appraising the significance of listed buildings, conservation areas and other 'designated assets' is longstanding in legislation and guidance, and is to be protected through the application of other policies in this section. This policy however provides clear local criteria to help guide development decisions, enabling applicants and decision makers to better understand what is meant by 'significance' in relation to local non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Any development proposals that relate to non-designated heritage assets and their settings must be accompanied by an assessment of their significance in line with the criteria in Policy D7.

8.36 Where a development will comprise works to a designated or non-designated heritage asset then building recording will be required. Building recording may comprise detailed archaeological survey or a photographic record, depending upon the significance of the heritage asset and the nature of the works proposed. The survey must be undertaken by a suitably experienced professional in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation approved by the Local Planning Authority and to the relevant Historic England and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance. The results of the building recording will be deposited with the City of

York Historic Environment Record. Significant findings will also be formally published in order to make the information publicly accessible and to advance understanding.

8.37 City of York Council has been working alongside a local community group (York Open Planning Forum) to establish a set of criteria to appraise and help establish a Local Heritage List for York. Local Heritage Assets contribute to York's special character, significance and sense of place, as defined in the Council's Heritage Topic Paper Update (2014).

8.38 The policy will be supported by a Local Heritage List Supplementary Planning Document, its aims and objectives are to:

- recognise the importance of York's locally important buildings, monuments, sites,
- places, areas and landscapes to York's special character and significance;
- add to the local community's knowledge and enjoyment of their historic environment;
- promote the conservation, repair and enhancement of local heritage assets;
- encourage owners, and the wider community, to take pride in the care and conservation of local heritage assets, for the benefit of present and future generations; and
- promote good design for development affecting local heritage assets that is appropriate to their special character and local significance.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 10		Supports: 3	Objections: 3	Comments: 4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Civic Trust generally support the policy's approach. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy to ensure that any non-designated assets are protected especially those with community significance. • CPRE - North Yorkshire state that a separate policy dealing with the significance of non-designated Heritage Assets is welcomed especially in an area containing such historic assets and often deemed less important than others. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England support but note that policy needs to clearly differentiate the approach that the Council will take to applications affecting non-designated heritage assets compared to designated heritage assets. Suggests deleting the first Paragraph and replacing with:- "<i>Development proposals affecting a non-designated heritage asset or its setting will be supported where they conserve those elements which contribute to its significance. Developments which would remove, harm or undermine the significance of such assets, or their contribution to the character of a place will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the heritage asset</i>" 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that the policy and the explanation at paragraph 8.35 are back to front. Without a Local Heritage List (paragraph 8.36) it is open season for anyone to claim that a site or building is or is not an un-designated Heritage Asset. If the LPA considers a building or site to be an un-registered Heritage Asset, it should justify this by some then it may be appropriate for an applicant to assess any development proposals against the criteria identified in the policy. • Gladman Developments states policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Georgian Society and Conservation Areas Advisory Panel suggest text amends to bring policy in closer alignment with SPD consulted on in 2012. • York Green Party suggests to add bullet point in the policy specifically mentioning SPD Local Heritage List. • Asks when the local list of heritage assets is to be finalised to enable it to play a material role in planning decisions.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D8: Historic Parks and Gardens

Development proposals affecting a registered historic parks and gardens or their wider setting will be supported where they:

- i. ~~do not have an adverse impact on the park's fundamental character, amenity, and setting or key views into or out of the park~~ do not harm the layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the park or garden, key views into or out from the park;
- ii. ~~do not compromise the public's enjoyment of the park; the spatial qualities; the integrity of important landscape features, or the setting of any structures within its boundaries; and~~
- ii. are sensitive to the original design intention and subsequent layers of design and the functional evolution of the park or garden and do not prejudice any future restoration.
- iii. Would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Historic Park and garden or would help to secure a sustainable future for a feature within it.

Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 6	Supports: 2	Objections: 2	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Civic Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supported the policy. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England fully supported the thrust of the policy but felt it needs to make it clear that it is dealing with only those landscapes that are Registered (other non-designated landscapes would fall within the provisions of Policy D7). It also needs to set out the considerations that would be taken into account when determining proposals which would be likely to harm such landscapes, and include and positive support for proposals which would enhance their significance. Suggested deleting policy D8 and replacing with: - "Policy D8: Registered Historic Parks and Gardens Development proposals affecting a Registered Historic Park and Garden or their wider setting will be supported where they: i. do not harm the layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the Park or Garden, key views into or out from the Park; ii. are sensitive to the original 		

	<p>design intentions and subsequent layers of design and the functional evolution of the park or garden and do not prejudice any future restoration iii. would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Historic Park and Garden or would help to secure a sustainable future for a feature within it. Harm to an element which contributes to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a Registered Historic Park and Garden will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would bring substantial public benefits.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gladman Developments objected as the policy is not consistent with the NPPF in the treatment of Heritage Assets.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Georgian Society and Conservation Advisory Panel both commented referencing para 8.28, suggesting a check should be made on whether the gardens at Bishopbarns in St George's Place, and at Goddards Tadcaster Road, are also included on the List of Historic Parks and Gardens.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D9: City of York Historic Environment Record

City of York Council will develop, maintain and make available a comprehensive digital Historic Environment Record (HER) for the City of York for use by those preparing development proposals, community groups, academic researchers and students, and the general public.

Development proposals affecting heritage assets will need to be accompanied by an appropriate Heritage Statement – it is expected that the City of York Council HER will have been consulted in preparing this document.

Copies of all heritage statements and reports on archaeological interventions and/or of historic buildings, whether pre- or post-determination, must be deposited with the City of York HER.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 2	Supports: 2	Objections: 0	Comments: 0
--------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England and York Civic Trust both support this policy.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objections made to this policy.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments made to this policy.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy D10: York City Walls and St Marys Abbey Walls (York Walls)				
Projects that set out to conserve and enhance the values and significances of York Walls will be supported.				
Development proposals within the areas of York Walls designated as Scheduled Ancient Monuments will be supported where they are for the specific purpose of enhancing physical and intellectual access to York Walls.				
Development proposals adjacent to, or likely to affect the setting of, the City Walls designated as Scheduled Monuments will only be permitted where:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. they are accompanied by a Heritage Statement that clearly assesses the impact which the proposals are likely to have upon the elements and principle characteristics which contribute to their significance <u>and the six principle characteristics of the City as identified in the Heritage Topic Paper</u>; ii. they are designed to be no higher than the city walls externally and not reduce their dominance; iii. they do not cause harm to those elements which contribute to the significance or the setting of York Walls; and iv. they are of the highest design quality which, where possible, enhances or better reveals the significance of York Walls. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Proposed amendments better reflect national Planning guidance and advice from statutory consultees.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 4		Supports: 3	Objections: n/a	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Civic Trust and York Green Party support this policy. • Historic England support subject to suggested change to Criterion i) to read "...the elements which contribute to their significance and the six principle characteristics of the City as identified in the Heritage Topic Paper." 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust commented that paragraph 8.48 could include enhancement of biodiversity around the walls. 			

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy D11: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings			
It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality design for all development proposals. Proposals to extend, alter or add to existing buildings will be supported where the design:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responds positively to its immediate architectural context and local character and history, in terms of the use of materials and detailing, scale, proportion, landscape design and the space between buildings; • sustains the significance of a heritage asset and/or its setting and the character and appearance of conservation areas; • positively contributes to the setting, wider townscape, landscape and views; • protects the amenity of current and neighbouring occupiers, whether residential or otherwise. • Contributes to the function of the area and is safe and accessible. • Protects and incorporates trees that are desirable for retention. 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Change.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 6	Supports: 3	Objections: 0	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England, York Civic Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support this policy. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Georgian Society and Conservation Areas Advisory Panel suggest tet of para 8.49/8.50 is amended to refer to impact of development on designated assets. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy D12: Shopfronts			
Proposals to alter or replace existing shopfronts, or create new shopfronts will be supported where they:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. conserve and enhance the special qualities and significance of the building and area; and ii. relate well to their context in terms of design, scale, material and colour. 			
Proposals that set out to remove, replace or substantially harm shop fronts of high quality design or of historic interest will not be supported.			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No change.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 4	Supports: 4	Objections: 0	Comments: 0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England, York Civic Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support this policy. • York Green Party support this policy, suggest adding reference to retaining and repairing historic features including signs, clocks etc. 		
Objection	No objections made to this policy.		
Comments	No comments made to this policy.		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy D13: Advertisements				
Permission will be granted for the display of advertisements where they:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. are of a scale, design, material, finish, position and number that will not cause harm to visual or residential amenity, or to the character of the host building, and will respect the character and appearance of a building or the street scene; and ii. positively reflect the interests of amenity and public safety. 				
In addition, within conservation areas and on buildings identified as heritage assets, illumination will only be supported where the fittings, wiring and level of illumination is designed to preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the building, area and the premises trade as part of the evening economy.				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 6		Supports: 2	Objections: 2	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports this policy. • York Civic Trust supports this policy, suggests additional reference to 'A' boards as other forms of advertising are explicitly mentioned. Concerned that reference to 'exceptions' in para 8.59 could result in unsightly advertisements of the type that the Council is clearly seeking to remove. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Museums Trust object; whilst recognising the need for appropriate and sensitive signage, more flexibility would be welcome in order to generate trade and income for heritage buildings. Many people are put off by historic buildings and without signage they will not enter and use the facilities. • British Signs and Graphics Association object, as the policy only partly reflects the requirements of the legislation and national planning policy advice. Some parts of the draft policy and supporting text remain incorrect and other parts could be improved and simplified. Paragraphs 8.58 are overly prescriptive, suggested wording was given in relation to the policy and supporting text. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group notes that the policy does not include reference to 'temporary advertising'. • York Green Party felt reference should be added to traditional (non illuminated) hanging signs attached to buildings being considered as alternative to A boards within the city centre where they are justified to direct customers into side streets. 			

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy D14: Security Shutters

Suitably designed internal see-through shutters will be considered where other security measures can be demonstrated to be inadequate and where there is justifiable need.

Proposals for the installation of solid or external see-through shutters in conservation areas or on buildings identified as heritage assets will not be supported other than in the following circumstances:

- i. where they are externally demountable open mesh grilles; and
- ii. where they are of an appropriate scale and the design preserves the character and significance of the shopfront.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 3	Supports: 3	Objections: 0	Comments: 0
--------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

Support	Historic England, York Civic Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support this policy.
---------	--

Objection	No objections made to this policy.
-----------	------------------------------------

Comments	No comments made to this policy.
----------	----------------------------------

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy GI1: Green Infrastructure

York's landscapes, geodiversity, biodiversity and natural environment will be conserved and enhanced recognising the multifunctional role of green infrastructure in supporting healthy communities, cultural value, a buoyant economy and aiding resilience to climate change. This will be delivered as part of the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and subsequently through the following:

- ~~i. the production of associated management plans to describe, protect and enhance York's biodiversity, with priority given to those designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation;~~
- ii.i. the delivery of the aspirations of partner strategy documents and action plans, including the Leeds City Region Green Infrastructure Strategy (2010) any other current regional strategies, ~~and~~ any other plans formally approved in the future by the Council as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- iii.ii. the protection and enhancement of existing recreational open space in York, and through increasing provision in areas where a deficiency has been identified;
- iv.iii. maintaining the integrity of existing green corridors and their role in the green infrastructure network and enhancing and extending it where possible through major new development;
- v.iv. recognising the role that common land, village greens and other important local green spaces play in protecting and enhancing the historic character of York as well as providing important recreational and nature conservation benefits to the city; and
- vi.v. Increasing appropriate access to nature and open spaces to cater for the recreational and well-being needs on an increasing population and mitigating a growing pressure on natural habitats and the wildlife and flora it supports.

Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that green infrastructure considerations have been taken into account, in line with the criteria above.

Supporting Text Changes:

Supporting text will be amended to state that the Green Infrastructure Strategy will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

- Key Delivery Partners: City of York Council; developers; Natural England; Environment Agency, [Historic England](#), Public Health England and community groups.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Changes have been made to the policy in relation to criterion i), which has been deleted and new wording is given in Policy GI2.

Additional wording is suggested in relation to an SPD on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in response to comments made through the consultation by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

Historic England has been added to the Key Delivery Partners in the Delivery Box.

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 11	Supports: 6	Objections: 0	Comments: 6
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports this policy and, especially, the recognition, in Criterion v, of the contribution which the City's heritage assets make to the Green Infrastructure network. • This policy is supported by several respondents including Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group who supports the policy to ensure the protection of existing green areas which will include SSSIs, SACs and SINC's as well as smaller green spaces in the community. • CPRE - North Yorkshire welcome this policy in its entirety, particularly point vi) to extend current networks where possible. Recognition in the supportive text that a green infrastructure system approach to assessing biodiversity, open space and areas of public realm as one entity are not just in isolation is considered a best practice methodology and is supported. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust suggests there could be further detail as to the appropriate planting in new areas of Green Infrastructure. The provision of an SPD on GI and Biodiversity would be supported. • Sport England indicates that sport does happen in areas with landscape protection designations; landscape protection does not necessarily rule out a sporting event taking place. Sport England considers that it is important that the policy recognises the sporting events that take place and do not introduce policies that could restrict such events happening. • Several developers suggest further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • Friends of Holgate Community Garden urge the council to protect Holgate community Garden and Park from development as part of the York Central "southern option" access road. Mentions the ward lacking green space, that the garden is an Asset of Community Value and its importance for recreational amenity. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature

In order to conserve and enhance York's biodiversity, any development should where appropriate:

- i. Avoid loss or significant harm to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), whether directly or indirectly. Where it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the development in that location and the benefit outweighs the loss or harm the impacts must be adequately mitigated against, or compensated for as a last resort.
- ii. ensure the retention, enhancement and appropriate management of features of geological, or biological interest, and further the aims of the current Biodiversity Audit and Biodiversity Action Plan;
- iii. take account of the potential need for buffer zones around wildlife and biodiversity sites, to ensure the integrity of the site's interest is retained;
- iv. result in net gain to, and help to improve, biodiversity;
- v. enhance accessibility to York's biodiversity resource where this would not compromise their ecological value, affect sensitive sites or be detrimental to drainage systems;
- vi. maintain and enhance the rivers, banks, floodplains and settings of the Rivers Ouse, Derwent and Foss, and other smaller waterways for their biodiversity, cultural and historic landscapes, as well as recreational activities where this does not have a detrimental impact on the nature conservation value;
- vii. maintain water quality in ~~both~~ the River Ouse, River Foss and River Derwent to protect the aquatic environment, the interface between land and river, and continue to provide a viable route for migrating fish. New development within the catchments of ~~both these~~ rivers will be permitted only where sufficient capacity is available at the appropriate wastewater treatment works. Where no wastewater disposal capacity exists, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Derwent, Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary European Sites;
- viii. maintain and enhance the diversity of York's Strays for wildlife; and
- ix. ensure there is no detrimental impact to the environmental sensitivity and significant Lower Derwent Valley and its adjacent functionally connected land which whilst not designated, are ultimately important to the function of this important site.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Additional wording proposed for criterion i. In relation to the protection of SINC sites in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 113.

Change to the policy to include the River Foss in relation to maintaining water quality.

Sites of Local Interest (SLIs) delete references to these designations and keep them for internal use only.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 7	Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lichfields on behalf of Wakefield Properties state the Princess Road site and southern part of Southfields Road site are identified as SLIs however they highlight that there is no clear justification for this so the designation should be removed. The plan commits to maintaining water quality in the Ouse and Derwent. The respondent strongly suggests extending the same commitment to the River Foss. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yorkshire Wildlife Trust supports the policy of achieving net gain in biodiversity through developments and suggests it will be necessary to account for losses of habitat and the total area of habitat created. They state it would be valuable to ensure that the assessment of biodiversity on development sites is done to a consistent standard. A biodiversity SPD would be a valuable addition and include Green Infrastructure. Canal & River Trust welcomes parts v and vi of the policy to protect and enhance biodiversity. Several developers suggest further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy GI3: Green Infrastructure Network			
In order to protect and enhance York's green infrastructure networks any development should where relevant:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. maintain and enhance the integrity and management of York's green infrastructure network, including its green corridors and open spaces; and ii. protect and enhance the amenity, experience and surrounding biodiversity value of existing rights of way, national trails and open access land; and iii. ensure the protection of the hierarchy and integrity of York's local, district and regional green corridors; and iv. create and/or enhance 'stepping stones' and new green corridors that improves links between existing corridors <u>including those in neighbouring authorities</u>, nature conservation sites, recreational routes and other open space. 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Additional text is suggested for criterion iv. to include linking existing green corridors with neighbouring authorities in response to comments made through the consultation by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 7	Supports: 3	Objections: 0	Comments: 5
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Historic England, Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy which ensures the protection of the green infrastructure network which is a key element of the special character of the historic City. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objections made to this policy. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust indicates that Green Corridors are valuable city and region wide. The policy could contain a reference to connecting up Green Corridors as part of co-operating with Neighbouring authorities. They also note that Green Corridors are valuable within and between developed areas. • Several developers indicate further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • CPRE - North Yorkshire whilst supportive of the text within GI3 dealing specifically with Green Infrastructure Networks, CPRENY believe this policy could be incorporated in Policy GI1 to avoid duplication and provide an more detailed first policy. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy GI4: Trees and Hedgerows				
Development will be supported where it:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. recognises the value of the existing tree cover and hedgerows, their biodiversity value, the contribution they can make to the quality of a development, and its assimilation into the landscape context; ii. provides protection for overall tree cover as well as for existing trees worthy of retention in the immediate and longer term and with conditions that would sustain the trees in good health in maturity; iii. retains trees and hedgerows that make a <u>significant positive</u> contribution to the <u>character or</u> setting of a conservation area or to the setting of a listed building, the setting of proposed development, are a significant element of a designed landscape, or value to the general public amenity, in terms of visual benefits, shading and screening. iv. does not create conflict between existing trees to be retained and new buildings, their uses and occupants, whether the trees or buildings be within or adjacent to the site; and v. supplements the city's tree stock with new tree planting where an integrated landscape scheme is required. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Changes have been made to the policy to respond to comments made through the consultation by Historic England.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 7		Supports: 2	Objections: 4	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy to ensure protection of existing trees and hedgerows. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several Developers query why a developer contribution is required to protect existing trees and hedgerows. • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC indicate that the British Sugar application seeks to ensure the retention of all mature trees where possible in the context of the need to remediate the site. This policy should recognise that such landscaping should be retained wherever possible in the context of the necessary infrastructure provisions for the future development. Alternative wording given to criterion ii. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England supports this policy especially the requirement, in the third bullet-point, that trees which contribute to the character of a Conservation Area or Listed Building or are an element of a designed landscape should be retained. However, as currently worded, this aspect of the Policy only applies to trees which contribute to the setting of a Conservation Area. In many cases, there are trees within the Conservation Area 			

	<p>itself which contribute to its character. It would also be preferable to use the term “positive contribution” since this more closely reflects the terminology of the NPPF. Policy G14 Criterion iii amend to read:- “... <i>retains trees and hedgerows that make a positive contribution to the character or setting of a Conservation Area, to the setting of a Listed Building, ... etc</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yorkshire Wildlife Trust indicates the policy could have a presumption in favour of planting native trees and hedgerow plants in new developments. It could also specify adequate buffers for hedgerows within developments.• York Green Party suggest the policy should also include a reference to the development of a city wide Tree Strategy aiming to increase tree cover in York in line with the objectives of Treemendous.
--	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy GI5: Protection of Open Space and Playing ~~Pitches~~Fields

Development proposals will not be permitted which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced in the area of benefit and in terms of quality, quantity and access with an equal or better standard than that which is proposed to be lost.

Where replacement open space is to be provided in an alternative location (within the area of benefit) the replacement site/facility must be fully available for use before the area of open space to be lost can be redeveloped.

Development proposals will be supported which:

- provide allotments and productive land, to encourage local food production, and its benefits to education and healthy living;
- protects playing pitch provision except where a local area of surplus is indicated in the most up to date Playing Pitch Strategy;
- improves the quality of existing pitches and ensure that any new pitches are designed and implemented to a high standard and fully reflect an understanding of the issues affecting community sport; and
- meets the deficit of pitches in geographically appropriate and accessible way. This could be rectified through re-designation of any current surplus facilities in the area of benefit.

Supporting Text Changes:

9.17 Loss and Replacement sites/facilities should not increase any identified deficiencies in open space in the area of benefit where the original site is located and consideration should be demonstrated as part of the planning application process.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Change made to the Policy Title in response to comments made through the consultation by the Sport England.

Consultation Responses

Total representations:	9	Supports:	2	Objections:	5	Comments:	3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Fulford Parish Council support the policy to ensure provision of open spaces and playing pitches to meet the needs of the community. • Fulford Parish Council supports showing areas at School Lane, Fordlands Road and north and south of Broadway as open spaces under GI5. They feel consideration should be given to their designation as Local Green Spaces under paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Wishes to note that the pre-publication draft does not designate any Local Green Spaces within the city and considers that there should be a city-wide assessment of all 						

	green spaces to ascertain whether LGS designation is appropriate.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions Planning on behalf of Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust suggest that on the Proposals Map, the land to be protected by Policy G15 is annotated to make clear the land to which the Policy applies. Within the village of New Earswick, certain areas of land have been identified as being subject of the Policy G15, including land to the west of Red Lodge off Haxby Road, south of Limetree Avenue and north of the car parking serving the Folk Hall. This area of land has been the subject of a planning application to develop a new care home with independent living accommodation. The planning application also included proposals for the relocation of the MUGA and tennis club facilities to other locations within New Earswick. As a consequence of the permission that was granted under the reference 165/00758/FULM, the current extent of open space within this central area to the village is to be altered. Construction of New Lodge is to commence in November 2017 with completion phased over approximately 18 months. Consequently, it would be appropriate for the Local Plan Proposals Map to show the extent of the open space incorporated into the development given construction is likely to be near completion (or even completed) by the time the Local Plan has been adopted. If the development is ignored then the Local Plan will be out of date before it is even published. Included is a drawing showing the approved scheme, kindly requests that the Proposals Map is updated to reflect the approved scheme. • Sport England object to the policy on the following grounds: The policy seems to only cover playing pitches that are of recreational importance; importance is very subjective and there is no definition in supporting text as to what defines 'importance'. The policy is therefore imprecise - Sport England would object to this element of the policy unless the reference to importance was omitted; Further, as currently worded the policy appears to only apply to pitches. Sport England would therefore object until the policy's scope is clarified - this could be achieved by referring to pitches as including playing field in the Glossary of terms, or by changing the name of the policy from 'pitches' to 'playing field'. • Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC indicate as part of the planning application for British Sugar there has been a commitment to providing a combination of on-site sports pitches, open space and playing pitch provision and contribution to off-site facilities. The timescales for the delivery of off-site facilities are in the control of the council. This should not delay the redevelopment of ST1 where appropriate timescales for the off-site replacement are committed to via a s106 agreement. There is no definition within the policy or its supporting text as to the precise meaning of the words area of benefit. This must be

	precisely clarified. New wording suggested.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sport England understands that York is about to commence with a new Playing Pitch Strategy following Sport England's latest methodology. The policy should refer to this most up to date evidence base.• Johnson Mowat on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Trustees and Johnson Mowat on behalf of Redrow Homes and Linden Homes. queries why a developer contribution is required to protect existing pitches from development?• Paragraph 9.16 states there is a presumption against the loss of open space, this needs to be made more of a priority as many open spaces are under threat.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy GI6: New Open Space Provision

All residential development proposals should contribute to the provision of open space for recreation and amenity. The successful integration of open space into a proposed development should be considered early in the design process. The precise type of on-site provision required will depend on the size and location of the proposal and the existing open space provision in the area. Where there are deficiencies in certain types of open space provision in the area surrounding a proposed development, the Council will seek variations in the component elements to be provided by the developer in order to help to overcome them. Requirements will be calculated using the Council's up to date open space assessment and will be in line with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.

The Council will encourage on-site provision where possible but off-site provision will be considered acceptable in the following circumstances:

- i. if the proposed development site would be of insufficient size in itself to make the appropriate provision (in accordance with the Council's standards) feasible within the site; or
- ii. in exceptional circumstances, if taking into account a site's characteristics including but not limited to the accessibility/capacity of existing open space sites/facilities and the circumstances of the surrounding area the open space needs in the context of a up-to-date Playing Pitch and Built Sports Facility Strategy, it can be demonstrated that of the proposed residential development can be met more appropriately by providing either new or enhanced provision off-site.
~~Where appropriate, the Council will seek to enter into a Section 106 agreement with the developer for the future management and maintenance of the open space provision, before granting planning permission.~~
- iii on strategic sites, where through strategic masterplanning agreements that provide for green infrastructure approaches which make accessible provision beyond allocated site boundaries. Open space standards as set out in the most up to date open space evidence base document should still be used as a guide to overall provision.

New open space is identified on the proposals map at:

- OS1: Land North of Manor Church of England Academy
- OS2: Land to North of Poppleton Juniors, Millfield Lane, Poppleton
- OS5: Germany Beck
- OS6: Land abutting the River Foss at Heworth Croft

Indicative new significant areas of open space have been identified in connection with the following strategic sites, as shown on the proposals map:

- OS7: Land at Minster Way at ST7

- OS8: New Parkland to the East of ST8
- OS9: New Recreation and Sports Provision to the south of ST9
- OS10: New Area for Nature Conservation on land to the South of A64 in association with ST15
- OS11: Land to the East of ST31
- OS12: Land to the East of ST35

This new open space will be complemented by further on-site provision of local green and open space (as required in this and other relevant sections of the plan), and both should be planned cohesively in order, where appropriate, to:

- manage impacts on the city’s historic character and setting;
- mitigate and compensate for ecological impacts, and provide for ecological enhancement;
- meet open space requirements arising from new development;
- accommodate drainage infrastructure, flood storage and attenuation;
- retain and enhance landscape and heritage features; and
- frame pedestrian and cycle linkage.

The precise delineation and extent of the new open space will be set through detailed masterplanning and the planning process. The areas indicated on the proposals map are a guide to general extent based on current understanding of site and other conditions.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

Additional criterion in relation to off-site provision in response to comments made through the consultation by Sport England.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 20	Supports: 6	Objections: 8	Comments: 13
---------------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Railway Museum (NRM), and GVA on behalf of the York Central Partnership (YCP) supports the policy as it matches the ambitions of the YCP to provide significant areas of open space. • Arup on behalf of the YCP supports the principle of the policy – all development should contribute to open space. • Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and the Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee support the new open space proposals for the Poppleton area at the new Manor Academy site and the site adjacent to the Poppleton Junior Tigers Soccer Field (note further comment re local plan map) • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Supports the policy if a need for additional open spaces is identified. • Lichfields welcomes the provision for flexibility within the policy in terms of off-site provision being acceptable in the circumstances identified.
---------	---

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NRM advocates the policy recognise and include the need for flexibility. • Rapleys LLP state that British Sugar is committed to the appropriate provision of new open space provision, but the provision of such facilities must accord with the CIL Regulations 122 and must directly relate to the site itself. Furthermore, the reference in this policy to addressing deficiencies is not appropriate and should be deleted. • Lichfields state that the policy lacks clarity on the open space requirements sought • Lichfields and GVA on behalf of the HCA advocate that the policy should be reworded to include open space standards, to provide clarity on the open space requirements sought. • GVA on behalf of the HCA advocate that the policy should state that the precise type of on-site provision required will depend on the size and location of the development proposal and existing openspace provision • The NRM and GVA on behalf of the HCA advocate that the policy should include the need for flexibility dependent on the characteristics of the York Central site. • Johnson Mowat advocates that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required and states there is no justification for criterion iii) that requires further land beyond the boundaries of strategic sites • One respondent is concerned about allocation OS10 and the removal of land from food production and its environmental impact for open space, advocating alternative locations should be identified. • Sport England advocates an additional criterion that makes clear off-site provision will be acceptable where a robust and up to date Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Sports Facility Strategy identify the need for such facilities.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee state there appears to be a typographical error as the sites are not properly numbered in relation to the Poppleton neighbourhood plan and the local plan policies map. • DPP Planning states that Developers of site ST9 do not object to providing open space on the Site and the southern part of the Site might end up being the most appropriate location but the Developers feel that this should be determined by the master planning process, the Developers are concerned with the inter relation of policy SS11 and G16 and how this might impact on the capacity of ST9. The Developers reserve the right to comment in more detail on this matter when the details of the Council's intentions are fully understood. DPP Planning highlight Policy G16 indicates that new open spaces to the south of site ST9 will be complemented by further on-site provision of local green and open space. Policy G16 appears to

	<p>be the principle policy for the provision of open space. It is difficult to see how further on-site provision of local green and open space can be required by policies other than G16. They also highlight that the allocation identified as OS9 is about 9ha in size - a significant quantum of open space, adding that large tracts of additional open DPP Planning states space would erode the developable area of the Site.</p>
--	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds				
Planning permission for the use of land as a burial/memorial ground will be granted provided that:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there is an identified local need; ii. the site is accessible by public transport; iii. surface water drainage is adequate and there is no threat to groundwater quality; iv. the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the landscape quality nearby, the historic character and setting of York or residential amenity; and v. the proposal includes a land management and maintenance programme. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 3		Supports: 1	Objections: 1	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy to ensure sufficient space is available for extension and/or enhancement of burial grounds. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent believes a separate section to the policy should be added in relation to green or woodland or pet burial grounds in rural areas. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wigginton Parish Council passed comment that further increased development within the area will increase the need for burial facilities. 			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy GB1: Development in the Green Belt**

Within the Green Belt, planning permission for development will only be granted where:

- i. the scale, location and design of development would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt;
- ii. it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt; and
- iii. it would not prejudice or harm those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.

AND it is for one of the following purposes:

- agriculture and forestry; or
- appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation; or
- cemeteries; or
- limited infilling in existing settlements; or
- limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings; or
- limited affordable housing for proven local needs; or
- development of existing developed sites where this would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness; or
- ~~limited infilling or redevelopment of existing developed sites; or~~
- minerals extraction, provided high environmental standards are attainable; or
- essential engineering operations including waste disposal; or
- local transport infrastructure including highways work and Park & Ride facilities; or
- the reuse of buildings; or
- development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order; or
- renewable energy schemes, where it can be proved that the location is necessary for technical reasons and wider environmental benefits can be demonstrated.

All other forms of development within the Green Belt are considered inappropriate. Very special circumstances will be required to justify instances where this presumption against development should not apply.

Supporting Text Changes:

In the supporting text recognise that the development of existing developed sites can lead to an improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt. Specifically referencing York Racecourse; Askham Bryan College; Harewood Whin; and Cliftongate Business Park.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy amended to recognise the redevelopment of existing developed sites should be acceptable where it would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 10	Supports: 6	Objections: 5	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust support the policy for maintaining the Green 		

	<p>Belt around York.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunnington Parish Council supports this policy to protect the setting of the village and its green approaches. • Historic England supports this Policy especially Criterion iii. This will help to ensure that any development in the Green Belt safeguards those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City. • York Green Party generally supports this policy, but with following amendment: minerals extraction, provided high environmental standards are attainable and including all the safeguards specified in the Minerals and Waste Plan. • Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Steering Group supports the Policy, to ensure that inappropriate development is not carried out in the Green Belt. • NTR Planning (on behalf of McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet) support the identification of Park & Ride facilities as being appropriate in the Green Belt in Policy GB1 / para 10.14
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council objects to the policy as it should follow more closely the format of paragraph 89 of the NPPF. In particular, it should not make reference to renewable energy schemes being potentially appropriate forms of development. The NPPF is clear (paragraph 91) that most such projects would comprise inappropriate developments. There are no special circumstances in York to justify a different view. Indeed large renewable energy projects in the Green Belt have the potential to cause major damage to the setting and special character of the historic city. • Turnberry Consulting (on behalf of York Racecourse) considers the Green Belt designation to be unduly restrictive and any works within the main area of the racecourse are deemed 'inappropriate development'. Former national policy allowed for 'major developed sites in the green belt' which was reflected in the 2005 version of the local plan. Other sites previously identified as 'major developed sites' such as the designer outlet and Askham Bryan College are removed from the green belt in this version of the plan. Request that the area of the racecourse previously identified as a major developed site, should be removed from the green belt as it does not serve green belt purposes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultancy states that this policy as drafted is inconsistent with NPPF Green Belt guidance. Appeal Inspectors have in some instances treated roads as inappropriate development in the Green Belt since vehicles using them would detract from the openness. Any built development within the General extent of the Green Belt is bound to encroach to some degree on the countryside. As drafted, the policy precludes most forms of built and other development in the Green Belt whether appropriate by definition or not. Paragraph 10.4: No justification for removing permitted development rights from residential developments - the GDPO does not preclude extensions in the Green Belt, so why should York? Paragraphs 10.8 & 10.10: These paragraphs need reconsidering (and GB1 amending if necessary). There are a significant number of buildings in the open countryside round York which can be converted to residential or business use or from business use to residential either as permitted development or within policy, resulting in a development which can be less visually acceptable. Policy GB1 should facilitate redevelopment in these circumstances (It may be that the 7th bullet point of the policy is intended to achieve the same objective - please advise if this is the case) • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultancy states that policy GB1 and paragraphs 10.8 and 10.10 amended to facilitate redevelopment where this would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness (in conjunction with the deletion of criterion 'iv' of policy GB3) • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultancy asks how is the word 'limited' to be interpreted in the 4th-7th bullet points of the policy? In relation to the 3rd bullet point, is this one house? In relation to the 5th bullet point, some guidance of scale should be provided - 40%, 50%, 100% - should it be volume or footprint? There is no case for limiting 'alterations' to existing buildings. It is assumed that 'limited' in relation to affordable housing means limited to the local needs identified - if so, the word 'limited' should be omitted
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust supports for maintaining the Green Belt around York. However it is important that the protection of areas of Green Belt which are arable land, which is low in biodiversity and does not support or buffer important semi-natural areas do not receive more protection than brownfield land with high value for biodiversity. • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultancy states that in terms of the 9th bullet point (essential engineering operations) it is appreciated this is included to safeguard the Council's interests at Harewood Whin, but who is to determine whether engineering operations are essential? Essential to whom? Is an embanked slurry lagoon or a large concrete hardstanding on a farm essential? • Other another respondent object to development on Green Belt to retain recreational and social activities.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy GB2: Development in Settlements Washed Over by the Green Belt			
<p>Within the settlements washed over by the Green Belt as shown on the proposals map, planning permission for the erection of new buildings or the change of use, redevelopment or extension of existing buildings will only be permitted provided:</p> <p>i. the proposed development would be located within the built-up area of the settlement; and</p> <p>ii. the location, scale and design of the proposed development would be appropriate to the form and character of the settlement and neighbouring property; and</p> <p>iii. the proposed development would constitute limited infilling and would not prejudice the openness or the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
<p>No change. Issues relating to existing development in the greenbelt is now covered under policy GB1.</p>			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations:4	Supports: 1	Objections: 3	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy, where villages are washed over by the Green Belt. Consideration should be given within this policy to identify such villages. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulford Parish Council objects to the proposal to exclude the York Designer Outlet from the Green Belt. Instead, the site should be shown as washed over and treated as a previously developed site in the Green Belt. It would be subject thereby to the restrictions on development set out in the last bullet-point of NPPF paragraph 89 which allows development compatible with the site's status as previously developed and its location within the Green Belt. Goes into detail explaining why including the Designer Outlet in the Green Belt would be consistent with the history of the site. Excluding the site from the Green Belt allows unrestricted development within the boundaries of the inset (subject to other policies in the plan), this will likely lead to a loss of much of the landscape setting of the Designer Outlet which at present mitigates impacts of existing built development upon the wider Green Belt. Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that no justification is provided for washing over certain settlements (eg. Naburn - this is not a village where the open character of the village makes an important contribution to the Green Belt) - see NPPF para 86. Such settlements should be inset based on their merits and all villages currently washed over should be reassessed to ensure compliance with NPPF para 86. A respondent objects to the Green Belt boundary washing over Clifton Gate Business Park. It is considered that this will be restrictive to expansion of existing businesses in future as GB policy applies. 		

Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that there is some confusion between Policy GB2 criterion iii and the explanation following 10.18. If 'infilling' is to be interpreted as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage then perhaps it would be helpful to qualify this by limiting the number of dwellings to perhaps 1 or 2. The policy & explanation would be acceptable as drafted if the washed over villages were all loose knit settlements with gardens, paddocks and other breaks between buildings but in general they are not. Most villages surrounding York do not justify being washed over and all should be looked at again.
----------	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)			
Policy GB3: Reuse of Buildings			
Outside defined settlement limits planning permission for the reuse of buildings within the Green Belt will be granted provided:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the reuse does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt; and ii. the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; and iii. the proposed reuse will generally take place within the fabric of the existing building and will not require extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension; and iv. the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings <u>or it can be demonstrated that they create an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness and sympathetic to the character of the building</u>; and v. any residential buildings are not in close proximity to intensive livestock units or other uses that may result in a poor level of amenity for the occupier of the building; and vi. there is already a clearly defined curtilage; and vii. where the proposal involves changing the use to residential, permission will only be granted where criteria i. to vi. are satisfied; and the building(s) are within 800m of a defined settlement limit. 			
Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Part (iv) of the policy amended to improve clarity and allow for proposals that could create an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 3	Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rufforth With Knapton Parish Council states there are a number of buildings within the parish which come under the category set out in GB3 and therefore support the policy. • Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group states that the policy is supported to reuse existing buildings located in the Green Belt unless the design is such that it impacts on the openness of the Green Belt. 		

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that Permitted Development Regulations which permit the conversion of agricultural buildings to dwellings do not require the buildings to be within 800m of a defined settlement limit & there is no sound reason for criterion 'vii' of the draft policy. Additionally, there is something wrong with the wording of criterion 'iv' which requires the character of the building to be in keeping with the character of the building - assume its a typo? However, it appears to be the intention of the criterion to prevent re-use of buildings which are not entirely in keeping with their surroundings - is this what is intended? If so, how can it be sustainable to prevent the re-use of a permanent & substantial construction because it is not of a sympathetic design? Consequently this criterion should be deleted and Policy GB1 and paragraphs 10.8 and 10.10 amended to facilitate redevelopment where this would lead to an overall improvement in the character and appearance of the Green Belt without compromising openness.
Comments	No comments made to this policy.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)**Policy GB4: 'Exception' Sites for Affordable Housing in the Green Belt**

The development of affordable housing on exception sites in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development and will be considered where:

- i. the development contributes to meeting identified need as illustrated by an up to date housing needs assessment; and
- ii. the affordable housing is retained at an affordable price for future eligible households in perpetuity; and
- iii. the development is within 800m of an existing defined settlement limit or is well related to the existing residential development and amenities located in or adjacent to a clearly identified village or settlement; and
- iv. the development reflects the size of the settlement in terms of scale, form and character.

A proportion of market housing may be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that the site would be unviable as an exception site, without cross subsidy. However:

- The majority of development must be for affordable housing with the minimum number of market homes required to make the scheme viable.
- It must be demonstrated that there is insufficient public subsidy available.
- It must be demonstrated through a financial appraisal that the scale of market housing component is essential for the delivery of the scheme and is based on reasonable land values.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

N/A

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 3	Supports: 1	Objections: 1	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall With Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy, as it will enable the building of affordable homes on housing site H59. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states that rural exceptions sites should be located immediately adjacent to a settlement, not up to 800m from it - how is this sustainable for those in need? Furthermore, once detailed Green Belt boundaries are established in an adopted Plan, the opportunities for developing such sites are greatly restricted. Criterion 'iii' provides an opportunity for pockets of 100% affordable dwellings being dotted around the open countryside, not connected with any settlement - is this really what is intended? 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council has no objection to the principle of this policy - however it requires clarification to prevent abuse: 1) Criterion i) should be amended to make clear that it applies only to existing rural communities. This is to avoid exception sites being 		

	<p>put forward on the edge of the main urban area. 2) An additional criterion should be added to prevent exception sites being allowed on particularly sensitive areas of the Green Belt such as those shown by Figure 3.1. The wording of Policy H5 could be reused: Do not conflict with the objective of conserving and enhancing York's historic and natural environment. This includes the city's character and setting and internationally, nationally and locally significant nature conservation sites, green corridors and areas with an important recreational function.</p>
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)**Policy CC1: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Storage**

New buildings must achieve a reasonable reduction in carbon emissions of at least 28% unless it can be demonstrated that this is not viable. This should be achieved through the provision of renewable and low carbon technologies in the locality of the development or through energy efficiency measures. Proposals should forset out how this will be achieved and any viability issues should be set out in an energy statement.

Renewable and low carbon energy generation developments will be encouraged and supported in York. We will work with developers to ensure that suitable sites are identified and projects developed, working with local communities to ensure developments have their support. Developments on brownfield land will be encouraged.

All applications will also need to consider the impact the scheme may have on:

- i. York's historic character and setting, including the sensitivity of the scheme to the surrounding landscape and proximity to air fields and other sensitive land use, including conservation areas;
- ii. local communities and residential amenity resulting from development, construction and operation such as air quality, atmospheric emissions, noise, odour, water pollution and the disposal of waste;
- iii. the location in terms of the scale of the proposal and new grid connection lines;
- iv. national and internationally designated heritage sites or landscape areas, including the impact of proposals close to their boundaries;
- v. nature conservation sites and features, biodiversity and geodiversity, including protected local sites and other sites of nature conservation importance, and potential effects on setting, habitats, species and the water supply and hydrology of such sites;
- vi. the road network, taking into account the accessibility of the site by road and public transport and also the proximity to the renewable fuel source; and
- vii. agriculture and other land-based industries.

Any application for renewable energy would also need to consider the areas of potential and other technical requirements identified in the Council's most up to date Renewable Energy Study.

Strategic sites will be required to produce energy masterplans to ensure that the most appropriate low carbon, renewable and energy efficient technologies are deployed at each site, taking into account local factors and the specifics of the masterplans.

Proposals for renewable and low carbon energy storage developments will be supported and encouraged. Developments should be sited a suitable distance from major residential areas and have suitable fire suppression procedures.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change			
Policy amended to allow for the consideration of viability.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 15	Supports: 2	Objections: 10	Comments: 4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy. Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership is supportive of the policy in principle. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kexby Parish Council objects to all potential wind farms as they are inappropriate within the Vale of York. It also advocates that solar panels should not be placed on agricultural land, rather they should be placed on the roofs of industrial premises and incorporated in roofing of new build residential properties. Rachel Maskell MP advocates that York should be aiming to become a zero-carbon city, which will require it to find ways of generating its own renewable energy and sites need to be set aside to enable this to happen. Gladman Developments state that the requirement for a 28% reduction in carbon emissions goes beyond the target emission rate of Part L of the Building Regulations. ELG Planning objects to the requirement for reduction in carbon emissions of at least 28% as the justification for this figure is not clear they also object to the requirement for strategic sites to produce energy masterplans, as this is disproportionate and impractical for the three sites that comprise the ST14 Terry's Extension Sites. The requirement should only apply to strategic sites >5ha. Arup along with GVA on behalf of the York Central Partnership advocate that 28% reduction in carbon emissions is too inflexible. ARUP also seek additional detail as to how this should be balanced against the overall viability of the scheme. They also advocate the need for further clarity regarding how energy masterplans would be flexible enough for sites with long build out where energy technologies might be substantially different at the end of the build out period. Johnson Mowat objects to the policy being applied to strategic sites, as the viability report suggests it does not apply. More clarity is needed particularly because Para. 5.4.7 informs that no costs have been allocated to this requirement as the Carbon Trust noted further work is required. Rapleys LLP states that there was no requirement for the production of an Energy Masterplan when the Sustainability and Energy Statements were submitted for ST1 in support of the application, and it should be noted that was not and is not a requirement that should be applied to British Sugar. They advocate that the policy does not make it clear what the 28% reduction relates to and should be deleted – alternative wording suggested. 		

Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is supportive of all efforts to reduce the emissions of gases which increase global warming. They advocate that the policy should specify specific high standards for housing developments. They believe the phrase within the policy <i>'New buildings must achieve a reasonable reduction in carbon emissions of at least 28%'</i> is not a meaningful phrase or target and is unlikely to lead to energy efficient developments. • North Yorkshire County Council suggests that proposed developments (housing, retail, factory, business parks) should plan for the installation of equipment or suitable provision of ducting at the onset to enable the latest technology to be deployed, and not leave it to be installed by third parties once the development is complete. When development is planned, discussion with mobile operators should be undertaken as part of the initial planning stages, and where additional masts are required, they should be built as part of the infrastructure and not left to be provided later. York's aspirations as a Gigacity and the increasing capacity and use of communications technology can potentially have a significant impact on the way people choose to live and work and play within the city. The Plan may seek to recognise that the boundaries of these activities are becoming increasingly blurred and therefore flexibility and connectivity may become increasingly crucial to ensuring future vitality and use of the City Centre assets. • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states the phrase within the policy <i>'New buildings must achieve a reasonable reduction in carbon emissions of at least 28%'</i> needs to be clarified and queries what constitutes 'reasonable'. • York Green Party comments that, for new developments, the cost of installing ground source heat systems is significantly lower if done at the time of groundworks when other utilities are installed. They therefore believe all new developments should assess and factor in the whole life cost of installing ground source heat pumps and higher levels of insulation against the requirement for linking to district heating networks. Where ground source heat provision would be more cost effective, this should be installed.
----------	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development

Developments which demonstrate high standards of sustainable design and construction will be encouraged. Development proposals will be required to demonstrate energy and carbon dioxide savings in accordance with the energy hierarchy: reducing energy demand, using energy and other resources efficiently and generating low carbon or renewable energy and water efficiency. Development proposals will be expected to consider good practice adaptation principles for climate resilience in their design, construction and operation.

Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development

Proposals will be supported where they meet the following:

All new residential buildings should achieve:

- i. at least a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate compared to the Target Emission Rate (calculated using Standard Assessment Procedure methodology as per Part L1A of the Building Regulations 2013); and
- ii. a water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day (calculated as per Part G of the Building Regulations).

All new non-residential buildings with a total internal floor area of 100m² or greater should achieve BREEAM 'Excellent' (or equivalent).

Strategic site developments should undertake a BREEAM Communities assessment (or equivalent).

All new residential and non-residential developments will be required to submit an energy statement which demonstrates how these requirements will be met. This should include a sustainability checklist, which shows how principles for sustainable design, construction and operation will be achieved.

Conversion of Existing Buildings and Change of Use

Applications for conversion of existing residential buildings or change of use to residential should achieve BREEAM domestic refurbishment 'very good' and non-residential conversions or change of use will need to achieve BREEAM 'excellent'.

If proposals relate to buildings of heritage and conservation value these standards would only be required where they can be achieved in a manner consistent with the appropriate conservation of that asset. The extent they can be achieved must be demonstrated by the applicant.

Consequential Improvement to Existing Dwellings

When applications are made to extend dwellings, proposals will be expected to demonstrate reasonable and proportionate improvements to the overall energy performance of the dwelling. This will be in addition to the requirements of Part L of the Building Regulations.

Supporting Text Changes:			
N/A			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
Policy amended to recognise water efficiency and the need for flexibility when converting buildings of heritage or conservation value.			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 19	Supports: 5	Objections: 14	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency is pleased to see that water efficiency guidelines have been followed and the consideration of the Humber River Basin Management Plan in the Plan, and would encourage any projects that would help improve the status of a water body. Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and CPRE North Yorkshire support the policy. Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership (YCP) generally supports the policy. York Green Party fully support policies which require maximum permissible uplift in energy efficiency and renewable generation and believes there should be a commitment to uprate all targets on an annual basis, in line with national and international policies and scientific evidence. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency recommend a policy is inserted that ensures the requirements of the Water Framework Directive are adhered to, where appropriate, and suggest a point is included within Policy DP2 or Policy CC2 to ensure that appropriate water efficiency measures are secured for developments. Historic England states there may be historic properties where it is impossible to attain BREEM 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' standards without compromising elements which contribute to their significance. The Policy should recognise that these standards would only be a requirement where they can be achieved in a manner consistent with the appropriate conservation of that asset. They also include a suggested amendment to the Policy relating to Conversion of Existing Buildings and Change of Use. York Green Party advocates that Para. 11.16 should make reference to rainwater and greywater recycling having dual benefit of reducing consumption of clean water supplies and reducing discharge rates to watercourse. Amongst others, Northminster Business Park states it is unreasonable to require new non-residential buildings over 100m² to achieve BREEAM "Excellent" rating Furthermore, Directions Planning states that it is unreasonable to require all non-domestic buildings over 100m² to score at least 70% on the BREEAM rating. Gladman Developments state that the policy is not consistent with current Government advice. Barton Willmore (obo Barratt 		

	<p>and David Wilson Homes) concurs, adding that the requirements to achieve at least a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate and a water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day are already governed within Building Regulations, so they should not be included in the plan. They state that the policy should be deleted as it is not justified and fails to meet the tests of soundness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Johnson Mowat objects to the 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate as it goes beyond building regulations that are constantly being updated and improved, so there is not case for York to run a parallel process. • ELG Planning object to the absence of any justification for the requirement that all new residential buildings should achieve at least a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate compared to Target Emissions Rate, adding it is also unclear how this target relates to the target in policy CC1 for all new buildings to achieve a 28% reduction in carbon emissions. • GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency and Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant state the policy is too prescriptive and inflexible, Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant adds it is unlikely to be deliverable particularly in so far as it applies to small scale developments, adding that there are no gas supplies to many parts of the rural areas of the District. • Arup on behalf of York Central Partnership advocate that flexibility is incorporated into the policy to enable the policy requirements for a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate, water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day, BREEAM 'Excellent' target or BREEAM Communities Assessment to be general guideline rather than a prescribed requirement.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachael Maskell MP observes that not only should all new build seek to draw minimal energy, but through micro-generation, buildings have a real opportunity to feed into the grid, whereas open spaces can also be used for renewable energy generation.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy CC3: District Heating and Combined Heat and Power Networks

The Council strongly supports the development of decentralised energy, including both combined cooling, heating and power (CCHP) and combined heating and power (CHP) distribution networks.

~~All new developments are required to connect to (C)CHP[‡] distribution networks where they exist, or incorporate the necessary infrastructure for connection to future networks, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that doing so is not feasible or that utilising a different energy supply would be more sustainable.~~

Proposals for development within heat priority areas and all New Strategic Sites~~sufficiently large or intensive developments~~ must demonstrate that heating and cooling technologies have been selected in accordance with the following heating and cooling hierarchy, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such requirements are not ~~economically~~ viable and/ or that an alternative approach would be more sustainable:

- i. connection to existing (C)CHP distribution networks;
- ii. site wide renewable distribution networks including renewable (C)CHP;
- iii. site wide gas-fired (C)CHP distribution networks;
- iv. renewable communal heating/ cooling networks;
- v. gas-fired communal heating/ cooling networks;
- vi. individual dwelling renewable heating; and
- vii. individual dwelling heating, with the exception of electric heating.

All (C)CHP systems are required to be scaled and operated in order to maximise the potential for carbon reduction. Developments that do not connect to or implement (C)CHP or communal heating networks should be 'connection-ready'.

Energy statements must be provided to demonstrate and quantify how development will comply with the energy requirements of this policy. Sustainability and energy statements should set out a level of detail proportionate to the scale of development. The Council will work proactively with applicants on major developments to ensure these requirements can be met.

Supporting Text Changes:

Policy and supporting text amended to provide increased clarity to the type and scale of development to which it will be applied.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy and supporting text amended to provide increased clarity to the type and scale of development to which it will be applied.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 12	Supports: 2	Objections: 7	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy where CCHP and CHP can be provided to 		

[‡] ~~(C)CHP refers to both combined cooling, heating and power (CCHP) and combined heating and power (CHP).~~

	<p>new and possible existing developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party supports the policy especially for developments that are close to the existing network at University of York (ST27 and ST4).
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant states the policy is too prescriptive and unlikely to be deliverable particularly in so far as it applies to small scale developments, adding that there are no gas supplies to many parts of the rural areas of the District. • Gladman Developments states the Policy is not consistent with current Government advice, adding that the requirement for all new development to either connect to or be connection ready for Combined Heat and Power or District Heating systems is unjustified and unduly onerous. • Johnson Mowat objects to this policy as according to para 11.33, the 300 dwellings threshold would mean that the requirement applies to all strategic sites. The installation will impact upon the delivery of other elements of social infrastructure. They also object on the basis that energy efficiencies are already sought under Policy CC2 and as demonstrated in Table 5.12 of the viability report the cost of Policy CC3 would be an extra £3,396 to a typical 3 bed house. The Plan contains no good examples of where such a system has been successfully installed on a large housing site. • ELG Planning objects to the requirement that all new developments are required to connect to CHP2 distribution networks as there is very limited access to such networks in the city at present and limited prospect of such networks being constructed in the near future. In absence of such networks it is unreasonable and disproportionate for the council to require developers on all sites to go to the expense of undertaking relevant energy studies and making all new developments 'connection ready' whilst they will still have to provide individual facilities for each new dwelling. • Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership has significant concerns regarding the implementation of Policy CC3. The supporting text suggests that the heat network feasibility study undertaken on behalf of the Leeds City Region for York Central is financially viable. They are concerned that the technical study undertaken does not have regard to the significant infrastructure costs as set out in the draft Local Plan, and note that the conclusions of the report demonstrate that a heat network would only be viable with significant public sector funding. They also question the assertions in the Local Plan regarding the feasibility of a Heat Network at York Central.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent states that heat distribution networks can work in some circumstances but they are in many ways less important than thinking about energy use reduction and sources of energy / primary energy.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another respondent states clarification is required as to how the policy influences existing properties / residents.• GVA on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) advocates that further clarity must be given as to the impact of this policy on the viability of development in the city so as not to become a redundant policy and would welcome further discussion with CYC on the potential impact on York Central.
--	---

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)
--

Policy ENV1: Air Quality

Development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and prevent further exposure to poor air quality. This will help to protect human health.

To establish whether air quality impacts are acceptable all minor and major planning applications are required to identify sources of emissions to air from the development and submit an emissions statement. This should qualitatively identify all new emissions likely to arise as a result of the proposal and demonstrate how these will be minimised and mitigated against as part of the development. For major developments a more detailed quantitative emissions strategy may be required. This must fully assess and quantify total site emissions in terms of potential damage costs to both health and the environment both with and without mitigation measures in place. Further guidance will be made available to assist applicants with this process. For major developments with potentially significant air quality impacts, a full air quality impact assessment should be undertaken to establish the resultant impact on local air quality (in terms of change in ambient concentrations of air pollutants within the vicinity of the development site).

Where a development will introduce new relevant exposure in an area of existing, or future air quality concern, an exposure assessment will also be required. This should detail current and expected air quality conditions and assess the suitability of the location for human occupation. Where there is potential for new occupants to be exposed to unacceptable levels of air pollutants, an exposure mitigation strategy will be required.

The Council will review the significance of the air quality impacts in line with local and national guidance. The exercise of professional judgement by both the organisation preparing the air quality assessment and the local authority officers when they evaluate the findings is an important part of the assessment of significance. Evaluation of air quality impacts will take into account factors such as the number of people affected, the absolute levels and the predicted magnitude of the changes in pollutant concentrations. The evaluation will also take into account of the likely emissions impacts associated with the development and if the proposed mitigation is considered reasonable and proportionate. New development should support and contribute towards delivery of City of York Council's AQAP.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/A

Summary of Reasons for Change

No change.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 3	Objections: 5	Comments: 2
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is supported as should ensure air quality is not lowered by developments or additional traffic flows.
---------	--

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulford Parish Council state that the first part of the policy
-----------	--

	<p>should be reworded as follows: <i>“Development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are put in place to mitigate fully adverse impacts and prevent exposure to poor air quality. Proposals which worsen air quality in and around Air Quality Management Areas, either individually or cumulatively, will not be allowed”</i>. This is in order to protect human health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers object to the requirement for strategic sites to undertake detailed emissions strategy. This inserts an unnecessary layer of paperwork on a site that has already been examined and found to be suitably located. • Suggests amendments to encourage developments that include green walls, green roofs and generally more green living elements, which have health benefits, make buildings more attractive and improves air quality. • Low emissions zone should be considered for any non ultra low emissions vehicles entering the area just inside the outer ring road, and could fund improvements in public transport and the cycle and walking network.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust has concerns about the sharp increase in the use of biomass. The use of non-sustainable biomass can have serious impacts on woodlands and air pollution. Should consider specifying sustainable origin biomass should be used and non polluting boilers and stoves must be specified. • York Green Party comment that reference should be made to the proposed city centre ‘Clean Air Zone’ and the intention to remove all pre Euro 6 buses and diesel operated deliveries to premises from within the inner ring road by 2020. Developers of city centre sites will be required to contribute to the operational costs of a freight transshipment service unless they can demonstrate the intention to use their own electric fleet or cycle couriers. • Include statement specifying the date by which all AQMA zones are set to comply with the maximum pollution levels set by WHO health based objectives. • From May 2020 all new developments accessed directly from or within an AQMA (which has not been revoked) should include a requirement that only electric vehicles or Euro 6 minimum will be allowed to use parking provision within the development. Car club membership, free bike and public transport passes can be provided as incentives to new occupants.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy ENV2: Managing Environmental Quality				
<p>Development will not be permitted where future occupiers and existing communities would be subject to significant adverse environmental impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, fumes/emissions, dust and light pollution without effective mitigation measures. Evidence must be submitted to demonstrate that environmental quality is to the satisfaction of the Council.</p> <p>Development proposals for uses that are likely to have an environmental impact on the amenity of the surrounding area, including residential amenity, open countryside, local character and distinctiveness, and public spaces, must be accompanied by evidence that the impacts have been evaluated and the proposal will not result in loss of character, amenity or damage to human health, to either existing or new communities. This includes assessing the construction and operation phases of development.</p> <p>Where proposals are acceptable in principle, planning permission may be granted subject to conditions.</p> <p>For proposals which involve development with common party walls a verification report must be submitted to confirm the agreed mitigation works have been carried out.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No Change				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 6		Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy and as previously identified the continued use of the firing ranges on Strensall Common will need mitigation to enable development of the QE Barracks site. CPRE - North Yorkshire supports the policy. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC argue that the policy should be consistent in its tests to deliver for the level of impact that is acceptable in accordance with the NPPF and the opening paragraph of the policy itself which refers to development not giving rise to significant adverse environmental impacts. The second paragraph of the policy should therefore be reworded. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YEF and Treemendous identify the lack of inclusion of Green Infrastructure and trees effect on air and noise pollution. York Green Party state that reference should be made to the proposed city centre 'Clean Air Zone' and the intention to remove all pre Euro 6 buses and diesel operated deliveries to premises from within the inner ring road by 2020. Developers of city centre sites will be required to contribute to the operational 			

	<p>costs of a freight transshipment service unless they can demonstrate the intention to use their own electric fleet or cycle couriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include statement specifying the date by which all AQMA zones are set to comply with the maximum pollution levels set by WHO health based objectives.• From May 2020 all new developments accessed directly from or within an AQMA (which has not been revoked) should include a requirement that only electric vehicles or Euro 6 minimum will be allowed to use parking provision within the development. Car club membership, free bike and public transport passes can be provided as incentives to new occupants.
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy ENV3: Land Contamination				
<p>Where there is evidence that a site may be affected by contamination or the proposed use would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination (e.g. housing with gardens), planning applications must be accompanied by an appropriate contamination assessment.</p> <p>Development identified as being at risk will not be permitted where a contamination assessment does not fully assess the possible contamination risks, and / or where the proposed remedial measures will not deal effectively with the levels of contamination. Where proposals are acceptable in principle, planning permission will be granted subject to conditions.</p> <p>Where remedial measures are required to deal effectively with contamination, a verification report must be submitted to confirm that the agreed remedial works have been carried out.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
Amend explanatory text in para 12.23 from 'hazardous substances' to 'potentially polluting substances'.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No changes to policy				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 2		Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 1
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency supports inclusion of policy specifically for this matter. Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group state that policy should ensure developments are not constructed before contamination investigations take place. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency states that para.12.23 needs to be amended from 'hazardous substances' to 'potentially polluting substances'. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency states that in para.12.23 'Hazardous substances' could be interpreted as very specific substances that are legally defined as 'hazardous'. Non-hazardous substances could also cause pollution / harm to human health. 			

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy ENV4: Flood Risk				
<p>New development shall not be subject to unacceptable flood risk and shall be designed and constructed in such a way that mitigates against current and future flood events.</p> <p>An assessment of whether proposed development is likely to be affected by flooding and whether it will increase flood risk locally and elsewhere in the catchment must be undertaken. The assessment of proposed development against its flood risk vulnerability and its compatibility with this vulnerability, as defined in the most up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), will determine whether development is appropriate, what detailed policies for the resultant flood zone classification, as stated in the SFRA will apply, and whether a further Exception Test (that makes provision for sites in a zone with a higher probability of flooding to be assessed against wider sustainability benefits, provided that the flood risk posed is controlled and mitigated to an acceptable level) is subsequently required.</p> <p>Where flood risk is present, development will only be permitted when the local planning authority is satisfied that any flood risk within the catchment will be successfully managed (through a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development) and there are details of proposed necessary mitigation measures.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment must be submitted with any planning application where flood risk is an issue, regardless of its location within the flood zones. In addition, a site-specific flood risk assessment that takes account of future climate change must be carried out for all planning applications of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1 and for all applications in Flood Zones 2, 3a, 3a(i) and 3b.</p> <p>Areas of greater flood risk may be utilised for appropriate green infrastructure spaces.</p>				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 10		Supports: 3	Objections: 2	Comments: 6
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency supports this policy. York Green Party supports this policy. They also suggest that York should have an appropriate flood warning system, evacuation plan and escape routes when the development is in or near flood risk areas. Strensall and Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support this policy. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapleys LLP on behalf of British Sugar PLC argue that the policy wording should be clarified to ensure that it makes clear that only increases in flood risk arising as a direct result of the 			

	<p>development in question will need to be mitigated for. New wording suggested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More adaptation required given that York is prone to flooding. Suggests focussing more on green and blue infrastructure and a relationship with flooding rather than barriers to it.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers request that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required. • YEF and Treemendous comment that there is no mention of mitigation measures. Trees and leaky dams can slow the flow on river Ouse, Foss and strategically on Becks within York to reduce flood risk. • Environment Agency assumes that the modelling used was the current York Detailed Model. Also acknowledge that an updated SFRA is underway and would like to work with the Council on this.

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)

Policy ENV5: Sustainable Drainage

For all development on brownfield sites, surface water flow shall be restricted to 70% of the existing runoff rate (i.e. 30% reduction in existing runoff), unless it can be demonstrated that it is not reasonably practicable to achieve this reduction in runoff.

Sufficient attenuation and long term storage should be provided to ensure surface water flow does not exceed the restricted runoff rate. Such attenuation and storage measures must accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. Any design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event plus the recommended additional flows from the latest climate change advice, to account for climate change and surcharging the drainage system, can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into a watercourse or adjacent areas.

Where these surface water run-off limitations are likely to be exceeded development may be approved provided sufficient facilities for the long-term storage of surface water are installed within the development or a suitable location elsewhere. Long term surface water storage facilities must not cause detriment to existing heritage and environmental assets.

For new development on greenfield sites, surface water flows arising from the development, once it is complete (and including any intermediate stages), shall be no higher than the existing rate prior to development taking place, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not reasonably practicable to achieve this.

Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) methods of source control and water quality improvement should be utilised for all new development, to minimise the risk of pollution and to attenuate flood volumes. Such facilities should be provided on-site, or where this is not possible, close to the site.

Where new development is proposed within or adjacent to built-up areas it should be demonstrated that retrofitting existing surface water drainage systems, in those areas for flood prevention, and SuDS within the existing built environment have been explored. Any retrofitting proposals must not damage existing environmental assets including but not limited to landscapes, trees and hedgerows and agricultural land.

The authority will support applications where SuDS are enhanced for biodiversity~~Where possible SuDs approaches should be used to enhance and support the environmental aspects of the development.~~

In exceptional circumstances, where SuDS methods of source control and water quality can not be provided, it must be demonstrated that:

- i it is not possible to incorporate SuDS, either on site, or close to the site; and
- ii an acceptable means of surface water disposal is provided which does not increase the risk of flooding, does not damage existing environmental assets and improves on the current situation.

Measures to restrict surface water run-off rates shall be designed and implemented to prevent an unacceptable risk to contamination of groundwater. The type of SuDS

used should be appropriate to the site in question and should ensure that there is no pollution of the water environment including both ground and surface waters.

New development will not be permitted to allow ground water and/or the outflow from land drainage to enter public sewers.

Existing land drainage systems should not suffer any detriment as a result of development.

Supporting Text Changes:

N/a

Summary of Reasons for Change

Amendments to policy to reflect consultation comments to clarify when applications involving SUDs will be supported in relation to biodiversity.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 5	Objections: 0	Comments: 6
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency supports the policy's specific reference to ensuring that SuDS prevent pollution of groundwater. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust strongly support the inclusion of sustainable drainage enhanced for biodiversity in developments. Dunnington Parish Council supports the principles on sustainable drainage in this policy but they need to be implemented to reflect the nature and topography of Dunnington. York Green Party ask that a reference is added to the biodiversity, water quality and aesthetic benefits of green roofs, open swales and balancing ponds or lakes as part of a SuDS in appropriate developments. New habitats can help to mitigate wildlife loss at the same time as slowing runoff and preventing localised flooding. Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership are supportive in principle of this policy.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yorkshire Wildlife Trust ask that the phrase 'Where possible SuDS approaches should be used to enhance and support the environmental aspects of the development' could be strengthened to '<i>The authority will support applications where SuDS are enhanced for biodiversity</i>'. It can also be very valuable to install SuDS in older developments and opportunities should be taken whenever they arise. Rain gardens and permeable swales and paving can reduce pressure on the Victorian sewers in York which accept sewerage and surface water runoff. Arup on behalf of the York Central Partnership state that it may be necessary to update the 2013 SFRA given the 2017 update on Flood Risk Maps for Planning. Clarity required - revise the wording so that it is clear the policy endorses a 30% reduction in run-off. Several developers ask that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required. Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

	<p>support the policy but where connections are to be made to existing drainage systems then investigations must be carried out to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to take the additional flows even from developments with SUDs provision. Concerns that surface water drainage does not compromise any land drainage arrangements such as dykes etc.</p>
--	---

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy WM1: Sustainable Waste Management				
Sustainable waste management will be promoted by encouraging 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. This will be achieved in the following ways:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. working jointly with North Yorkshire County Council to develop capacity to manage residual municipal waste through mechanical treatment, anaerobic digestion and energy from waste; ii. safeguarding existing facilities as identified in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan; iii. identifying through the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, suitable alternative capacity for municipal waste and suitable capacity for all other waste streams, as may be required during the lifetime of the Joint Plan until 2030. iv. 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 sites; v. promoting opportunities for on-site management <u>and recycling</u> of waste where it arises at retail, industrial and commercial locations, particularly in the main urban area; and vi. granting planning permissions for waste facilities in appropriate sustainable locations only where they would not give rise to significant adverse impacts on the amenity of local communities and the historic and natural environment, in accordance with other relevant policies in the plan. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
Cross reference to WM2 to be added below policy.				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
Amendment made to clarify that opportunities for on-site recycling of waste at retail, industrial and commercial locations				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 5		Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 2
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council support sustainable waste management. • Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council appreciate that Waste Management and Harewood Whin are not covered in detail in the Local Plan, however they note that it is covered in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan and are supportive of the policies contained therein with reference to Harewood Whin especially the recognition that the site is in the Green Belt. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Party considers that (v) should include requirement for new commercial developments to include separate recycling as well as waste storage facilities and a reference should be added that new food premises should have provision for food waste collection, separate from recycling and other waste collection and requirement to store waste within the site prior to collection. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the boxes for Policies WM1 and WM2 there is a 'See also: Policy ...' line. It would be useful if the one for WM1 was cross- 			

	<p>referring to WM2 and vice-versa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern over how extra development will deal with additional sewage as the River Foss currently takes Earswick, Towthorpe and Strensall.
--	--

Potential Changes to Policy Post Pre- Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy WM2: Sustainable Minerals Management				
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. This will be achieved in the following ways:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. minimising the consumption of non-renewable mineral resources in major developments by requiring developers to demonstrate good practice in the use, reuse, recycling and disposal of construction materials; ii. identifying, through the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, resources to be safeguarded, safeguarded areas for minerals and ancillary transport infrastructure including sites in the City of York area; and iii. identifying, through the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, areas of sufficient quality for mineral extraction, in line with any agreed apportionments and guidelines. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/a				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 3		Supports: 1	Objections: 2	Comments: 0
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Planning Group Policy support the policy as it should ensure that any waste is re-used where possible. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachael Maskell MP states that sites should be refused to any company planning to frack for shale gas. • Green Party believe reference should be made to ensuring mineral exploitation takes full account of residential amenity and the unique heritage on which so much of York's economy now depends. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments made to this policy. 			

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)**Policy T1: Sustainable Access**

Development will be supported where it minimises the need to travel and provides safe, suitable and attractive access for all transport users to and within it, including those with impaired mobility, such that it maximises the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

This will be achieved by

- a. ensuring developments that can be reasonably expected to generate significant traffic movements are supported by frequent high quality public transport linking them to York's City Centre and other key destination, as appropriate; and
- b. requiring development proposals to demonstrate:
 - i. there is safe and appropriate access to the adjacent adopted highway;
 - ii. there are safe and appropriate links to local services and facilities, the surrounding walking, cycling and public transport networks (including, where appropriate, the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network), and that these integrate into the overall development;
 - iii. they provide suitable access, permeability and circulation for a range of transport modes whilst giving priority to pedestrians (particularly those with impaired mobility), cyclists and public transport services;
 - iv. they create safe and secure layouts for motorised vehicles (including public transport vehicles), cyclists, pedestrians that minimise conflict;
 - v. they provide sufficient convenient, secure and covered cycle storage, ideally within the curtilage of new buildings; and
 - vi. new roads or accesses through the development restrict access for, or otherwise discourage general motor traffic.

Where development is to be supported by frequent high quality public transport linking them to York City Centre or other key destination, developers will be required to ensure the provision of such new services or enhanced existing services, as necessary, from first occupation of the development for a period of up 10 years, or five years after last occupation, whichever comes sooner. For all development, public transport services should be within reasonable safe walking and cycling travel distance of all parts of the development.

In applying this policy it is recognised that in some circumstances developments will not be able to achieve these criteria (for example, in heart of foot streets area), so they can, subject to sufficient justification of effective accessibility (including taxis) being submitted by a developer, be relaxed. Also some developments may be of a sufficient size to warrant a higher degree of accessibility than would otherwise be required for its location.

See also Policy DP3, D2 ~~and~~, DM1 and ENV1

Supporting Text Changes:

- Minor change to paragraph 14.10 (see below) reflect that new or enhanced public transport services can become commercially viable over a shorter timescale than stated in the policy.

14.10 The requirement to ensure the provision of public transport services from first occupation of the development for a period of up to 10 years, or five years after last occupation, whichever comes sooner, shall apply unless the developer can demonstrate:

- ~~-this is not a viable option in terms of practicality and cost - in such cases the developer should set-out the proposed level of public transport provision and the duration of this provision, together with a justification for this, or-~~
- such new services or enhanced existing services will become commercially viable within a shorter timeframe.

14.12 Lack of sufficient safe, covered and convenient storage space for cycles in new development, particularly in residential development, can deter people from owning and using a cycle. Development will be expected to be in accordance with the advice ~~given contained~~ in the ~~latest version of the Council's Cycle Parking Guidance. Might need to reword this if we are to include the cycle parking guidance in the Guide to Sustainable~~ Access to new Development SPD

Summary of Reasons for Change

- Minor changes, in response to representations received, to ensure that the policy has sufficient flexibility to adapt to the differing circumstances that apply to each development proposal.
- Policy cross-referenced to Policy ENV1 to address representation relating to the provision of electric car charging points within new development.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 18	Supports: 5	Objections: 8	Comments: 7
---------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England and Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the policy. • The York Cycle Campaign is pleased to see cyclists considered and included in the Sustainable Access plans. • York Green Party support overall aims of the policy and welcomes the LSTF funded 'i-Travel York' programme (not referred to the policy). It also supports and welcomes the policy requirement for the provision of public transport from first occupation for a period of 10 years. • The National Railway Museum is supportive of the approach to transport and connectivity, particularly those set out in this policy and York Central is critical to its success. • Arup (obo the York Central Partnership) supports the policy in principle.
---------	---

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several developers state that the policy as drafted lacks the flexibility suggested in para 14.10. It may be a bus enhancement scheme can become viable over a shorter period. Johnson Mowat (obo Taylor Wimpey) reiterates this and advocates the policy needs amending to allow a developer to submit a proposal where it can be demonstrated a service is
-----------	--

	<p>viable without subsidy over a shorter period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The York Environment Forum objects to there being no mention of Green Infrastructure strategy and plans for cyclists/ walkers. • Rachael Maskell MP advocates that car electric charging points should be built into all new developments where cars are on site, and that elderly and disabled people should not have to face barriers to travel, since this further entrenches restrictive social mobility. Another respondent reiterates Rachel Maskell's view regarding electric charging points, adding that one should be made available for each parking space a development creates and that they should have a minimum power output of 7kW. • Rapleys LLP (obo British Sugar PLC) states the policy must be clear that the contributions in accordance with CIL Regulation 122 are directly related to the development and fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposal. In particular it should be clear that contributions will be required to ensure the provision of such new services as are proven and demonstrated to be necessary to support the development in question. Rapleys LLP also suggested new wording for the policy. It advocates that such data should form part of the evidence base to demonstrate the most effective local strategies to mitigate the likely car trips that may be generated by new developments in the city. • York Green Party advocate that the suggestion that applying the policy criteria could be 'relaxed' is too weak and should be removed.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party states the following: 1. that the i-travel York programme has focused mainly on the north-east sector of York and there is no indication how this might be extended more widely, 2. the current version of the plan does not appear to contain any evidence of the measurable outcomes of the programme and the most effective measures that might be more widely deployed during the plan period. 3. advocates that there should be a 'master plan' to give certainty to developers, potential businesses and future residents as to the long term infrastructure that will serve the site. 4. advocates transport initiatives such as car clubs, electric bike hubs, driverless vehicles, 'Uber'- style taxi minibus services and 'on demand' trip services should all be factored in to ensure new developments capitalise on emerging new transport options. More specifically a business case model should be considered for orbital bus services, shuttle bus services , light rail/ tram/ trolley bus/ guided bus routes etc. • Arup (obo York Central Partnership) seeks clarity on whether the requirement to provide frequent, high quality public transport services 'from first occupation of the development for a period of 10 years, or five years after occupation whichever comes sooner' applies to sites with long build out periods - for

	<p>example, the York Central site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Network Rail stated it would be beneficial for the policy to highlight the need for applications to be supported by appropriate transport statements or assessments and that funding to support increased connectivity necessary to support the principle of the development will be sought via developer contributions• One respondent advocated that the 'Sustainable Transport for Development' Supplementary Planning Document should be consulted on. It should encourage reliable public transport options throughout the day and into the evening.• Another respondent advocates that a Towthorpe – A64 flyover dual carriageway is needed.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy T2: Strategic Public Transport Improvements

The Plan will support the delivery of general and specific junction, highway or public transport infrastructure enhancements as set out in the Local Transport Plan 2-2011-2031 (LTP3) and subsequent associated (or complementary) investment programmes.

In addition, strategic public transport infrastructure, as listed below, and (if requiring land outside of the highway boundary to implement) as identified on the Proposals Map, will be implemented in the short-term and medium-term timescales shown, and pursued in the long-term timescale shown.

Short-term (2017-22)

- i. The following highway enhancements to improve public transport reliability
 - Public transport interchange improvements at York Station
 - Leeman Road / Shipton Road Corridor Improvements
 - improve bus routing and waiting facilities adjacent to the memorial gardens in Leeman Road; ~~and,~~
 - citywide improvements to the urban traffic control system; and
 - a package of physical measures to improve operation of bus fleet and bus services in York City Centre.

Medium-term (2022-27)

- ii. Further expansion of the Askham Bar and Poppleton Bar Park & Ride facilities to match rising demand.
- iii. The following highway enhancements to improve public transport services and reliability:
 - a segregated grade-separated bus (and pedestrian / cycle) route across A1237 to improve connectivity with the areas to the north-west of the city; and
 - a dedicated public transport / cycle route linking the new settlement (ST15) to a suitable access on York's highway network in the urban centre of York (subject to confirmation of developers access proposals to site ST15 so not shown on the proposals map).

Long-term (2027-32)

- iv. A new railway station at Haxby.
- v. Traffic restraint measures in the city centre ~~The following highway enhancements~~ to improve public transport reliability.
 - ~~• a package of physical measures to improve operation of bus fleet and bus services in York City Centre; and~~
 - ~~• traffic restraint measures in the city centre.~~

The Plan will also support (subject to compliance with other policies in the Plan) development proposals that

- vi. Improve rail access and connectivity, including but not limited to new railway stations / halts for heavy or light rail services, and capacity improvements and

other enhancements (including new technology applications, where appropriate) on rail lines running into or through York.

vii. Provide highway enhancements to improve public transport reliability.

viii Facilitate the relocation of the Designer Outlet Park & Ride facility.

Supporting Text Changes:

- Minor change to 14.17 (see below) to reflect that the public transport interchange improvements at York Station have been taken out of policy T3 and included as a strategic public transport improvement to be delivered in the short term.
- 14.17 Policy T2 identifies the principal strategic schemes that need to be delivered, but many more smaller projects with more local impacts will also be required, either individually or as part of larger projects. More detail is contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. York Railway Station is not included in this list (other than for the public transport interchange improvements at York Station as it is subject to a separate specific policy (Policy T3)).
- Minor change to 14.21 (see below) to reflect that in supporting development proposals which bring about the improvement of existing railway stations and facilities or the provision of new existing railway stations and facilities, such proposals should also improve access to them by all modes.
- 14.21 The Council will support development proposals which bring about the improvement of existing railway stations and facilities or the provision of new existing railway stations and facilities, or bring about some other improvement which will be beneficial to the operation of the line. At new or improved rail stations the 'station environment' must provide safe and convenient movement to and between platforms and include other facilities, such as sheltered waiting and ticketing facilities, public transport information and sensitive lighting and landscaping. Proposals for new or improved rail stations should also have improved access to them by all modes, in accordance with the Council's Hierarchy of Transport Users as set out in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (LTP3).

Summary of Reasons for Change

- In response to representations received, the use of new technologies, where appropriate, is included in sub-clause vi, sub clause viii added to safeguard the long-term operation of the Designer Outlet Park & Ride facility in the event that the lease is terminated prior to its expiry date (2026 with possible 3yr extension to 2029), following discussions with Transport Service the public transport interchange improvements at York Station have been taken out of policy T3 and included as a strategic public transport improvement to be delivered in the short term.
- In response to representations received and following discussions with Transport Service the package of physical measures to improve operation of bus fleet and bus services in York City Centre Measures is moved from Long-term to Short-term. (NB this package is funded for delivery in the short-term).

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 19	Supports: 4	Objections: 8	Comments: 10
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England welcomes the long-term proposal in the policy to strengthen traffic restraint measures in the city. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is supportive of the policy • The National Railway Museum is supportive of the approach to transport and connectivity, particularly those set out in this policy and York Central is critical to its success. • The York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce welcomes the commitments to the strategic rail networks. • Arup (obo the York Central Partnership) supports the policy in principle. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulford Parish Council objects to the proposal for “a dedicated public transport/cycle route linking the new settlement (ST15) to a suitable access on York’s highway network in the urban centre of York.” as there are no details of where or how this public transport / cycle route would be created Fulford Parish Council considers that it is premature for such a proposal to be included in the Plan. • Historic England has concerns about the impact which the following might have upon elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic City including the expansion of the Park and Ride Sites at Askham Bar and Poppleton Bar and a segregated grade-separated bus route across the A1237. • York Green Party advocates a comprehensive review of the existing public transport strategy. It also proposes several options for public transport service frequencies and routes, advocates that alternative modes be considered for providing public transport services, seeks the exploration (in addition to supporting the station at Haxby) for options for new stations at Strensall, Copmanthorpe, and a tram/train halt at British Sugar and advocates that traffic restraint measures and public transport priority within the city centre are far more urgent than ‘long term’ and should be introduced incrementally, starting next year. • Whilst Network Rail supports the principle of improved facilities [adjacent to the Memorial Gardens in Leeman Road] that are beneficial to public transport it would like to ensure that proposals give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements from the station and from the York Central development. • NTR Planning (obo McArthur Glen, Aviva Investors & York Designer Outlet) advocate that given York Designer Outlet's commitment to expand on site and expand / relocate the existing park & ride facilities, the following should be inserted in the short-term (2011-22) list: "Further expansion and relocation of the York Designer Outlet Park & Ride facilities on adjacent 		

	<p>land south of the York Designer Outlet"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent states that the proposed new station at Haxby is in the wrong location as the only route to the station (Station Road) would not cope with the extra traffic. There is the school to consider and also the loss of allotments.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although Highways England welcomes the expansion of Park & Ride in principle, the proposal to expand Askham Bar Park & Ride will increase traffic using the A1036/A64 junction and Highways England will need to understand the impact on the operation of the A1036/A64 junction. • Network Rail stated it would be beneficial for the policy to highlight the need for applications to be supported by appropriate transport statements or assessments and that funding to support increased connectivity necessary to support the principle of the development will be sought via developer contributions. • Selby District Council requests further information regarding the potential relocation of the Park & Ride facility at the York Designer Outlet Centre, as identified on the draft Proposals Map. Selby District Council supports the provision of this facility, but need confirmation of why it may be relocated within the site. If this is due to anticipated further expansion to the Designer Outlet Centre, this would be of concern, as it would be of concern as it may have implications relating to traffic congestion on the A19/A64, as well as having an impact on the health of Selby town Centre. • Network Rail would welcome being part of the consultation process for any scheme to provide waiting facilities in the area [adjacent to the Memorial Gardens in Leeman Road] • Rachell Maskell MP states that public transport routes need serious thought and development. Bus routes are too restrictive currently and therefore people opt for their car. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would prefer that the building of a new railway station at Haxby is brought forward to the medium term. • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • One respondent advocates that the long-term additional transport investments should include new railway stations at Strensall (ST5), Wigginton Road (ST17, York Hospital, Bootham Crescent), and adjacent to ST1/ST2 and asks whether there is potential for a people mover between Poppleton Station and Poppleton Bar Park and Ride as an alternative to the current bus. • Another respondent queries what the Short –term 'city-wide improvements to the urban traffic system' are, queries what constitutes 'Provide highway enhancements to improve public transport reliability', adding that if these are new roads or expanding the out ring roads then they are in conflict with the

	<p>Climate Change section on sustainable transport and states there is a lack of information on the proposed Haxby station and queries why there is no station for the new Elvington site.</p>
--	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)**Policy T3: York Railway Station and Associated Operational Facilities**

Development will be supported that:

- i. ~~enhances the~~ Conserves and, where appropriate, enhances those elements that contribute to the significance of the Listed Grade II* station;
- ii. ~~Improves the setting of and approaches to the station and the experience of those using it, to meet the demands of the modern rail customer; and its setting that conserve and enhance its historic and natural environment, particularly those that improve the visual amenity at the station and its environs, to meet the demands of the modern rail customer;~~
- iii. increases the railway capacity at York Station (as identified on the Proposals Map) to meet changing demands on and capacity in the rail network, over the duration of the Local Plan period and beyond, and to develop the station as:
 - a hub and gateway station for York and the wider sub-region, and
 - a hub station for high-speed rail (HS2 and ~~HS3~~Northern Powerhouse Rail).
- ~~iii. assists in the delivery of short-term public transport interchange improvements at the station in the short-to-medium-term;~~
- iv. assists in the improvement of public transport turn around and interchange facilities as part of a general package of measures to improve access at York Station, by all modes, in the medium-to-long-term;
- v. consolidates public car parks and maintain an appropriate level of long-stay and short stay parking at the York Station, which is currently provided at several locations;
- vi. improves pedestrian and cyclist access to within and through the station, including, but not limited to:
 - links to improved interchange with further links from this to the south-western quadrant of the city centre;
 - links to the York Central site through the station (including pedestrian crossings of the lines);
 - links between the York Central site and the north-west quadrant of the city centre;
 - reduced pedestrian / vehicular conflict in Queen Street;
 - creation of environmental improvements at Tea Room Square;
 - improved cycle parking;
 - improved way-finding and signage, and
- vii. ~~safeguards land required for the potential future expansion of the Siemens Trans Pennine Express depot. facilitates the continued use of essential operational rail lines and facilities or the establishment of new essential operational rail lines or facilities until such time, as determined by rail regulator, that land required for York Central (Policy SS4) is no longer to remain in rail use.~~


Supporting Text Changes:

14.28 The Government has determined that the necessary capacity and quality improvements for future long distance north/south movements will be provided by a new high speed rail system - HS2. The proposed network would be Y-

shaped, running from London to Birmingham then splitting in two, to run eastwards to Leeds and westwards Manchester with onward links to the existing ECML and West Coast Mainline respectively. When complete in 2033 it will provide a much faster connection to London and the continent for travellers from the Leeds City Region and the north of England and York will have a direct link with the new high speed line. Prior to the implementation of HS2, new 'Azuma' Class 800 train sets (to replace ageing Inter-City 125 HST and IC225 train sets) are expected to start operating on the East Coast Main Line in 2018. Furthermore, in the 2016 Budget the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the Government will allocate £60 million to develop options for ~~HS3 (or Northern Powerhouse Rail)~~ between Leeds and Manchester, as well as options for improving other major city rail links. This is in addition to the Transpennine Route Upgrade between Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and York.

Figure 14.1: York Station Access Concept Plan (see below) has been updated to reflect consultation comments and further information received in relation to York Central.

Figure 14.1 York Station Access Concept Plan



14.35 A Siemens Transpennine Express depot is currently located within the existing operational railway land to the north of Leeman Road and north-west of York Station ~~(i.e. within the York Central site, see Policy SS9)~~. The resultant operational requirements of the Transpennine Route Upgrade (TRU)

may necessitate the ~~expansion and / or relocation of this depot.~~provision of additional operational rail facilities. existing

~~Figure 14.1: York Station Access Concept Plan will be updated to reflect consultation comments and further information received in relation to York Central.~~

Summary of Reasons for Change

In response to representations received the following amendments are proposed:

Sub-clause (i) has been separated into two sub-clauses (i) and (ii) to better reflect the significance and setting of York Railway Station and the support for development that will enhance, as well as conserve, them.

Sub-clause (iii) has been deleted, as moved to policy T2, and existing sub-clause (ii) renumbered sub-clause (iii) and minor amendment made to show correct project title - supporting text also amended to suit.

Sub-clause vii amended to reflect latest position regarding Transpennine Route Upgrade facility title - supporting text also amended to suit.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 13	Supports: 6	Objections: 1	Comments: 8
---------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail supports the principle of the proposals to improve the railway station and appreciates the acknowledgement of the need to improve the environment to support increased capacity and connectivity. • The Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership states that the plan acknowledges that commuting to destinations outside York occurs, with significant outward commuting to Leeds in particular and welcomes that improvements to York Railway Station are included in the plan to accommodate enhancements for the planned electrification of the Trans Pennine Line, HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail aspirations. • The National Railway Museum supports the provisions in the policy where it relates to York Central. • Arup (obo the York Central Partnership) support the principles of the policy. • The National Railway Museum is supportive of the approach to transport and connectivity, particularly those set out in this policy and York Central is critical to its success. • The York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce welcomes the commitments to the strategic rail networks. • Arup (obo York Central Partnership) supports the policy in principle. • York Green Party supports the development of a more formal western entrance and square linking to the new approach for rail passengers working at or living in York Central, adding that it should be designed to enhance the attractiveness of walking and cycling, accommodating taxis and buses serving
---------	--

	the station from the west side.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail states that the York Access Concept Plan shows a Harrogate Chord which is an out of date capacity scheme and conflicts with York Central Masterplan aspirations. This plan should be updated to remove the chord, the reference to HS3 is out of date and should be replaced with northern Powerhouse Rail, Paragraph 14.35 is incorrect in that the existing Siemens depot is just outside the York Central allocation therefore the bracketed reference to York Central should be removed and the operational requirements of the Transpennine Route upgrade may require a new facility within the York Central site; this will not be an expansion or relocation of the Siemens depot which will remain a separate facility. • Historic England advocates amending criterion (i).
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Yorkshire County Council states that proposals [at Site ST5] include improvements at York Railway Station, which plays an important role in providing connections to parts of North Yorkshire and beyond, adding that ensuring that opportunities are taken to maximise benefits from enhancements and connection to HS2 is important for the potential economic growth, for York and areas beyond its boundaries. • Network Rail advises that a new Platform 12 at York Station could be built as parallel to Platform 11. Network Rail would appreciate clarification as to which land is to be safeguarded as part of sub-clause vii. • York Green Party states that Opportunities should be taken to reduce long stay parking at the station, priority for existing space should be given to expanding platforms, services for rail customers etc, provision would also need to be made for interchange to any new bus, shuttle bus or taxi services and tram train if developed from British Sugar site. • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. • One respondent states that there do not appear to be many walking access points shown on Figure 14.1 (none from west/Acomb) and the existing{Walton Road] bridge and Cinder Lane are are popular and this access should be kept open.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)**Policy T4: Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements**

The Plan will support the delivery of general and specific junction or other highway enhancements as set out in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (LTP3) and subsequent associated (or complementary) investment programmes that improve journey time reliability on sections of the road network that experience high volumes of traffic or delay.

In addition, Strategic highway capacity improvements, as listed below and (if requiring land outside of the highway boundary to implement) as identified Proposals Map, will be implemented in the short-term and medium-term timescales shown, and pursued in the long-term timescale shown:

Short-term (2017/18 – 2022/23)

- i. Improvements to the following junctions (including approaches) on the A1237:
 - Haxby Road
 - Monks Cross (North Lane)
 - B1363 Wigginton Road
 - Great North Way
 - Strensall Road
 - Clifton Moor
 - B1224 Wetherby Road
- ii. Provision of a new all-purpose access road, including a new bridge over the existing railway, to serve the York Central site (ST5)

Medium-term (2022/23 -2027/28)

- iii. Improvements to the A64/A1079/A166 Grimston Bar junction (including approach roads);
- iiii. Improvements to A1036 (Malton Road, Heworth Green) / Stockton Lane / Heworth Road junction;
- iv. Junction improvements on Wigginton Road, north of A1237, ~~and;~~
- vi. Wigginton Road / ~~Grington-Crichton~~ Avenue junction improvement (complementing inbound bus priority measures on Wigginton Road), ~~and~~
- vii. New access of A64, including new grade separated junction, to serve the Land West of Elvington Lane site (ST15)

Long-term (2027/28 – 2032/33)

- viii. Upgrading the A1237 to dual-carriageway standard

The plan will also support the construction of new or improved accesses to other major development sites, to a suitable standard, to form part of the city's strategic highway network as appropriate.

See also Policy SS4, SS13 and DM1

Supporting Text Changes

Change to paragraph 14.36 to better reflect the timescales for the delivery of the capacity enhancements to the A1237. Minor change to paragraph 14.37. Minor change to 'Delivery' box to take into account of Highways Agency changing to Highways England. See below for all changes.

Explanation

- 14.36 The £34.2m project to deliver Capacity capacity enhancements to the A1237 junctions has secured Gateway 1 (Outline Business Case) approval from West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA). This project, due for completion by 2021/22, will improve the through-flow of traffic across each junction and thereby improve the overall movement of traffic on the A1237- as already experienced in the vicinity of the A1237/A59 following the recent upgrade to the A59/A1237 junction - thus encouraging the transfer of cross-city private motor vehicle journeys away from radial routes through the city centre and its immediate surrounding area. This, in-turn, will enable complementary measures that encourage the use of more sustainable travel to be implemented on radial routes (including at junctions with the A1237) and other roads closer to the city centre.
- 14.37 In the longer-term, as more developments come on-stream further enhancements to the A1237 will be necessary to provide substantial additional link capacity to cater for the projected increases in traffic. This additional link capacity will improve traffic flow and journey time reliability along it such that it will draw more cross-city traffic away from the radial routes and inner urban routes. On 3 August 2017 ~~the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA)~~ approved a bid by City of York to secure £295,000 to fund a pre-feasibility study to identify and evaluate options for upgrading the A1237 between the A64 at Askham Bar-Bryan and the A64 at Hopgrove to a dual carriageway. The outcome of this feasibility work will pave the way for a later bid by the council for money to dual the road as part of the Government's Transport Investment strategy, published on 5 July 2017.

Delivery

- Key Delivery Partners: City of York Council, Highways England, Network Rail, ~~train operating companies?~~ and developers
- Implementation: Planning Applications, Developer Contributions, City of York Council Capital Programme, East Riding of Yorkshire Council Capital Programme and Highways England Agency Programmes.

Summary of Reasons for Change

In response to representations received

- New sub-clause (vii) (new access off A64) added to schemes to be delivered in the medium-term. Also as the access to the York Central site is considered by officers to be a strategic link a new sub-clause (ii) has been added, similarly, to schemes to be delivered in the short-term.
- Existing sub clauses (ii) to (v) and (vii) renumbered (iii) to (vi) and (viii) accordingly.
- Minor alteration to renumbered sub-clause (viii) to take account of new sub-clauses (ii) and (vii)
- Policy cross-referenced to Policy SS4 and SS13 to take account of new sub-clauses (ii) and (vii)
- Supporting text updated to better reflect the timescales for the delivery of the capacity enhancements to the A1237 and update the details of one of the implementation organisations.

Similar to as already stated in Policy T2, the Local Plan supporting the delivery of enhancements set out in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2033 (LTP3) has been inserted at the beginning of the policy.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 13		Supports: 4	Objections: 4	Comments: 8
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Riding of Yorkshire Council welcomes the identification of strategic highways network improvements at Grimston Bar in the policy and the need for joint working and is committed to working constructively with City of York Council and Highways England to ensure this is fully assessed and appropriate improvements can be identified and delivered. • The York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce welcomes the commitments to the strategic road networks. • York Green Party welcomes the stated objective for enhanced capacity on the outer ring road, namely discouraging driving through the city centre. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the inclusion of Strensall Road within the short-term section. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England advocate that the policy should include a reference to the provision of a new junction on the A64 to provide the main access to strategic housing site ST15 Land West Elvington Lane and states that 'Highways Agency' needs to be replaced by 'Highways England' in the 'Delivery' boxes following Paras. 14.39 and 14.43. • York Green Party states that Para. 14.36 is NOT borne out by policy T2 which proposed city centre traffic restraint measures as 'long term' ones (when they need to be short term to 			

	<p>achieve this objective), states that there is nothing in the transport policies as currently presented to indicate action to discourage driving through the city centre and advocates that the ambition[to dual the outer ring road] should be scrapped now in favour of a regionally funded feasibility study for an appropriate light rail network to serve the largest new development sites within the plan. This is supported by Para. 4.11.9 of the Sustainability Appraisal Main Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Cycle Campaign questions the evidence upon which the substantial additions and alterations to the strategic road network are based and question the need for such extensive changes to the road infrastructure, they would be very concerned if the infrastructure investments proposed are based on the transport model (that the York Cycle Campaign consider to be flawed) and question whether they represent best value for money, they advocate that there is a danger that the proposed alterations and additions to York's strategic road network may ultimately only add to York's traffic congestion and states that many of the additions and alterations to the strategic road network directly contradict a number of the objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal; namely objectives 2, 6,7 and 12. • One respondent supports dualling the outer ring road, and suggests a cycle lane all the way round the new dual carriageway would be good.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England states that the policy includes several schemes that impact on the A64 Trunk Road. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group notes the policy does not mention improvements to Towthorpe Moor Lane in relation to Highways Agency improvements to A64 east of Hopgrove. • York Cycle Campaign note that it is widely recognised by transport professionals that widening and increasing capacity only delivers short term relief, and actually increases the number of motor vehicles, a phenomenon known as induced demand, they would like to see a full reasoning and justification for the substantial additions and alterations to the to York's strategic road network, the parameters used in the transport model and appropriate economic weighting given to additions and alterations to cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, they state that it is imperative that the council presents a strong economic rationale for making substantial changes to the road network. • Several Developers states that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required and that the timings of junction upgrades in the policy need further explanation and are linked back to the delivery trajectories of each strategic site. • One respondent states that the A64 / A1070 / A166 are already identified as a focal point for traffic from East Yorkshire, they advocate that the A roads need to be improved to accommodate this traffic flow and B roads, such as the B1228 or Common Lane should not be altered as both are in green

	<p>corridors and contribute to the character leading to both Dunnington and Elvington, and in turn preserve the identity of the settlements and villages, they state that in the Transport Topic Paper neither the N1228 nor Common Lane were included in the tables but were referred to in the document, it is highlighted that of particular concern is the anticipated increase in traffic on Common Lane which is a narrow road and meets a difficult intersection on A1079, this is not appropriate to be used as a link road from industrial units in Elvington, Winthorpe and traffic from Selby and East Yorkshire to the A1079, They suggest that upgrading the A1237 needs to be brought forward to the medium term,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another respondent advocated that these upgrades are essential to the successful delivery of many sites in the northern half of the city, adding that the Haxby Road/A1237 junction needs to be grade separated.
--	--

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy T5: Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements

The Plan will support the delivery of general and specific schemes as set out in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (LTP3) and subsequent associated (or complementary) investment programmes to provide a comprehensive cycling and pedestrian network and improve the environment for walking and cycling.

In addition, sStrategic cycle and pedestrian network links and improvements, as listed below and (if requiring land outside of the highway boundary to implement) as identified on the Proposals Map, will be implemented in accordance with the timescales shown, to encourage modal shift away from private motor vehicle use to more active and sustainable modes of transport:

Short-term (2017/18 – 2022/23)

- i. Widening of footway / cycle way on east side of Scarborough bridge and new approach ramps (includes direct link into York Station);
- ii. Haxby Road / Huntington Road Corridor (Phase 1 – north of existing Nestle site to A1237)*;
- iii. Wetherby Road / Acomb Road Corridor *;
- iv. Bishopthorpe Road South Corridor *;
- v. Fishergate North Corridor *, and
- vi. Strensall Road Corridor (Strensall to A1237).*
- vii. University of York East Campus to West Campus link.

Note schemes denoted thus (*) also extend into the medium term and long term.

Medium-Term (2022/23 – 2027/28)

- viii Wigginton Road Corridor – Mill Lane to north of existing Nestle Site (ST17) (complementing Inbound bus priority measures on Wigginton Road);
- viiiiix. Haxby Road / Huntington Road Corridor (Phase 2 – city centre to north of existing Nestle site (ST17));
- ix. Hull Road Corridor (complementing Bus priority measures on the Hull Road corridor); ~~and~~
- x.i. Hurricane Way / Stirling Road corridor**, ~~and~~
- xii. Pedestrian / cycle bridges across the River Foss (as part of the re-development of the York Caste Gateway major regeneration area);

Note scheme denoted thus (**) is a relatively small scheme that could be implemented the short-term.

Long-Term (2027/28 – 2032/33)

- ~~xi. Pedestrian / cycle bridges across the River Foss (as part of the re-development of the York Caste Gateway major regeneration area);~~
- xiii. Strategic north-south and east-west cycle routes through the city centre, ~~and~~
- ~~xiii – University of York East Campus to West Campus link.~~

In addition to the above, other schemes identified through the Council's Strategic Cycle Route Network Evaluation and Prioritisation Methodology (e.g. Strategic Infill cycle scheme package and Cycle Routes to Villages package) will be pursued.

The Plan will also support proposals that improve access to and around new development, particularly strategic sites, and proposals that improve other cycle and pedestrian routes that are neither strategic network links nor routes included in the Proposals Map.

See also Policy T1, [SS4 to SS13, SS16, SS18 to SS20, SS22 to SS23](#) ~~SS9~~ and DM1

Supporting Text Changes:

Change to paragraph 14.40 to better reflect the roles that cycling and walking have in reducing congestion and improving health, well being and economic performance. Minor change to 'Delivery' box to take into account of Highways Agency changing to Highways England. See below for all changes.

14.40 [Actively encouraging individuals to undertake journeys by cycle or on foot, has the potential to reduce congestion by removing some vehicles from the roads, particularly for short journeys. It can contribute to economic performance by improving the health of employees, \(as well as children attending school\) and help reduce social exclusion by making more facilities accessible to non-car users. Cycling can make a major contribution to improving the health of participants whether they are travelling to school, work or for leisure.](#) Therefore, the Council has, and is continuing to develop a comprehensive network of safe and accessible strategic cycle and pedestrian routes, principally to connect residential areas with employment areas, schools and retail areas as well as other facilities and services. In some cases these routes are intended to connect strategic sites and other sectors of the city with the city centre. For example, the proposed new landmark River Foss pedestrian/cycle bridge envisaged to be delivered as part of the York Castle Gateway ('Castle Gateway') major regeneration area of the city centre will improve pedestrian and cycle flow throughout the area and in to the wider city. It will also connect with new routes along one or both banks of the River Foss, also envisaged to be delivered as part of Castle Gateway that will, themselves, have connections to the wider pedestrian and cycle route network.

Delivery

- Key Delivery Partners: City of York Council, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Highways [Agency-England](#), Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership, York North Yorkshire and East riding Local Enterprise Partnership, Network Rail, train operating companies and developers.

Summary of Reasons for Change

- In response to representations received
 - Sub-clause (vii) (University of York East Campus to West Campus link) added to improvements in the short-term (moved from improvements in the long-term) and existing sub clause (xiii) deleted.
 - Existing sub clauses (vii) to (x) renumbered (viii) to (xi) accordingly.
 - New sub-clause (xii) (Pedestrian / cycle bridges across the River Foss (as part of the re-development of the York Caste Gateway major regeneration area)) added to improvements in the medium-term (moved from improvements in the

long-term) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing sub clause (xii) renumbered (xiii) accordingly. Minor amendments to existing 1st paragraph. Policy cross-referenced to Policies SS4 to SS13, SS16, SS18 to SS20, SS22 to SS23 Supporting text updated to better reflect the roles that cycling and walking have in reducing congestion and improving health, well being and economic performance, and update the details of one of the implementation organisations. <p>Similar to as already stated in Policy T2, the Local Plan supporting the delivery of enhancements set out in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2033 (LTP3) has been inserted at the beginning of the policy.</p>				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 15		Supports: 3	Objections: 3	Comments: 10
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Museums Trust supports the principle of bridges over the Foss. Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the policy in respect of improvements of the pedestrian and cycle access along the Strensall Road corridor. York Green Party welcomes the short term projects in the policy, notably the improvement to Scarborough Bridge which has potential to create a major boost in walking and cycling between the west side of York and the city centre/ Minster quarter.. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Environment Forum and Treemendous state there is no mention of Green Infrastructure strategy and plans for cyclists/ walkers in the policy. They also advocate the inclusion of a Rufforth to Acomb cycleway and a segregated grade-separated bus and a pedestrian/cycle route across A1237. York Green Party advocates that corridor schemes need to be more clearly specified into Phase 1,2,3 if they are to take place incrementally as development progresses. Each phase must have some coherence in its own right for local users. They advocate that the Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge as part of the Castle Gateway regeneration must be in Short – Medium term, NOT long term to have any beneficial contribution to the development of this area. They state that the University East - West campus link was supposed to be a planning condition funded by S106 and must be included in the Short term provision. They advocate that strategic cross centre cycle routes should be implemented in the medium term as changes associated with Castle Gateway and stronger links to the city centre are implemented. The Party advocates the policy refers to the impact of flooding on walking and cycling routes and work with the Environment Agency – riverside routes need to be provided with signed alternatives (as on Fulford Road) and 			

	<p>they advocate resilience measures need to be given priority for short term action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent objects to how brief the policy is, and that the 'objectives' are suggested measures and have no details or plans. Need planning objectives in a document set for the future. • One respondent advocates that the Transport Topic Paper needs to include a clear and deliverable city wide strategy to improve routes for cyclists and pedestrians in line with One Planet principles. • One respondent advocates increasing the focus in the plan on making the bicycle the preferred approach to transport in the City, public transport - buses, trams, park and ride and the river as a route into the city and de-incentivising car use in the city by introducing congestion charging.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Osbaldwick and Derwent Ward Councillor advocates that cycle provision along the A1079 should be extended to include York Road, Dunnington, to allow residents a safe cycling route to and from York. • Kexby Parish Council state that whilst the City of York Council Strategic Cycle Route Network Evaluation & Prioritisation Methodology in the context of the pre-publication draft Local Plan is commendable, Kexby Parish Council is acutely aware that Kexby is not served by this policy, as access to the city centre does not include many outlying villages. They urge this policy covers Kexby and the A1079, including the provision of a dedicated cycle path from Kexby to the Hull Road roundabout. • Rachael Maskell MP advocates that if York wants to see serious modal shift, it needs to seriously invest in new cycling/walking infrastructure, to enable safe and easy routes through and round the city, including to and from rural areas. New developments should place the importance of cycling and walking above car use, while enabling adequate public transport. • York Green Party advocate that additional work needs to be done to ensure the links and signage at either side [of Scarborough Bridge] are appropriate for increased cycle traffic and movements across Bootham, they advocate cycle parking at the edge of the footstreets etc and suggest the review of the city centre inner ring road and the severance caused from surrounding suburbs as proposed by Prof Tony May on behalf of the Civic Trust should inform this section of the local plan • York Cycle Campaign would like to see cycling infrastructure in York provided to a technical standard that is higher than the national requirements, targeting best practices such as those set out in the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design, CROW and other evidence based publications. • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One respondent advocates that Poppleton Road cycle routes and pedestrian routes need a rethink with more thought required on where cycle routes end, merge and cross.• Another respondent suggests more cycle parking is needed.
--	---

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy T6: Development at or Near Public Transport Corridors, Interchanges and Facilities

~~To make best use of the development potential around public transport corridors and facilities, and contribute to sustainable access higher density, mixed-use development~~ Development will be supported in locations close to existing or proposed public transport interchanges or facilities provided that the development does not:

- lead to a loss of access to and at the interchange or facility; or
- have a detrimental impact on the operation of the interchange facility; or
- have a detrimental impact on the interchange or facility or the surrounding area, such that the long-term viability of public services would be adversely affected; or
- prejudice the existing or future expansion of the interchange or facility to accommodate more services or modes (e.g. freight); or
- generate a demand for travel by private motorised vehicles that is likely to be unsustainable either in the location of the development or on the wider highway network; or
- have an adverse impact on the character, historic and natural environment and amenity of the area in the vicinity of the development, [or](#)
- [compromise the purposes of the Green Belt.](#)

To prevent the loss of disused public transport corridors or public transport facilities that could otherwise be reused, new development will be not be permitted where it prejudices the reuse of disused public transport corridors or facilities, and where there is a reasonable prospect of the:

- reopening of the transport corridor or facility for either heavy rail or light rail (e.g. tram-train) operation, or other form of 'guided' public rapid transport service; or
- the re-opening of a heavy rail/light rail (tram-train) station or halt; or
- the provision of a rail head/freight facility; or
- the continued use or future use of the transport corridor as a walking or cycling route or as a route for horse-riding; or
- the transport corridor either functioning or being able to function as a wildlife corridor; or
- the transport corridor being reclaimed for use as a linear park.

[Where development is sited close to or is likely to have an impact on existing operational railway lines or lines that may be reopened no new crossings will be permitted. Furthermore, development proposals must demonstrate to the satisfaction of Network Rail that the safe use of affected level crossings as a result of development will not be compromised or the impacts can be mitigated.](#)

[See also Policy H2](#)

Supporting Text Changes:

Change to paragraph 14.44 to reflect changes to changes to the first part of the

policy referencing density and the new paragraph relating to the impacts of development on level crossings. Change to paragraph 14.45 to state that an assessment accompanying any planning applications for development on or affecting a disused public transport corridor should identify potential extensions into and through the development sites to maximise the use of the existing corridor. Change to paragraph 14.46 to reflect that disused public transport corridors perform a function as a recreational asset and access to them should be improved where possible and appropriate. See below for all changes.

14.44 ~~The first part of t~~This policy recognises that ~~the availability of public transport capacity enables development density to be increased. D~~development in the vicinity of public transport facilities, particularly transport hubs or interchanges, enables more sustainable trips to be made on the radial and orbital public transport networks, and provides local and sub regionally-significant centres for shopping, employment, entertainment and other amenities. It also acknowledges that any future development needs to ensure that it does not have a detrimental impact on or prejudice transport operations within the vicinity of the development, including the safe operation of level crossings..

14.45 The second part of this policy aims to protect disused public transport corridors and facilities to allow for the possibility of returning them to their former use, or for new uses such as footpaths, cycleways, bridleways or wildlife corridors because once such a resource has been lost it is unlikely to ever be recovered. Any planning applications for development on or affecting a disused public transport corridor should be accompanied by an assessment in order to establish whether there is any reasonable prospect of the corridor being brought back into use, and identify potential extensions into and through the development sites to maximise the use of the existing corridor.

14.46 Even in their disused state, former public transport corridors perform a valuable function as wildlife corridors and habitats, and as a recreational asset. Any new development should be carefully designed to minimise harm to these newly established habitats. Opportunities should also be pursued, where possible and appropriate, to enhance flora and fauna, provide or enhance green infrastructure within the corridors and improve access to them

Summary of Reasons for Change

In response to representations received the following amendments are proposed:

- Additional bullet point inserted at 1st paragraph to ensure that development at or near public transport corridors, interchanges and facilities does not compromise the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Third paragraph inserted to state Network Rail's position with regard to traffic movements on level crossings across existing operational railway lines or lines that may be reopened arising from development that is sited close to them or is likely to have an impact on them.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 6	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
--------------------------	-----------	-------------	-----------

	1	1	4
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England welcomes the requirement that development near public transport corridors should not have an adverse impact upon the historic environment. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England advocates including an additional criterion in the policy to ensure that any development around a public transport corridor is required to safeguard the Green Belt. Network Rail advocate the inclusion of a policy statement which makes it clear to developers that no new crossings will be permitted, that proposals that increase the use of level crossings will generally be resisted and where development would prejudice the safe use of a level crossing an alternative bridge crossing will be required to be provided at the developers expense. York Green Party advocates that these corridors and potential corridors need to be identified as such on the site allocations plans. They advocate potential extensions into and through new development sites should be identified from the outset and developers required to demonstrate how use of the facility will be maximised. The Party suggest Para 14.46 should also make reference to their value for recreational use and health benefits for residents, with new access points from development being encouraged to facilitate this. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England states it is imperative that making the best use of public transport corridors does not harm the elements which make York distinctive. Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. York Green Party comments that potential corridors e.g. of former railway lines, need to be identified as such on the site allocations plans. Ideally potential extensions into and through new development sites should be identified from the outset and developers required to demonstrate how use of the facility will be maximised. Para 14.46 should also make reference to their value for recreational use and health benefits for residents, with new access points from development being encouraged to facilitate this. 		

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy T7: Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips

All development proposals that can be reasonably expected to have a significant impact on the transport network must be supported by a Transport Statement (TS) or by a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), as appropriate, depending on the scope and scale of the development. The TS or TA shall demonstrate:

- i. the number and distribution of trips by each mode likely to be generated by the development, particularly by private motorised vehicles, without mitigation measures;
- ii. the mitigation, or other measures to be put into place (through a travel plan or otherwise) to reduce the number of trips generated by the development, particularly by private motorised vehicles;
- iii. that any resultant new traffic (principally private car traffic) generated by new development can be safely accommodated on the local and strategic highway network, or can be made safe by appropriate transport infrastructure and service improvements; and
- iv. ~~appropriate future monitoring arrangements in place to show the effectiveness of mitigation and an ability to increase mitigation measures, if required, to achieve or keep within agreed trip generation thresholds (either set through a travel plan or otherwise).~~ Appropriate future monitoring arrangements will be put in place to show the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and if it is shown by monitoring that agreed trip generation thresholds set through a travel plan or otherwise are not being achieved, further measures will be taken.

For strategic development sites, Transport Assessments must, specifically, identify any traffic impacts on the A64 Trunk Road and sections of highways within York's neighbouring authorities arising from the proposed development individually or in combination with other strategic sites and any mitigation including physical capacity enhancement measures thereon (including junctions and approaches) must be agreed with Highways England and neighbouring highway authorities, as appropriate.

For development proposals near railways or likely to have an impact on the operation of railways Transport Assessments should consider rail infrastructure.

See also Policy T1, SS4, SS9 to SS13, SS15, SS17, SS19, SS20, SS22 and ENV1

Supporting Text Changes:

14.52 ~~In some cases w~~Where developments are in close proximity, developers should liaise with the Council and Highways England as necessary to establish whether a joint master travel management plan may be required.

Summary of Reasons for Change

Policy has been amended to reflect comments received through consultation in relation to monitoring of travel plans and identifying in Transport Assessment the impacts of development on the Strategic Road Network (A64).

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 8	Supports: 0	Objections: 1	Comments: 8
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No representations received specifically in support of the policy.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England advocates changes to the policy and proposes the text for this. Fulford Parish Council advocates that some of the criteria in the policy need strengthening and propose the text: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Criterion iii) should be reworded so that it incorporates the stricter test for new development set out in the NPPF: That any residual cumulative impacts of development are not severe and would not create safety hazards on the local and strategic highway network. Criterion iv) should be reworded as follows: Appropriate future monitoring arrangements will be put in place to show the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and if it is shown by monitoring that agreed trip generation thresholds set through a travel plan or otherwise are not being achieved, further measures will be taken. York Green Party advocates that Para. 14.52 should not say 'in some cases'.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England states this policy is of key interest to it, adding there is no reference to the Strategic Road Network or Highways England in the Policy or the subsequent explanatory text, they indicate a number of the strategic development sites will have a significant individual or cumulative traffic impact on the operation of the A64 and its junctions with York's primary road network, Transport Assessments will need to address this issue. North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) states that as a neighbouring Local Highway Authority, any traffic impact on NYCC's local highway network that could arise from allocations [need to] be identified and considered . Where it is clear that a development will have a material impact on its local highway network. The County Council also requests that it be included in agreeing the scoping for the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) in addition to being formally consulted during the application process. Network Rail advocates that Transport Assessments which consider rail infrastructure must support all applications near railways. York Green Party advocates that the Transport Statement or Assessment should be more proactive in demanding evidence of potential for viable public transport, walking and cycling provision regardless of the anticipated car trips and the capacity of local roads. Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy T8: Demand Management				
<p>To improve the overall flow of traffic in and around York City Centre, improve road safety, provide an environment more conducive to walking and cycling, and contribute to overall environmental quality development will be supported that is in compliance with the Council's up-to-date Parking Standards, as contained in the 'Sustainable Transport for Development' SPD.</p> <p>Development that increases the number of long-stay (i.e. more than 4 hours parking) car parking spaces in and around the city centre will not be permitted.</p> <p>Positive consideration will be given to development proposals incorporating appropriate demand management measures that reduce congestion, improve public transport journeys, ease pedestrian and cycle access to, within and through the development and improve the streetscape.</p>				
See also Policy ENV1 and T8T7				
Supporting Text Changes:				
'See also Policy' amended to show correct policy reference (T7).				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
No change to policy.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 10		Supports: 2	Objections: 1	Comments: 7
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England and York Green Party support the policy. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Railway Museum, Arup (obo the York Central Partnership) and GVA (obo the Homes and Communities Agency) advocate more flexibility in the wording of the policy to allow proportionate provision on major sites such as York Central where visitors may wish than more than 4 hours parking. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York Green Party advocates that there should be a presumption that new developments within the inner ring road will be 'car-free' (except for disability needs). More specifically, there should be no new parking provision unless it is replacing existing parking in a more appropriate location away from the footstreets. The York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce advocates: the implementation of demand management must be carefully considered in the York city context; for the foreseeable future, access by car to the City Centre will remain a necessity and parking provision should continue to be provided, and the business community should be consulted on proposals to restrict car access beyond the current pedestrianised areas of the city. The York Museums Trust states that not allowing long stay car parking for overnight visitors will damage the visitor economy and advocates some form of dispensation for overnight guests. Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. 			

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)				
Policy T9: Alternative Fuel Fuelling Stations and Freight Consolidation Centres				
<p>The Plan will support the development of alternative-fuel (for example, compressed natural gas (CNG), hydrogen, or electric charging) fuelling stations and Use Class B8 freight consolidation centres (FCCs), subject to the proposals being in compliance with the other policies in the plan and the provision of:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a suitable evidence base (business plan) to demonstrate the financial viability of the proposal over the plan period, and ii. a transport assessment demonstrating that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the implications of traffic distribution arising from the transfer of traffic or vehicles to particular routes does not generate detrimental impacts that it is not feasible to mitigate, and • impacts on the local and strategic highway network are manageable and can be mitigated. iii. an evidence base to substantiate anticipated reductions in freight (and emissions), particularly in the city centre; iv. traffic management proposals that are achievable and 'lock-in' the anticipated benefits, and v. a travel plan demonstrating realistic opportunities for journeys to work being undertaken by more sustainable modes of transport. 				
Supporting Text Changes:				
N/A				
Summary of Reasons for Change				
In response to representations received the policy is proposed to be amended to include a wider range of alternative fuel examples.				
Consultation Responses				
Total representations: 6		Supports: 1	Objections: 1	Comments: 3
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The York Green Party supports the policy. • Rachael Maskell MP advocates that a logistics interchange should be developed, to break down goods, and reduce the flow of goods traffic in York. 			
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce suggests that the policy should refer to, and make provision for, other Alternative Fuel Fuelling Stations such as hydrogen stations and electric recharging stations. 			
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York Green Party has concerns that a suitable location [for either an alternative fuel fuelling station or a freight consolidation centre] is not identified in the current version of the plan. • Several developers state that further detail on the extent of developer contributions is required. 			

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy C1: Communications Infrastructure

Communications infrastructure - general

Proposals for high quality communications infrastructure that supports the development of York's world-class ultrafast connectivity - both fixed and wireless, and high speed connectivity for the City's transport network will be approved wherever possible, unless adverse impacts on the special character of York significantly outweigh the benefits. Proposals will be supported where:

- i. mobile communications infrastructure is located at an existing mast or transmission site, where it is technically and operationally feasible, unless it is particularly visually intrusive and is available for use as a shared facility - where new equipment is proposed which cannot be located on an existing mast or site at its preferred location due to technical and operational constraints, operators will be required to provide evidence that they have explored the possibility of utilising alternative existing sites, in preference to the proposed location;
- ii. the development is of an appropriate scale and design and it is sited and designed to not have any adverse impact on residential amenity of people and properties and minimise its impact on visual amenity;
- iii. it will be available for use as a shared facility where possible;
- iv. there are no significant or demonstrable adverse impacts that outweigh the benefits of the scheme, particularly in areas of sensitivity including the Green Belt, strays, green wedges, sites of nature conservation value, conservation areas, listed buildings and their setting, areas containing or in proximity to a heritage asset (including non-designated heritage assets), and areas of high visual amenity including protecting key views.

The Council will seek the removal and relocation of any visually intrusive masts particularly in the city centre, as and when the opportunity arises. A planning condition will be used to implement the removal of redundant masts or other communications equipment, where appropriate.

Communications Infrastructure in new developments

All new development will be required to enable a Next Generation Access (NGA) broadband connection (i.e. to communications infrastructure that provides a broadband in excess of a minimum of 24Mbps (30Mbps for contracts signed from 2017 onwards)) unless the developer can clearly demonstrate that meeting this requirement is not viable. Where it can be demonstrated that the provision of a NGA broadband connection is not viable, proposals should provide a minimum download connection of 10Mbps and incorporate suitable infrastructure to support delivery of NGA broadband at a future date.

Developers of strategic sites (or other major schemes) should engage with communication providers and local broadband groups to explore how NGA broadband can be provided and how the development may contribute to and integrate with active broadband projects within the local area.

Supporting Text Changes:

14.68 The provision of and access to ultrafast and future-proof connectivity is now an essential, and a key enabler for the UK's Industrial Strategy, that is being supported by Government programmes and other initiatives. [More specifically, one of the Government initiatives aims to enable everybody in the UK to access broadband speeds of at least two megabits per second and 95% of the UK to receive far greater speeds, \(at least 24 Mbps\), by 2017. In addition the European Commission, through the Digital Agenda for Europe, anticipates 100% coverage of 30Mbps broadband or more by 2020 and that over 50% of households will have a subscription to broadband connection in excess of 100Mbps.](#) Future development provides an ideal opportunity for the Council and other organisations to expand and continue the development of York's world-class ultrafast connectivity and it is vital to offer highspeed internet access as York continues to be promoted as a vanguard 'Digital City'. York must also address the growing need for City's transport network to have high speed connectivity. York intends to retain its position as a leader in this area by ensuring appropriate data connectivity is available throughout the existing road network and is included where new roads and transport infrastructure are provided to meet the challenge the city will face with the advent of new technologies. This includes the use of ducting, street furniture and on-premise masts.

Summary of Reasons for Change

In response to representations received the following amendments are proposed:

New paragraph added setting out the requirements for new developments in enabling Next Generation Access (NGA) broadband connection.

Supporting text amended to reflect the changes to the policy.

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9	Supports: 2	Objections: 2	Comments: 5
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Support

- Historic England supports that proposals for communications infrastructure will only be supported where there will be no adverse impacts upon the landscape character, setting, views, heritage assets or Green Belt objectives.
- York Green Party support the approach to the policy however would like to see some control included on the ancillary infrastructure, with a presumption against advertising material on junction boxes when located in conservation areas and the Green Belt.

Objection

- York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce state that the policy should require refurbishment and new development schemes to be future proofed to facilitate the provision of mobile, broadband and wireless communications infrastructure.
- The policy fails to include fast broadband internet for all York households. In rural areas internet speeds are slow and leaves people disadvantaged. This should be updated to reflect the required action to enable support for residents and businesses in

	rural areas.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Yorkshire County Council suggests that proposed developments (housing, retail, factory, business parks) should plan for the installation of equipment to enable the latest technology to be deployed, and not leave it to be installed by third parties once the development is complete. When development is planned, discussion with mobile operators should be undertaken as part of the initial planning stages. York's aspirations as a Gigacity and use of communications technology can have a significant impact on the way people choose to live within the city. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan states that the steering Group Policy is supported but any sizable development must include plans to ensure there is sufficient communications infrastructure to meet the demands of modern living. • Several developers states that further detail on the extent of the developer contributions is required.

Potential changes to Policy Post Pre-Publication consultation (2017)

Policy DM1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

New development will be supported by appropriate physical, social and economic infrastructure provision. New development will not be permitted unless

- the infrastructure required to service the development is available, and
- the necessary infrastructure to meet the local and wider (strategic) demand generated by the development can be provided and coordinated.

The Council will seek contributions from developers to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support future development in York. Contributions will be sought to fund strategic infrastructure that helps to deliver the Vision, Spatial Strategy and Objectives of the Local Plan, as well as specific infrastructure that is necessary to deliver an individual site.

The required strategic infrastructure, the timescale for its delivery and the anticipated funding streams for its provision (including the role of S106 contributions and CIL) are set out in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Supporting Text Changes:

15.9 It is likely that all development will require some new infrastructure to be provided. However, certain elements of strategic infrastructure are considered to be essential to deliver the overall amount, location and type of development identified in York's Local Plan. Essential strategic infrastructure is anticipated to fall within the following broad categories:

- transport – within the city of York Unitary Authority area, on the Strategic Road Network (i.e. the A64 where appropriate), and on local highways extending into neighbouring authority areas (where appropriate);
- utilities;
- health facilities;
- emergency services;
- affordable housing;
- renewable energy;
- flood mitigation;
- waste facilities;
- education;
- green infrastructure, including open space and built sports facilities;
- community facilities; and
- the public realm

Summary of Reasons for Change

In response to representations received, and as a result of discussions with officers the supporting text has been amended to provide more detail on the strategic infrastructure considered to be essential to deliver the overall amount, location and type of development identified in York's Local Plan.

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 9	Supports: 1	Objections: 3	Comments: 6
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPRE North Yorkshire support the policy, as it is vital that infrastructure is delivered prior to new development proposals for sites to be developed sustainably 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England states that the policy needs to include an additional reference to the need for developers to contribute to mitigation schemes on the A64. Network Rail states that developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured. Rapleys LLP advocates the Council must ensure, in accordance with the NPPF, that the requirement for funding strategic infrastructure does not hamper the viability and deliverability of the key strategic sites, and that the policy should include specific reference to contributions being in accordance with the requirements of CIL Regulation 122. CPRE North Yorkshire advocate that an additional paragraph should be included within this policy setting out that any developer wishing to opt out of this payment should be required to provide an open book audit as set out in Policy H10 dealing with affordable housing provision. Johnson Mowatt advocates amending the policy to include test from NPPF para. 173 regarding reasonable returns to landowner and developer. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network Rail states that it would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of its remit. Johnson Mowatt notes that the Plan identifies approximately 30 policies where 'developer contributions' are referenced in the supporting 'delivery text'. Adding that it must be acknowledged they are all potentially making demands of development on matter that in the main would be covered by CIL. Johnson Mowatt also advocates that the viability work currently being undertaken by CYC needs to be vigorously tested working with the development industry. Johnson Mowatt refers to NPPF Paragraph 173 that concerns sites and scale of development not being subjected to a level of policy burdens and obligations such that viability is threatened. 		

Allocation H1: Former Gas Works Heworth Green (Phase 1 & 2)

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	Phase 1 = 2.87ha Phase 2 = 0.67ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Phase 1 = 271 dwellings Phase 2 = 65 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Phase 1 = Short Term (Years 1 – 5) Phase 2 = Medium Term (Years 6 – 10)	Phase 1 = Short-medium term (Years 1-10) Phase 2 = no change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change to Boundary Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 5 no.	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: 2 no.	Comments: 2 no.
Support	The site is currently unattractive and needs developing.		
Objection	Objections to the site included the loss of green space, potential		

	congestion and the high density assumptions used resulting in flats rather than family housing being provided. Concerns were raised surrounding access to the site which was seen as being inadequate.
Comments	<p>Historic England had no objections to the principle of developing this site, however, given the proximity of the City Walls and CHC Conservation Area the significance of both should not be harmed as a result of developing this site.</p> <p>Removal of the gas holder and communications mast was generally supported, whilst it was suggested that a hotel should be considered for this site.</p>
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary Suggested	

Allocation H3: Burnholme School

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.90ha	No change
Estimated Yield	65 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change to Boundary Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
1	0	0	1

Support	None
Objection	None
Comments	Affordable housing should be provided.


Boundary change suggested

No alternative boundary suggested

Allocation H5: Lowfield School

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	3.64 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	162 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Boundary Change

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 6 no.	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: 4 no.	Comments: 1 no.
---------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------

Support	Supports refer to the site providing much needed homes built in an area of need on a brownfield site.
---------	---

Objection	<p>Save Lowfields Playing Field Action Group object to this draft allocation stating that it represents gross over-development and will result in the loss of valuable sports pitches and recreational land. Development should be restricted to the built footprint only. Local support for older person's accommodation and useable public opens space on site has been overlooked as higher density development has been proposed.</p> <p>General objections include the impact the site will have on the amenity of local residents, the high density of development proposed as well as the loss of sports pitches in a ward with an open space deficit including sports pitch provision. There was an objection to CYC submitting a planning application on this site prior to the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
Comments	<p>Comments in general looked positively at the potential for affordable housing to be provided on site whist there was a willingness for the site to start early in the development process.</p>
<p>Boundary change suggested</p> <p>No alternative boundary suggested</p>	

Allocation H6: Land r/o The Square

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.53ha	No Change
Estimated Yield	0 dwellings (allocation for specialist housing use C3b for residential extra care facilities in association with the Wilberforce Trust)	No Change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No Change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 5 no.	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 2 no.	Comments: 2 no.
--	---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------


Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (O'Neill Associates obo St Leonards Hospice, St Leonards Hospice, The Wilberforce Trust) Support proposals to rear of
----------------	---

	Hospice and allocation of remainder of site as Green belt. Keeping land to the rear of hospice free from development is important for privacy of patients.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (The Wilberforce Trust) Traffic impact on Tadcaster Road. At peak times at standstill and breaches EU air quality standards. Contains flora and fauna, site is attractive. Development should be discouraged and traffic flow improved. • O'Neill Associates OBO Wilberforce Trust object to reference for C3b housing and would like re-designating as C3a
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Picture of site produced by O'Neill Associates Planning Consultants, with ultra modern buildings with garish colours is out of keeping with the architecture. Access is hazardous for students on foot on bike. Traffic should enter at Principals Rise where there is a wide island with room for parked cars. There are full border shrubberies on the site which are full of wildlife.

Boundary change suggested

O'Neill Associates OBO Wilberforce Trust


Proposals for the site suggest changes which include extending the allocation to include a further 0.5 hectares of land to the north (which lies to the east of St Leonards H, with subsequent revisions to the Green Belt in order that it is more clearly defined) and removing the reference C3(b) as the use class for the development and redesignating it as use class C3(a).



Allocation H7: Bootham Crescent

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.72 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	86 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Boundary Change

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 2 no.	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: 1 no.	Comments: n/a
Support	Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd – support		

	development of this site and point out that a historic legal agreement with the owners allows for residential development once the football club moves to a suitable replacement ground.
Objection	Rachel Maskell MP considers that more openspace should be provided on site given lack of green space in the area.
Comments	N/A
Boundary change suggested	
No alternative boundary suggested	

Allocation H8: Askham Bar P+R

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.57ha	No change
Estimated Yield	60 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Boundary Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 9 no.	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 3 no.	Comments: 4 no.
--	---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the principle of housing here. However, some concerns over lack of a community focus in
----------------	---

	the area, esp following the development of the old college site.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion and parking issues – suggest retaining parking on P+R site as overflow for existing residents. • Park and ride should be preserved. • Building on H8 has the potential to affect the nature reserve at Askham Bogg.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need incentives for builders to create affordable housing. Housing too dense. • Congestion may become an issue – suggests traffic lights are removed/ slowed down. • New rail link suggested. • Proposed that York College could buy the site and use as overflow car park to stop student parking on residential streets. • Prioritise housing for elderly (bungalows/ sheltered accommodation).
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary suggested	

Allocation H10: The Barbican			
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change	
Site Size	0.96 ha	No change	
Estimated Yield	187 dwellings	No change	
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1 – 5)	No change	
Allocation boundary			
<p>Site Ref: 656</p>			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Boundary Change Proposed			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
2 no.	n/a	2 no.	n/a
Support	n/a		
Objection	Objections relating to: concerns surrounding the increase in the amount of traffic onto Fulford Road and the need for plans to ease congestion; retaining the site as a green space for public use.		
Comments	n/a		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative boundary suggested			

Allocation H20: Former Oakhaven EPH			
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change	
Site Size	0.33ha	No change	
Estimated Yield	56 dwellings	No change	
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change	
Allocation boundary			
<p>Site Ref: 124</p> <p>Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction without Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. City of York Council. Licence No. 1000 26546</p>			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Boundary Change Proposed			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 2 no.	Supports: n/a	Objections: 1	Comments: 1 no.
Support	n/a		
Objection	Site would be better staying as a care home for the elderly.		
Comments	Site should allow for additional parking provision.		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative Boundary suggested			

Allocation H22: Former Heworth Lighthouse

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.29 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	15 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1 – 5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: n/a	Supports: n/a	Objections: n/a	Comments: n/a
-------------------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------

Support	No supports received
Objection	No objections received
Comments	No comments received

Boundary change suggested

No Alternative Boundary Suggested

Allocation H23: Former Grove House			
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change	
Site Size	0.25ha	No change	
Estimated Yield	11 dwellings	No change	
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change	
Allocation boundary			
Summary of Reasons for Change			
No Proposed Boundary Change			
Consultation Responses			
Total representations:	Supports:	Objections:	Comments:
1 no.	n/a	n/a	1 no.
Support	None		
Objection	None		
Comments	Used to housing being densely concentrated in city centre. Appreciate provision of green space, protection of trees, and effort to build more housing.		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative Boundary Suggested			

Allocation H29: Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	2.65 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	88 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Proposed Boundary Change

Consultation Responses


Total no of respondents: 15 no.	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 8 no.	Comments: 7 no.
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer confirms that the site is suitable, available and achievable and can provide 88 high quality homes alongside public open space and associated necessary infrastructure. Completion of the site is anticipated within the next 5 years @ 35 dwellings per annum. (PB Planning on behalf of Barratt 		

	<p>Homes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the site identified that it is a logical extension to the existing village and is, therefore, in-keeping and contained by the railway line and Moor Lane.
<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copmanthorpe Parish Council object to the site and state that if built at a density to match that of the existing village only 60 homes should be built as opposed to the 88 specified in the draft Local Plan. • General objection comments to this site relate to the proposed number of houses being inappropriate for the edge of a village with only one access point. Concerns were also raised in connection to the capacity of local roads to take additional traffic that would result in dangerous junctions and congestion. Also local services, such as schools were at capacity. It was suggested that more appropriate sites in Copmanthorpe are available for development. Wildlife needs to be considered before any start to development can be made.
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations from the prospective developer explain that the associated open space, both on site and via financial contributions towards local community infrastructure will be delivered as the site progressed through the developments process. (PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes) • Barton Wilmore (on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes) commented that a series of individual letters promoting each site including H29 are also submitted to be read in parallel other submitted representations. • General comments note that improvements to local infrastructure (roads, drainage, schools and doctors) should be put into place before development takes place. There were general reservations about the proposed density of housing to be provide and it felt that it should reflect existing estates.
<p>Boundary change suggested</p> <p>No Alternative Boundary Suggested</p>	

Allocation H31: Eastfield Lane, Dunnington

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	2.51ha	No change
Estimated Yield	76 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Boundary Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 30 no.	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 22 no.	Comments: 9 no.
----------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-----------------


Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (PBPlanning on behalf of David Wilson Homes) Site is available, deliverable and achievable. Thorough evidence taken to support site.
---------	--

Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Dunnington Parish Council) Access issues – Eastfield Lane too narrow, however if widened will be used as a shortcut to A1079/ will destroy ancient hedgerows. • Concerns raised in relation to junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk being unsuitable to cater to traffic increase and associated safety concerns. • (Dunnington Parish Council) Housing density – overcrowded. • Lack of green space – impact wildlife/ hedgerows/ protected species, site is agricultural grade 2 • Currently peaceful and tranquil area. • Liable to flood – drainage needs upgrading. • Will affect community. • Need more public transport. • Lack of existing infrastructure in village. Concerns relating to waiting times at doctors will increase, at capacity. In addition, lack of school space– public transport links far from current school which will encourage car use, no nursery in village. • (O'Neill Associates on behalf of Jorvik Homes) H30 more suitable site. • Negative effects on SA objectives. • Impact character of village. • (PBPlanning on behalf of David Wilson Homes) Support 84 dwellings as opposed to 76 allocated in the Local Plan. • (Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes) A series of individual letters promoting each site including H31 are also submitted to be read in parallel to these overarching representations.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Dunnington Parish Council) Surface water and drainage issues. • (Dunnington Parish Council) Provision for older residents should have easy access to surgery and shops. • Eastfield Lane should be widened. Speed controls included. However this would remove ancient hedgerow which would harm character of village. • Dangerous junctions. • Traffic management scheme needed. • Affordable homes needed.
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary Suggested	

Allocation H38: Land r/o Rufforth Primary School

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.99 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	33 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 6 no.	Supports: 4 no.	Objections: 3 no.	Comments: n/a
---------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------


Support	<p>Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council support the development of this site stating it is also allocated for housing within the Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>DPP Planning (on behalf of Linden Homes) support the location of the development, however, support a larger boundary (see below).</p> <p>Support in general was expressed to the potential for the site to provide family housing within the village and the good access the site would provide to the school allowing for safer parking/drop off points.</p>
Objection	The general objections received for this site focussed on the local

drainage and sewerage issues that will be exposed if further housing adds to their capacities. Local road access is restricted and parking/congestion issues will result from development of this site.

Comments N/A

Boundary change suggested

DPP Planning (on behalf of Linden Homes) supports a larger boundary for this site (0.99ha) – as proposed by officers in July 2017. The site is suitable, deliverable and viable and has a willing landowner. The site is included in the Rufforth Neighbourhood Plan. It is also deemed not to perform a green belt function. Further evidence has been provided to support this larger site.



Allocation H39: North of Church Lane, Elvington

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.92ha	No change
Estimated Yield	32 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1-10)	No change

Allocation boundary





Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 67 no.	Supports: 3 no.	Objections: 63 no.	Comments: 3 no.
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Directions Planning Consultancy) Supports housing and short to medium term time frame for 32 dwellings • (DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes) Supports but not in preference to H26. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elvington Parish Council supports previous Planning inspector who determined that the site serves green belt purposes, which impact wildlife, degrade the conservation area and encroach on countryside. • Elvington Parish Council consider that this site conflicts with policies on wildlife protection. Together with members of the public, concerns are raised in relation to the impact on wildlife, a listed boundary hedge to site and link to Wheldrake Ings. Development would bring pets which would predate on wildlife. River Derwent is under restoration and this would impact that. • Elvington Parish Council and Julian Sturdy MP as well as several members of the public consider that traffic would impact on resident's quality of life. Traffic will increase on B1228, which is already busy. Many consider that the road is at capacity. In addition, concerns were raised in relation to increase of HGV use and safety of residents. • Unsafe for children in street due to access through Beckside residential area. • Members of the public also raised their concerns in relation to parking issues on Beckside due to lack of garages and small driveways as well as the narrow nature/ sharp bend of Church Lane. • Wheldrake Ward Councillor, Elvington Parish Council, DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes and members of the public expressed preference for alternative site H26 as it is considered that this links two residential areas of Elvington. It is considered that 60 houses is more suitable and that removing H26 is against the wish of residents. • Preference for housing to be accommodated on ST15 also expressed by Members of the public. <p>General objections by the public incided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to site via Church Lane is not viable or safe. Access via Beckside preferable. • More housing will worsen drainage issues and decrease water pressure. Flooding issues are likely to get worse on Church Lane, • Beckside disproportionately large and densely populated. The 		

	<p>site is out of keeping with rest of village and there will be a clear mismatch between old and new development. As a result the character of village will be damaged. Houses in area bought due to rural aspect which will be ruined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No suggestions on addressing adverse effect on infrastructure. School and medical practise are struggling to cope with numbers now. • Variety of housing needed – executive style, 4 bed homes and starter homes. Identified need for site does not meet these requirements. • Draft plan is wrong where it indicates village has only industrial units – there are 150 residential properties to the west of the school. • Edge of site contains a country walk used by many. Site used for recreational reasons – walking, dog walking. • No defensible boundary to the west which conflicts with par 85 of the NPPF.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is a historic conservation area. • Past inspectors report stated site should remain open for green belt. • Concerned about impact of traffic on child friendly streets. • Site is not natural extension to village or within walking distance to amenities • Social care in area is poor, and there is no reliable public transport for health services in York, current surgery at capacity. • Need to consider road safety and increase of HGVs. • Shortage of 4-5 bedroom houses and affordable housing.
<p>Boundary change suggested Directions Planning OBO landowner</p> <p>Previously highlighted merits of site 789 (Land West of Beckside, Elvington) an area of 5.7ha as a housing allocation. The current representation is for a smaller site of 1.6ha (Site 976) - delivering approx 56 dwellings as an extention to H39. Propose that this site is removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing. Previous representation attached to current submission.</p>	

976: Site to the West of H39



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
City of York Council, Licence No. 1000 20818

REP ID6046

Allocation H46: Land North of Willow Bank, New Earswick

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	2.74 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	104 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No boundary change proposed.

NB: Although the whole site is identified the landscaped buffer identified on the proposals map to the east is still supported and intended to remain within the greenbelt.

Consultation Responses


Total no. of respondents: 13 no.	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: 11 no.	Comments: 1 no.
Support	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning OBO JRHT supports this site and the landscaped strip along its eastern boundary confirming that		

	previously made comments from JRHT remain valid.
Objection	<p>Objectors to this site raise concerns about the likely impact of development on traffic and congestion, both locally and onto the A1237 (York Outer Ring Road). With increased traffic the concerns relating to pollution and increased accident risk near to the school have been raised as major issues.</p> <p>Reference has been made to the fact that development of this site would remove the last remaining green recreational space in the parish and that there are no alternatives locally for public use and for the preservation of wildlife as it forms an important natural habitat for flora and fauna.</p> <p>It has been stated that local residents were successful in objecting to development of the site in the past and that nothing has changed since that time.</p> <p>Impact would result on local services and amenities as well as the loss of opportunities for recreational activities including dog walking, running and play space for school children.</p> <p>Some objectors raise concerns about local flooding and drainage issues that affect this site and local area and that investment in improvements to infrastructure should take place before any development can be considered.</p>
Comments	Historic England comment that they have no objection in principle to the draft allocation, however, the plan should make it clear any development should not harm the elements that contribute to significance of the New Earswick Conservation Area.
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary Suggested	

Allocation H52: Willow House EPH

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.20ha	No change
Estimated Yield	15 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 5 no.	Supports: n/a	Objections: 3 no.	Comments: 2 no.
---------------------------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------

Support	None
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grounds should be formally and permanently retained as public open space for the recreational use of their communities. • Objects to development as a whole. • Concerned by choice to use land for student accomodation rather than for old people or green space. Hopes the pine trees will be saved.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Historic England) No objection to principle of this allocation, but given its proximity to city walls (scheduled ancient monument) and central conservation area, policy would need to ensure that development proposals safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the conservation area and city walls. • (Cllr Hayes) The green open space on H52 should be registered as Local Green Space.
Boundary change suggested	
No boundary change proposed	

Allocation H53: Land at Knapton Village

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.33 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	4 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1 – 5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 8 no. (plus 2 NDM)	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 6 no. (plus 1 NDM)	Comments: 1 no. (Plus 1 NDM)
---	--------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigo Planning support the continued proposed allocation of this site for residential use and its estimated capacity of 4 new dwellings (arrived at following site assessments undertaken in support of a previously refused application). The decision to refuse was based on the site being within the green belt, however, they state that there were no technical reasons that rendered the site unsuitable for housing. The site is well contained with well established boundaries on three sides and will provide a defensible green belt boundary to the east if developed. The site will provide limited infill to the existing settlement form. There are no nature designations affecting the site and is well served by local road infrastructure and key services and has the benefit of a willing landowner. • Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council support the site and affirm that it is also allocated within the Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julian Sturdy MP is not convinced the proposal has addressed the issues previously raised and does not believe it should be included within the Plan. • Several objectors raised concerns about the development of green belt land that forms part of the rural setting of Knapton. The site will create unwanted infill if developed and remove the benefits the site currently affords in terms of wildlife habitat and local green space. Due to its limited capacity the site will not greatly affect the area's housing needs. Further, the site is deemed unsustainable due to the lack of public transport and local services. The site is also in an elevated position and would create an imposing and out of character development whilst adding traffic through the village. • It was pointed out that the site has previously been refused for residential use and if now allowed may set a precedent for future development encroaching on the green belt, especially when considered with other proposed local developments at, for example, Northminster Business Park.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting on this site it was pointed out that Knapton Village is vulnerable to being joined to York and relies on protection provided by the green belt. Although the site is green belt land it could also be seen as infill land. A maximum of four houses is imperative to help maintain the character of the village and access should be from Main Street as Back Lane is too narrow for proper access. • Development of 4 houses may lead to further development swamping village and green belt.
<p>Boundary change suggested No Alternative Boundary Suggested</p>	

Allocation H55: Land at Layerthorpe

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.20ha	No change
Estimated Yield	20 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change

Allocation boundary**Summary of Reasons for Change**

No Boundary Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: n/a	Supports: n/a	Objections: n/a	Comments: n/a
-------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------

Support None

Objection None

Comments None

Boundary change suggested

No Alternative Boundary Suggested

Allocation H56: Land at Hull Road

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	4.00 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	70 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1 – 5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 25 no.	Supports: 2 no.	Objections: 19 no.	Comments: 4 no.
----------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-----------------

Support	<p>Heslington Parish Council continues to support this allocation. Should the allocation be approved there should be conditions to provide good family accommodation and affordable housing for people of all ages whilst there should be continued preservation of the mature trees around the site.</p> <p>Further support for the development of this site was registered provided that it is sensitively developed with a low density design</p>
---------	--

	including affordable housing and tree planting to provide shielding with access to the site restricted only from Hull Road.
Objection	<p>A Hull Road Ward Councillor objected to the proposed development of this site as it is currently an open green space with a mature border of woodland that is of great value to the local community. Outline consent has recently been granted for residential development on the site, however, the Councillor believes this should not have been allowed. In terms of the Local Plan the site should be treated on its merits and not automatically be included because planning consent has been passed. Designation of the site should be as green/open space as Hull Road has a deficit of open space. The site has long-standing, historical public use and these facilities have not been adequately replaced. As the open space and amenities at the University of York are not open to the general public there remains a deficit of such land within the Hull Road Ward.</p> <p>There were a number of objections received in relation to the allocation of this site for housing, below is a summary of the main points raised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is currently an open green space with a mature woodland border that is a precious asset to the local community • Previously this site was designated as Open Space that recognised the local value the site provided in terms of playing pitches, open space, wildlife corridor and the green wedge it forms that protects the character of Heslington Village as well as its function as a recreational amenity – development would negate these benefits. • A recently published report indicates a surplus of green space in the Hull Road ward – this is factually incorrect as the open space provision at the University of York should not be counted in the calculations as it is not accessible to the general public. • The playing fields are of good quality and do not flood, unlike their proposed replacements. • A petition of 1300 signatures was presented to CYC in order to protect the green space - this has been ignored. Further, petitions of greater than 1000, in accordance with CYCs website, should be debated by Full Council – this has not been the case. • Concerns were raised over the granting of outline consent for 70 homes on this land in advance of the Local Plan being adopted. • The site has been allocated previously for open space, employment land and now as a housing allocation without due consultation. • The substitute open space at Haxby Road Sports Field is not appropriate as it is not easily accessible.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about the potential housing type being for student housing, not the family housing that is needed. • Traffic generated from the site will add to congestion and pollution levels experienced locally. • The mature trees are important and fundamental for maintaining local air quality • Development would impact on the character of the area. • This open space helps prevent coalescence of the York Urban Area and Heslington Village and helps maintain the village's rural character – evidenced in the Heslington Village Design Statement. • The value of open space has been recognised in documents supported or issued by the Council.
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Northern Power Grid passed comment about the potential need for network reinforcement to accommodate the additional load on the system but at this stage there was insufficient information to quantify the extent at this point – this may impact on delivery timescales for the development of the site.</p> <p>General comments received expressed concerns about the impact development would have on the green belt and the loss of green space and reflect similar concerns covered within the objections to the site. It was raised that the housing capacity of the site is insignificant compared to the cities overall requirements, therefore, development should take place in more appropriate locations.</p>
<p>Boundary change suggested</p>	
<p>No Alternative Boundary Suggested</p>	

Allocation H58: Clifton Without Primary School

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	0.70ha	No change
Estimated Yield	25 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short Term (Years 1-5)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change Proposed

Consultation Responses			
Total no. of respondents: 3 no.	Supports: n/a	Objections: 2 no.	Comments: 1 no.
Support	none		
Objection	<p>Objects to potential overdevelopment of the site, impact on house prices, potential access to Fairway, lack of local primary school space.</p> <p>(Clifton Parish Council) Support the principle of redeveloping the site but object its sole use for housing. Site has been a community facility within Parish for years and would like to see this is not lost. Support use of site as a new base for Salvation Army.</p>		
Comments	<p>(Historic England) Plan should make it clear that any development would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the Clifton (Malton Way and Shipton Road) Conservation Area are not harmed.</p>		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative Boundary suggested			

Allocation H59: Queen Elizabeth Barracks

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1.34 ha	No change
Estimated Yield	45 dwellings	No change
Phasing	Short to Medium Term (Years 1 – 10)	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No Change Proposed

Consultation Responses

Total no. of respondents: 17 no.	Supports: 6 no.	Objections: 8 no.	Comments: 6 no.
----------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------

Support	<p>Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council support this site and its early development in the Plan period. The site is largely previously developed land and will help to provide much needed low cost and affordable housing in Strensall. The Council comments that, as site H59 lies within the broader area of Queen Elizabeth II Barracks but outside the secure area, it could be developed before final closure of the Barracks thus helping to provide much needed low cost/ social housing in Strensall at the earliest possible date.</p> <p>Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group also support the development of this site and propose it is released quickly to help provide affordable housing.</p> <p>GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) support the site coming forward as residential development.</p> <p>Further general support was expressed to the development of this primarily brownfield site that will include for much needed low cost and affordable housing. Whilst support for the site was expressed these were tempered with the belief that upgrades would be required to local road junctions (from Strensall and Flaxton onto the A64) and that improvements to the local sewerage system should be carried out prior to construction works on site taking place. Improvements to local infrastructure and services should reflect the extra demand that will result from this, and further proposed developments within the area. It was noted that the potential for development on brownfield sites, such as this, would take pressure off the development of greenbelt land.</p>
Objection	<p>Pilcher Homes have objected to the inclusion of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks development site (H59 and ST35) indicating that it is a concern to all stakeholders of the York Local Plan that it is considered to be sound and that the correct objectively assessed housing need is met and appropriate infrastructure will be in place to support new development. There is uncertainty about the availability of the MOD land within the Plan period and concentration should be placed on small to medium sized sites to help deliver early in the Plan period rather than on more unpredictable large housing allocations.</p> <p>General objections to the site focussed on the lack of local services and infrastructure within the Strensall area to support any additional local housing development. The school is over subscribed, there is no post-office or bank, there is one Tesco Express, whilst traffic, drainage and the sewerage system and local flooding all need to be taken into account before any development can commence. Local roads are busy and dangerous with parked cars on both sides of Main Street and any additional development will exacerbate existing traffic problems. The influx of additional housing schemes could overwhelm rural communities and ruin the character of the</p>

	<p>area.</p> <p>Objectors expressed a real need for improved road infrastructure including improved junctions with the A1237/A64 and a dedicated off road pedestrian/cycle track.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage in the area is highlighted as being problematic, whilst local services (supermarket, dentist, doctors, primary school and bus services) all need to be improved if any development is to take place.</p>
Comments	<p>GVA on behalf of DIO Estates (MOD) commented that the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (March 2017) identified that the QEII Barracks site should be subject to a botanical survey and subsequently to assess whether the presence of any of these areas of habitat represent a constraint to future development.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Doughty stressed the need for a suitable entry access road to the Queen Elizabeth II Barracks development sites that avoids the SSSI.</p> <p>General comments follow similar lines to those expressed in both the support and objections section and stress the need for improvements to roads, cycle paths, schools, doctors and leisure facilities before any developments commence. The conservation of Strensall Common was seen to be a priority.</p> <p>Suggested improvements to local road infrastructure included support for the Strensall Parish Councils traffic management scheme, such as an upgrade to the junctions between Towthorpe Moor Lane and A64, road realignment, a new link road between the barracks housing site to Towthorpe Lines commercial site, widening and improvements to Towthorpe Moor Lane and a full off road cycle track along Strensall Road.</p>
<p>Boundary change suggested No Alternative Boundary Suggested</p>	

Allocation [E8]: Wheldrake Industrial Estate

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	1,485sqm / 0.45ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 4no.	Supports: n/a	Objections: 4 no.	Comments: n/a
Support	None		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheldrake Parish Council objects to the proposed expansion of the industrial estate at its north side because of its adverse impact on the primary gateway to the village where the visual approach could be dominated by industrial type buildings rather than a pleasant green space as at present. Also, the Conservation Area western edge is close to the proposed area of E8. • Wheldrake Ward Councillor (Cllr Mercer) also objects because of the negative impact on the visual approach to the village. Any expansion of the industrial estate should be at the south side, as in the previous Local Plan. • Two members of the public object due to the loss of green space detracting from the visual approach to the village. 		
Comments	None		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative Boundary Suggested			

Allocation [E9]: Elvington Industrial Estate

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	3,300sqm / 1ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change


No change proposed

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: 17no.	Supports: 7no.	Objections: 9no.	Comments: 1no.
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elvington Parish Council supports the site allocation but wishes to point out that it is not a 'brownfield' site as described but is a grassy paddock. • Wheldrake Ward Councillor (Cllr Mercer) is largely supportive of the allocation and reaffirms the Elvington Parish Council comment. • Five members of the public support the allocation provided there is some traffic management in place to limit HGV access through the village. Two of the five state their support is dependent on a 7.5 tonne weight limit being imposed on HGVs using Main Street in the village. They also stress that attention must be paid to the continuation of the existing wildlife corridors set up under the Biodiversity plan. 		
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine members of the public voice strong objections for some or all of the following reasons: 1. Elvington is already surrounded by industrial estates. 2. Noise and air pollution are existing problems, that will only be exacerbated. 3. Additional traffic both during construction and occupation will exacerbate congestion. 4. Existing road safety issues will be exacerbated. 5. Impact on wildlife. 6. Changes to character of the village. 		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One member of the public comments B2 usage should be restricted to light industry. Limitations should be placed on HGV movement through the village. 		
Boundary change suggested			
No alternative boundary proposed			

Allocation [E10]: Chessingham Park, Dunnington

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	792sqm / 0.24ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses			
Total representations: no.	2	Supports: 1 no.	Objections: n/a
		Comments: 1 no.	
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dunnington Parish Council supports the allocation as it develops a currently derelict site within the industrial estate. 		
Objection	n/a		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One member of the public comments to say Industrial areas need light, small, affordable units (50-100 sqm) to accommodate business start-ups. 		
Boundary change suggested			
No Alternative Boundary Suggested			

Allocation [E11]: Annamine Nurseries, Jockey Lane

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	3,300sqm / 1ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change

Consultation Responses

Total representations: n/a	Supports: n/a	Objections: n/a	Comments: n/a
-------------------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------

Support None

Objection None

Comments None

Boundary change suggested

No Alternative Boundary Suggested

Allocation E16: Poppleton Garden Centre

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	9,240sqm / 2.8ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary**Summary of Reasons for Change**

No change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 7 no.	Supports: 5 no.	Objections: 1 no.	Comments: 2 no.
---------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nether Poppleton Parish Council, Upper Poppleton Parish Council and Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan Committee comment that the general consensus from the neighbourhood plan is that the garden centre should remain
---------	---

	<p>as a valuable attribute to the area. Change of use to housing would be opposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wyevale Garden Centres support the removal of the site from the green belt and its allocation for employment. Suggests that the site is suitable for B1a employment use as well as the current designation for B1c, B2 and B8.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England objects to the extension of development beyond the footprint of existing buildings on site. Such development would reduce the gap between the ring road the effective southern boundary of Poppleton. It would harm a number of elements identified as contributing to the special character and setting of the City. Along with ST2, this would result in a considerable alteration to the setting of Poppleton as a free standing settlement, and its relationship with the City. It would threaten coalescence with Northminster Business Park to the south. • One member of the public registered an objection to development but gave no specific reasons.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England has no objection to the redevelopment of the part of the site currently occupied by buildings. Notes the extent of site should be reduced to exclude currently undeveloped area to the south of the existing buildings. • One member of the public commented that any future part or total redevelopment of E16 should consider its location on an important approach to York. This should not be overdeveloped and should remain a rural business.
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary Suggested	

Allocation E18: Towthorpe Lines, Strensall

	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan	Potential Change
Site Size	13,200sqm / 4ha	No change
Estimated Yield	Not listed	No change
Phasing	Not listed	No change

Allocation boundary



Summary of Reasons for Change

No change proposed

Consultation Responses

Total representations: 10 no.	Supports: 5 no.	Objections: 3 no.	Comments: 6 no.
----------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------

Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council regret the Government's decision to close Towthorpe Lines (and Queen Elizabeth 2 Barracks), but are of the opinion that the inclusion of the sites in the Plan are logical and the allocation for business and employment is broadly supported to provide more local employment and to reduce the need to commute. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support the inclusion of the site as a location for commercial use as the existing buildings could be adapted for a number of business uses. • Julian Sturdy MP supports and is pleased the proposals indicate light industry. • DIO Estates (MOD) support the allocation for employment use.
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIO Estates (MOD) object to the restricting use classes to just B1c, B2 and B8 uses, would want allocation to include B1a and B1b as well. Also consider that there is potential to expand the size of the development footprint subject to ecological assessment. • One member of the public objected to development as the facility for training medical staff deployed to disaster areas should be considered as an invaluable asset. • Two members of the public object to development due to concerns around congestion, road safety, parking, schools, doctors and leisure facilities. Conservation of Strensall Common should also be a priority.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referencing ST35 Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council asks that, where relevant, equivalent policy considerations are applied to E18 as well. • Julian Sturdy MP comments that consideration should be made for the additional HGVs coming to and from the site and how this may affect Strensall village. At his recent drop-in session it was proposed that an entry access road to this site could also provide, avoiding the SSSI land, an access route to the proposed Barracks site. • One member of the public comments raising concerns about future congestion along Strensall road. Supports Strensall Parish Councils traffic management scheme, such as an upgrade of the junction between Towthorpe Moor Lane and the A64, road realignment, a new link

	<p>road between Strensall Barracks housing site to Towthorpe lines commercial site, widening and improvement to Towthorpe Moor Lane, and a full off road cycle track down Strensall Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another member of the public comments that the MOD sites will not be available in time for this plan period.
Boundary change suggested	
No Alternative Boundary Suggested	

Summary of new and previously rejected site submitted through Pre Publication draft (Regulation 18) Consultation (2017)

Site Ref	Former Allocation Ref	Site Name	Post PPC Outcome
6	H37	Land at Greystone Court Haxby	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)
23	N/A	The Paddock Acomb Grange	Previously Rejected Site No Change
33	H2a	Racecourse stables off Tadcaster Road	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)
49	H27	The Brecks, Strensall	Previously Rejected Site No Change
55	H26	Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
130	N/A	Land at Acomb Landing, Landing Lane, York.	Previously Rejected Site No Change
131	ST13	Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Previously Rejected Site No Change
132	H2b	Land at Cherry Lane	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)
155	ST11	New Lane, Huntington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
170	N/A	Pond Field Heslington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
179	H54	Whiteland field, Haxby	Previously Rejected Site No Change
180	H50	Land at Malton Road	Previously Rejected Site No Change
187	ST30	Land to the North of Stockton Lane	Previously Rejected Site No Change
221	N/A	Agricultural Land(North West) of Sim Balk Lane	Previously Rejected Site No Change
222	N/A	Agricultural Land (South West) Sim Balk lane	Previously Rejected Site No Change
223	N/A	Agricultural Land Copmanthorpe Lane	Previously Rejected Site No Change
224	N/A	Agricultural Land Church lane, Bishopthorpe	Previously Rejected Site No Change
565	SF1	Land at the Mews Strensall (North of Flaxton Road	Previously Rejected Site No Change
580	H36	Blairgowerie House,	Previously Rejected Site

		Poppleton	No Change
687	N/A	Land East of Northminster Business Park	Previously Rejected Site No Change
737	N/A	Stock Hill Field, West of Church Balk, Dunnington.	Previously Rejected Site No Change
752	SF11	Land at East Field Wheldrake	Previously Rejected Site No Change
768	SF5	Land to the West of Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe	Previously Rejected Site No Change
780	N/A	Site South of Knapton Openspace (New House Farm)	Previously Rejected Site No Change
789	N/A	Land to the West of Beckside Elvington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
792	N/A	Land South of Foxwood Lane, Acomb - Duplicate	Previously Rejected Site No Change
795	N/A	Greenacres Murton Lane	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)
800	ST25	Land south of Designer Outlet.	Previously Rejected Site No Change
801	N/A	Clifton Gate Business Park	Dealt with through policy GB1
814	SF4	Land north of Haxby	Previously Rejected Site No Change
825	SF1	Former Safeguarded Land South of Strensall	Previously Rejected Site No Change
827	H33	Water Tower Land Dunnington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
847	ST6	North of Grimston Bar	Previously Rejected Site No Change
859	SF15	Land To the North of Escrick	Previously Rejected Site No Change
864	N/A	Extention to Elvington Industrial Estate	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)
871	N/A	Land at North Field York	Previously Rejected Site No Change
872	ST12	Manor Heath, Copmanthorpe	Previously Rejected Site No Change
873	N/A	Land to the East of the Designer Outlet	Previously Rejected Site No Change
874	SF10	Land North of Riverside Gardens Elvington	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)
880	ST10/SF12	Land at Moor Lane Woodthorpe	Previously Rejected Site No Change
882	N/A	Land to the East and West of	Previously Rejected Site

		Askham Lane	No Change
884	N/A	Land southwest of the A1237 and A59 Junction	Previously Rejected Site No Change
885	N/A	Land East of Northfield Lane Minster Equine Veterinary Clinic	Previously Rejected Site No Change
887	N/A	Land lying between Northfield Lane, A59 and A1237	Previously Rejected Site No Change
890	N/A	Luigi's Restaurant, Northfield Lane,	Previously Rejected Site No Change
896	H35	Land at Intake Lane Dunnington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
897	N/A	Land at Landing Lane Haxby	Previously Rejected Site No Change
903	H34	Church Lane, Skelton	Previously Rejected Site No Change
907	N/A	Land North of Northminster	Previously Rejected Site No Change
926	H28	Land North of North Lane, Wheldrake	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing sites)
940	N/A	Remaining Land at Bull Commercial Centre	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)
941	N/A	Land West of Elm Tree Farm Elvington	Previously Rejected Site No Change
942	N/A	Land at Chapel fields York Duplicate	Previously Rejected Site No Change
956	N/A	Milestone Avenue Ruffoth	Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals
957	N/A	Malton Road Business Park	Previously Rejected Site No Change
958	N/A	Black Dyke Upper Poppleton	Previously Rejected Site No Change
959	N/A	Land at Kettlestring Way	Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals
960	N/A	Land North of Harewood Close Wigginton	Previously Rejected Site No Change
961	N/A	Low Well Farm Wheldrake	Previously Rejected Site No Change
962	N/A	Brook Nook and Holly Tree Farm	Previously Rejected Site No Change
963	N/A	Brook Nook	Previously Rejected Site No Change

964	N/A	Galtres Garden Village	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)
965	N/A	South of Southfields Close Rufforth	Previously Rejected Site No Change
965	N/A	Land South of Rufforth Airfield	Previously Rejected Site No Change
966	SF14	Land to the East of Strensall Road Earswick	Previously Rejected Site No Change
968	N/A	North of Avon Drive (reduced boundary)	Previously Rejected Site No Change
969	N/A	Land east of Northfield Lane and South of Wyevale Garden centre	Previously Rejected Site No Change
970	N/A	Land at Princess Road North Strensall	Previously Rejected Site No Change
971	H30	Southfields, Strensall	Previously Rejected Site No Change
972	N/A	North Carlton Farm, Stockton-on-the-forest	Previously Rejected Site No Change
973	N/A	Land off Mitchells Lane	Previously Rejected Site No Change
982	N/A	Racecourse Greenhouses	Previously Rejected Site No Change

Appendix 1

Summary of new and previously rejected site submitted through Pre Publication draft (Regulation 18) Consultation (2017)

Site Ref	Former Allocation Ref	Site Name	Post PPC Outcome	Page No
6	H37	Land at Greystone Court Haxby	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)	2
33	H2a	Racecourse stables off Tadcaster Road	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)	3
132	H2b	Land at Cherry Lane	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)	4
795	N/A	Greenacres Murton Lane	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)	6
864	N/A	Extension to Elvington Industrial Estate	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)	7
874	SF10	Land North of Riverside Gardens Elvington	Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)	8
926	H28	Land North of North Lane, Wheldrake	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing sites)	9
940	N/A	Remaining Land at Bull Commercial Centre	Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)	11
956	N/A	Milestone Avenue Rufforth	Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals	12
959	N/A	Land at Kettlestring Way	Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals	14
964	N/A	Galtres Garden Village	Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)	15

Land at Greystone Court Haxby

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From: 12389 Strathmore Estates On Behalf of Westfield Lodge and Yal

Summary of Response Received: This representation supports site H37 proposed allocation setting out that there is a willing landowner, no technical constraints to delivery and that the site could be delivered within 12-18 months of plan adoption to contribute to the 5 year supply. Supporting documents already undertaken and previously submitted include drainage, highways, ecology and contamination. Pre application advice has already been received supporting residential development for 1.95ha and 47 dwellings with new public openspace (2014). Reference is also made to officers support the reinstatement of the site (for 1.95 ha, 47 dwellings) as part of the Executive 2017 Annex 3 having accepted the evidence submitted . The applicant considers that the development could provide a stronger, more permanent greenbelt boundary to the south of Haxby through provision of new public openspace within the greenbelt. Disagree with previous responses by Historic England in relation to the site. Documents attached include the pre-app advice received, summary of the evidence base prepared for the site and masterplan.

Officer Analysis: The site was previously considered as H37 through the 2013 Preferred Options Local Plan. However, the allocation was removed prior to the Preferred Sites Consultation 2016 due to concerns regarding surface water drainage (Site contains elements of flood risk 2 and is adjacent to flood risk zone 3b) , coalescence and cumulative impacts.

Evidence submitted through this and previous consultation confirms that the total site area is 3.57ha with a 1.95ha developable area (55%) with the remainder of the site area to be open space (incorporating a woodland walk, balancing ponds and reed beds) which is proposed to be dedicated to York City Council/ or Haxby Town Council in perpetuity and to remain within the green belt. Previous concerns relating to the site’s removal as an allocation are considered to be dealt with in the supporting evidence base. The development and the required SUDS will be located wholly in flood zone 1. Yorkshire Water has confirmed that they have no objection in principle in terms of foul water discharge or surface water. Access remains via Greystone Court.

Racecourse stables off Tadcaster Road

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From: 220 Turnberry Consulting on behalf of York Racecourse

Summary of Response Received: York Racecourse object to the removal of former allocation H2a: Racecourse Stables, Tadcaster Road. Previously put forward and allocated. Confirmation is given that this site could be available in the long-term by York Racecourse following relocation of stables to main Racecourse site. According to policy H2 the density would be 'urban area' and would support up to 50 dwellings per acre. Considered to be a sustainable location for future development.

Officer Analysis: A part of this site (2.44ha closest to tadcaster road) was previously allocated in the 2013 Preferred Options Local Plan.

Development was however limited to exclude the area designated as SINC site 23 and to maintain the building line in this area to protect the landscape value of the Knavesmire.

This smaller site allocation was removed prior to the Preferred Sites Consultation 2016 due to concerns regarding deliverability of the site given that the stables need to be relocated prior to any development and concerns over a willing landowner given a lack of contact.

Representations recieved through the Pre Publication Consultation 2017 have confirmed that there is a willing landowner for the redevelopment of this site into residential units however relocation of the stables is part of a long term plan (Post 15 years).

Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)

Land at Cherry Lane

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

431

O'Neill Planning Consultatnts Representing Shepherd Ho

Summary of Response Received:

Shepherd homes seek the allocation of Site 132 for residential development. Part of the site was proposed for residential development in the 2013 Preferred Options Local Plan as part of a larger allocation of land that included the York Racecourse stables to the south. Representation were made to the previous stages of the local plan as well as the Preferred Sites Consultation (PSC) in September 2016 where removal of that allocation was proposed (included as appedices).

A Landscape Design Statement submitted since the representation to the PSC demonstrates that development would not cause harm to the setting of the Knavesmire. The site was considered in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2011 (site number 91).The SHLAA recommended the site is considered to be suitable for housing. A pre-application enquiry has been submitted for a scheme of 5 houses. A Hornbeam tree, protected by a tree preservation order, is located next to the proposed access and a small section of the root protection area of the tree will be affected. To minimise disruption to the tree root, this section of the access will be constructed utilising a cellular 'no dig' construction system.

Officer Analysis:

A part of this site and the adjacent land to the west (0.44ha closest to tadcaster road - site 947) was previously allocated in the 2013 Preferred Options Local Plan for housing but the extent of development towards the east was restricted to maintain the current built development line of this area due to concerns regarding nature conservation and landscape impact.

This smaller site allocation was removed prior to the Preferred Sites Consultation 2016 due to concerns regarding site access given restricted narrow access to the site via Cherry Lane and also because the site contains mature hedgerows and trees which would impact on the developable area. However, assessment of the evidence submitted through the 2016 preferred Sites consultation lead officers to consider that this reduced site area could be suitable for development if existing trees and hedgerows can be retained and if it can be developed in a way which retains the rural character of Cherry Lane.

Further landscape evidence has been received through the Pre Publication Consultation (2017) in support of the original larger site boundary. However, it is still considered that development further east than the current building line of the stables could have a negative impact. Therefore the smaller site boundary is still considered most suitable.

Potential new housing site allocations (previously rejected housing sites)

Greenacres Murton Lane

Submitted for:
employment



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:	12966i	Private Landowner
Summary of Response Received:	<p>Object to Employment Land Review (2017) because flawed methodology has led to the exclusion of site 795 Greenacres Murton Lane from the allocations for employment land. Goes into detail about a previous submission to the 2016 Preferred sites consultation taking issue with the Technical Officer Assessment of landscape impact. Says that a landscape and visual assessment was completed as recommended and submitted along with a transport assessment, impact on heritage could be mitigated at the masterplanning stage. Goes on to argue that their site meets all relevant criteria and should be allowed to come forward.</p>	

Officer Analysis:	<p>Site previously passed criteria 1 to 4 of Site selection process but failed technical officer assessment on landscape grounds: “The current site provides openness that can be observed from the A166 although the site is viewed against a backdrop of sheds, warehouses etc associated with Friars Close and the Livestock Centre. A Landscape and visual appraisal should be conducted to investigate these aspects”</p> <p>A landscape assessment was submitted previously through the PSC alongside a transport assessment. Representation through the Pre Publication Consultation (2017), refers to this assessment. Following consideration of this evidence it is accepted that the site may be appropriate for some employment development. The site would represent a logical extension to the adjacent commercial land uses subject to an appropriate scale/density of development and adequate landscape treatment.</p>
--------------------------	--

Potential new employment site allocation (previously rejected employment site)

Extention to Elvington Industrial Estate

Submitted for:
employment



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From: 12581 LHL Group OBO Private landowner

Summary of Response Received: Suggested land is located immediatley to the north of the existing Elvington Industrial Estate and is currently used for agriculture. Wants to allocate land in the local plan for employment uses (B1, B2, B8). Site is not in the current plan. It is 5.4ha in area. Represents a logical extension to the existing Elvington Industrial Estate and is accessible from the north of the estate. The sire is accessible, benefits from a willing landowner, not in flood risk, is low archaeological potential, not close to listed building, is of very low biodiversity value (arable field) and not high quality agricultural land (not grades 1 or 2). The existing Industrial Estate has high occupancy, so area is commercially sound and there is an unmet demand for additional employment floorspace in this area. Site's boundaries are defined by mature hedgerow and location means development would not be visible from many public vantage points. Attached is a map of site.

Officer Analysis:

The site was originally submitted through the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016). The resubmission of the site through the Pre Publication Consultation (2017) confirms that it has a willing landowner, is accessible and is likely to meet current unmet demand and that there is not considered any showstoppers to development.

The site passes the site selection methodology and technical officers consider that there are no showstoppers to the potential development of this site.

The site could provide additional employment land to help to increase flexibility over the Local Plan period in an attractive location for employment uses. The site boundaries are clearly defined by mature hedgerows and the site is well screened. The site is considered suitable for B1c/B2/B8 development.

Land North of Riverside Gardens Elvington

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

1668i

PB Planning obo Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes

Summary of Response Received:

Barratt and David Wilson Homes object to this site being rejected as a potential housing allocation. The proposal has the potential to provide a high quality development of up to 110 homes, alongside the delivery of public open space and associated infrastructure. The site offers the opportunity to help meet York's current and future housing needs. The proposals will deliver a development which respects the character of the surrounding area whilst seeking to incorporate 21st Century designs to provide a high quality residential development. The site is deliverable and located in a highly sustainable location. The site is available now as it is under the control of a national housebuilder who is actively seeking the site's allocation for development. The site can also be considered achievable as new homes can be delivered on the site within the next 5 years and indeed within the first 5 years of the Local Plan. There are no technical or environmental (built and natural) constraints that would preclude development of the site.

Officer Analysis:

The site was previously included as safeguarded land in the halted Publication Draft Local Plan and reconsidered following submission through the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016). Through this consultation access to the site was confirmed to be via Riverside Gardens. Landscape impacts on the 4ha site were not considered to be a showstopper as the site is well contained, surrounded on two sides by existing residential and on the other two by mature hedgerows. The site is close to the village centre and can be accessed via Riverside Gardens. It is considered that visual impact on the wider landscape and setting of the village would be relatively limited.

Land North of North Lane, Wheldrake

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

9381iv

DPP Planning on behalf of Linden Homes

Summary of Response Received:

Both Linden Homes and Pilcher Homes object to the sites omission as a housing allocation in the Local Plan. Linden Homes resubmit boudnary 926. The site size is 3.15ha of relatively flat land. The site is suitable, deliverable and viable and has a willing developer. There are not considered to be any technical constraints to preclude delivery now that access had been clarified. Evidence base undetaken to support the site remains valid including a topographical and archaeological surveys, geo-environmental apraisals, flood risk and drainage, air quality impact assessment, transport assessment and ecological assessments. Support the officers recommendation in July 2017 that the site could be reinstated for a housing allocation. Does not perform Green Belt function and therefore should be excluded from the Green Belt and included within the settlement of Wheldrake. Evidence base attached includes site plan, site allocation density information and a technical report on housing issues by consultants Lichfields. Pilcher Homes also confirm that H28 should be included as sustainable and technically deliverable. Revised access meets technical officer comments for exclusion. No issues with drainage. And submit and updated boudnary (926)

Officer Analysis:

This site was removed prior to the Preferred Sites Consultation 2016 due to concerns regarding site access which required further detailed survey/analysis.

The PSC stated that the proposed access via Cranbrooks, North Lane or Valley View needed to be investigated further given they are narrow residential streets and that there were potential visibility and footways issues. The representation and further technical evidence received through the PSC demonstrated that whilst the site has three potential access points via North Lane, Cranbrooks and Valley View that North Lane is the preferred access point and this is supported by the Transport Statement. Assessment through the technical officer groups confirms that there is no 'access' showstopper as the principle of access can be adequately demonstrated.

earlier submissions and also suggest an amended boundary (submitted by Pilcher Homes).

Officers consider therefore that the site could be included as an allocation within the Plan

Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)

Remaining Land at Bull Commercial Centre

Submitted for:
employment



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

1769 Module Partitions

Summary of Response Received:

Objects to land adjacent to the Bull Commercial Centre, Stockton Lane, York YO32 9LE not being included for employment use, and that the new plan has no new land for smaller light industrial units, which is in short supply. Employment use in plan is predominantly for office development. The Centre has been permanently let, with several businesses wanting to take this unit - this illustrates the demand. A business was forced to relocate when it grew to Ryedale. Suggests an extension of the centre into land previously in horticultural use, with 2x6m wide access roads and area for parking. It is well screened with trees. Extends to clear boundaries bordered by sewage treatment works and a garden centre. Better alternative to developing in green belt. Centre has a record for job creation and business growth.

Officer Analysis:

This site was first submitted through the Preferred Sites consultation (2016). Representation received at this point was for reconsideration of an extension to the existing employment site to allow for indigenous companies to expand. The site has been resubmitted through the Pre Publication consultation (2017) for the use.

The site is a former meat/livestock centre that was given consent as a light industrial employment site in 1987 and contains approximately 3,000 sqm of light industrial small scale workshops/units. The extension would provide a further 3ha providing up to 10,000 sqm of floorspace. The site has existing access onto Stockton Lane. The site currently provides a number of relatively low cost starter and nursery units for small businesses housed in self contained small units.

The proposed extension to the existing site is well screened by existing trees and hedgerows and would provide a logical extension to the existing site to allow for the expansion/reconfiguration of existing premises and/or the provision of additional starter units for new occupiers.

Milestone Avenue Ruffoth

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

13633

Barton Willmore on behalf of Equibase Ltd

Summary of Response Received:

A New Site is submitted at the end of Milestone Avenue, Rufforth. 0.37 ha with capacity for 9 dwellings. Site is supported in the Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan (site ref RK H2). The site is suitable and deliverable. This is demonstrated by various assessments that have been undertaken: flood risk and drainage strategy, noise assessment, assessment of vehicular access arrangements. Land has been provided to Rwk Parish Council to enable the creation of a cycle path to connect the path from Rufforth village to Harewood Whin cycle path and Knapton village. The land does not serve Green Belt purposes- it is enclosed by development on three sides and 'rounds' off the settlement.

Officer Analysis:

The Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been 'made' (Adopted) but draft work to date has included support for this site. The site is situated adjacent to the main built up area of Rufforth and is largely within the development line forming infill development. The village boundary is clearly marked either side of the site and the existing tree cover should be kept along the northwest boundary to reinforce this line. There are no protected trees on this site but there is significant tree cover, which provides the village with a setting and a suitable boundary with the wider countryside, and these should be preserved perhaps limiting the number of dwellings possible on the site. While there are no known ecological constraints but there are ponds within 500m of the site which may need assessment and possible mitigation. While there are some drainage issues in the area solutions can be found to these and evidence in respect of this would need to be submitted. The site lies within the toft/ croft layout of the medieval village of Rufforth. There is evidence for a well-developed late-prehistoric Romano-British landscape in the area west of York. While there are no designated heritage assets within the boundary of this site it is likely to contain undesignated heritage assets relating to the development of this late-prehistoric Romano-British landscape and the medieval village and its associated field system. This would not preclude development but a heritage statement would need to be submitted.

There are no showstoppers to development and a well designed scheme could compliment the area. The following evidence/ considerations would need to be evaluated as the site moves forward:

A hertigate statement which contains - A geophysical survey of the site; an archaeological evaluation of the site; An assessment of the significances of any archaeological features and deposits that are preserved on the site; proposals for any archaeological mitigation measures agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

The site would also be subject to AQ assessment and CYC's standard mitigation requirements (CEMP, EV charging provision etc).

It is important to consider noise from the nearby electricity sub-station, place of worship and Harewood Whin.

An assessment of potential contamination from the adjacent farm, the former use of the land and the landfill site at Harewood Whin and a closed landfill site at Rufforth Garth.

A report on drainage solutions.

Assessment of the potential impact on nearby ponds and in particular great crested newts.

New Site with Potential for residential

Land at Kettlestring Way

Submitted for:

Residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:	13539	Carter Jonas on behalf of Picton Capital Ltd
Summary of Response Received:	Site at Kettlestring Lane/Amy Johnson Way, Clifton Moor Industrial Estate, York, YO30 4XF. 3.20ha. Should allocate for housing. Existing commercial premises under-utilised and will become vacant in the near future. Good access to facilities at Clifton Moor and access to A1237 via roundabout. Indicative plan attached shows 90 townhouses and 40 apartments.	

Officer Analysis:

This is a brownfield site within the main built up area of York close to Clifton Moor. The site has access to local facilities and bus routes and there are no known physical restrictions to development. The area however is predominantly industrial and there is potential for some conflict with neighbouring business park/ industrial uses. However other units have been converted to residential within the area.

The site would be considered more favourably in the long term. Best to consider in the long-term. Site size is 3.2 ha in suburban archetype (0.7 ha x 40 dph) = 92 dwellings.

Potential completely new housing site allocations in response to developer proposals

Galtres Garden Village

Submitted for:

residential



Pre Publication Consultation Responses

PPC Response From:

ID 13099

O'Neill Associates OBO Galtres Village Development Com

Summary of Response Received:

Galtres Village Development Comapnay object to the rejection of thier previously submitted boudnaries and propose a revised boundary of 77.37 ha for 1753 dwellings of which 1403 would be market and affordable dwellings, 286 for retirement dwellings and a 64 bed care-home (4117 residents in total) as well as 15.6 ha new country park and 3.49 ha for community facilities, including a primary school. Indicative site density would be 32 dph. The revised boundary reflects consideration of officer's previous comments on the site; the boundary has been pushed back setting the development away from the ring-road (similarly to other allocated sites) with improved access off North Lane to be a standalone site. Site is landscape-led to and responds to location and evidence base undertaken. Able to deliver 30% affordable housing on site in an innovative way and would support self and custom house building. With financial support from HCA and Council there is also the ability to deliver affordable housing through accelerated delivery in the first 5 years. Consider that the site is suitable, deliverable and viable (using PBA Viability methodology). The site is predominantly a mixture of arable farmland, pasture and woodland. It is considered that the land does not meet green belt purposes. Evidence base underpinning the site submitted includes: Indicative masterplan, Transport Technical Note, Landscape Capacity Report, Ecology Report, Heritage Report, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage statement, Phase 1 habitat report and Heritage Appraisal as well as a prospectus for delivery.

Officer Analysis:

The revised boundary submitted for Galtres Garden village has a total site area is 92.97 hectares and the proposed development area approximately 77.37 hectares. Whilst the site passes the first 3 site selection criteria but fails the sustainable access criteria (4a and 4b) not meeting the minimum scoring threshold for residential sites. Given the size of the development and its location, it would be expected to provide commensurate facilities within walking distance of new residential development. It is noted that the revised masterplan includes the provision of a 'village hub' which it is proposed would include a primary school, playing pitches and retail/community facilities (circa 0.15ha). Provision of a village centre including an appropriate range of shops and community facilities would be

essential to make the site function as a sustainable settlement. This provision would need to be taken into account in considering the overall viability of the site.

Amber - In terms of access, the primary access points are proposed off North Lane with a new roundabout junction leading into the site. At a strategic level there is currently no evidence that transport should be considered to be a 'show stopper' for this site - provided that effective measures to both to reduce car trip generation and to mitigate against the impact of the residual car trips are put in place. However, the proximity of the development to the Strategic Road Network, in particular issues with the North Lane junction with the A64, would need to be addressed with Highways England. Furthermore, there are some concerns with the proposed width of North Lane leading up to the two roundabouts as the new local distributor road for Galtres Village as this is considered to be narrow.

Amber - In relation to ecology, the main issue to consider are potential impacts on Strensall Common SAC, which although to the north, may receive adverse effects as a result of increased recreational pressure. In their previous 2016 Habitat Regulations Screening submission this concludes Likely Significant Effects from recreation. This scheme is significantly different in scale and has also increased the amount of open space provision (including dedicated Country Park) but would still need to be considered in the Council's HRA process for recreational impacts and air quality. There is a clear intent to include significant open space but further work is necessary to understand whether likely significant effects can be excluded.

The Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken in September 2017 identified the need for a number of surveys and therefore there are other potential ecological issues e.g. presence of barn owls, hedgerows, breeding/wintering birds, great crested newts, water vole, bats etc. We note that bird species recorded in 2013/2014 (on the previous boundary but provided as information for the new boundary) includes lapwing, curlew and golden plover, which are birds associated with the Lower Derwent Valley SPA. Further work is necessary to understand any functional links to the LDV and requirements to avoid, mitigate or compensate for ecology.

Amber – In comparison to previous boundaries considered for this site, it is recognised that the extent of the proposed garden village has been moved away from the A64. Notwithstanding that however, it is still likely to be perceived as an urban extension rather than a separate outlying village and therefore goes against the grain of the inherited pattern of settlements around York. Whilst North Lane lends itself to the creation of a rural context for the proposed Galtres Village (although highway engineering would result in significant change to the character of this route) the distance between this site and proposed allocation ST8 is very short. Consequently, as the viewer travels along the road network in this area, the proximity of Galtres village would be so close to Monks Cross (a significant extension) that it could read as a further urban extension and encroachment into the countryside, rather than a separate village within a rural setting. This compounded especially as North Lane would be used as a direct link between the A64 and the outer ring road. For other sites considered, we have sought to retain the rural character along the lane and protect the countryside setting. North Lane continues east of the ring road and is currently still rural in character. The illustrative master plan places considerable reliance on woodland planting around the perimeter to screen and contain the development but the A1237 is on a southwest

trajectory at this point, pulling it away from the proposed allocation and its influence on the setting of the city as experienced from the ring road.

The scheme includes a country park and a cycle route to Earswick. This would be of great value to the development and provide green links between the settlements of Earswick and Galtres, which would also be available to the residents of Earswick. It would provide wider access to the countryside although it is relatively small, so would only provide for the most immediate population.

Potential new housing site allocation (previously rejected housing site)

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex B: Duty to Cooperate Responses**Summary of Prescribed Body Representations on City of York Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Regulation 18) Consultation, 2017**

Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation
East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft plan, which has been based on ongoing co-operation between the two authorities throughout the plan making process. • Strongly supports the provision of sufficient housing within the York Local Plan to enable the full need for housing to be met within the York HMA. • Welcomes the identification of strategic highways network improvements at Grimston Bar in policy T4 and the need for joint working. • Expressed concern at the Breen Belt boundary being set precisely at 6miles from the city centre as this would encroach into East Riding. • More detailed comments relating to Site ST15 Land West of Elvington Lane
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the whole, the Environment Agency's comments from previous consultations have been taken on board and the EA find the content of the plan positive. The section on green infrastructure is good and recognises the dual of both green open spaces and mitigation of current and future flood risk, as sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) or flood storage, can be achieved. • More detailed comments on policies relevant to its remit, e.g. Flood risk and land contamination.
Hambleton District Council (HDC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document identifies sufficient land to meet the development needs of the City and establishes a Green Belt enduring 20 years. It does not safeguard land for development and recognises the build out time of the strategic sites will extend beyond the plan period. The proposed detailed boundaries of the Green Belt offer little opportunity to accommodate the increased level of growth proposed in the White Paper, should this be required. • If the City of York does not ensure that its longer term development needs are met this will place pressure on areas in neighbouring authorities. • The Local Plan has been subject to viability testing and the proposed allocations have been selected through a robust assessment process, but the level of assessment that has been undertaken to confirm the viability and deliverability of the allocated sites is unclear
Harrogate Borough Council (HBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No representation made at this stage but ongoing discussions under the Duty will continue as the plan is taken forward
Highways England (HE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the emphasis on sustainable travel, high quality public transport links serving new sustainable communities and travel planning as key components of policy, and that new development sites are located with

Summary of Prescribed Body Representations on City of York Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Regulation 18) Consultation, 2017

Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation
	<p>good access to public transport, walking and cycling networks, thereby minimising growth in traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan lacks recognition of the scale of the forecast traffic growth on the A64 trunk road and its junctions with local primary roads will require physical mitigation in the form of investment in highway infrastructure despite the extensive sustainable travel proposals. • The spatial distribution and particularly the development of land opportunities in the south and eastern parts of York should be dependent upon agreement between the Council and HE of a Management Strategy for the A64 and its junctions with the local primary road network. • HE expects that the strategic sites located around the A1237 Northern Ring Road will combine to have a significant impact on the junctions of the A1237 with that A64 east and west of York. It will need to have a good understanding of that cumulative impact if it is to be able to state that the Plan is sound at Publication Draft stage. • HE will continue to work in partnership with CYC to understand the impact of the Local Plan proposals on the operation of the A64 and its junctions with the primary road network. • Requested that the key principles in many of the Spatial Strategy (SS) policies for the strategic sites be modified to include HE as an organization to be consulted with by developers when demonstrating that all transport issues have been addressed. • Requested explanatory text to several Spatial Strategy (SS) policies for the strategic sites be modified to include the need for a Transport Assessment to support the key principles relating to demonstrating that all transport issues have been addressed.
<p>Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (LCR LEP) / West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan forms a complete suite of local policies and directly addresses many aspects of the strategies in the SEP. • Land allocations for the provision of jobs will support sustainable economic activity with a focus on allocating enough sites to satisfy market demand and maximise connectivity to transport • The Plan supports the aim of increasing the amount of energy generated from renewable and low carbon sources, and supports proposals for renewable and low carbon infrastructure. These elements are well-aligned with the SEP • York has not applied the 10% market signals adjustment as recommended in the York 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment. • The Plan policies could strengthen the commitment to delivering better digital infrastructure which would support

Summary of Prescribed Body Representations on City of York Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Regulation 18) Consultation, 2017	
Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation
	<p>the SEP priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites and policies are not supported by an up to date infrastructure delivery plan and one would be expected. • The Plan acknowledges that commuting to destinations outside York occurs. Welcome that improvements to York Railway Station are included in the plan to accommodate enhancements for the planned electrification of the Trans Pennine Line, HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail aspirations.
North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • York is an important driver for growth both within the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP area and the Leeds City Region. It is important that the City has a robust and high quality Local Plan in place that best enables it to unlock economic growth and prosperity for the benefit of its communities and those of its wider hinterland. • Welcome the commitments set out in Policy DP1: York Sub Areas. In particular that York will <i>'fulfil its role as a key driver in the Leeds City Region , York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) area...'</i> and <i>'The housing needs of City of York 's current and future population including that arising from economic and institutional growth is met within the York local authority area.'</i> • Support the general thrust and intent of Policy SS1 : Delivering sustainable growth for York • Policy SS2: the Role of York's Green Belt - defining a clear and detailed inner boundary of the York Green Belt is welcomed and supported. In defining the Green Belt boundary it is important that the evidence underpinning the decision is clearly presented and included within the narrative accompanying the policy. NYCC recognise that the Plan makes provision up to 2038, providing for an additional 5 years beyond the plan period. In adopting this approach it is acknowledged that in the longer term consideration will need to be given to how future growth needs will be managed to provide confidence in relation to planning for infrastructure and services including within neighbouring parts of North Yorkshire • Any traffic impact on NYCC's local highway network that could arise from allocations need to be identified and considered. Where it is clear that a development will have a material impact on its local highway network, NYCC request to be included in agreeing the scoping for the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) in addition to being formally consulted during the application process. • Ask that within CYC's transport evidence account is taken of the traffic generated by the allocations of surrounding planning authorities., particularly Harrogate district and

Summary of Prescribed Body Representations on City of York Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Regulation 18) Consultation, 2017	
Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation
	<p>the Green Hammerton settlement and that committed developments within North Yorkshire that will impact on cross border issues are included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Development of the York Central site will provide new economic and residential uses and activity in the centre of the City in a location well connected to sustainable transport which will benefit from regeneration.
Ryedale District Council (RDC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No representation made at this stage but ongoing discussions under the Duty will continue as the plan is taken forward
Selby District Council (SDC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly supports the Local Plan approach and its policies, and more specifically, Policy DP1 • SDC notes Policy SS1 states that the plan will deliver a minimum of 867 dwellings per year .Having read the SHMA Addendum, it is also noted that this figure does not take into account the level of employment growth proposed by the Local Plan and that the SHMA has not undertaken a full update to the analysis of economic growth. Whilst the SHMA concludes that there is unlikely to be any justification for an uplift in housing numbers in York to support expected growth in employment, Selby District Council need to be confident that undertaking a policy-on approach to housing need would identify no more than 867 dwellings per annum. • CYC will also be aware of the proposed methodology for the calculation of housing need requirements set out in the in the DCLG consultation on 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places', which if taken forward would increase York's housing requirement figure to 1,070 dwellings per annum. Whilst you are confident that you can realise the growth aspirations detailed within the Pre-Publication Local Plan within the City of York boundary, Selby District Council is concerned that any increases to this figure could raise significant cross-boundary issues. • Question whether a Green Belt boundary enduring for 20 years is sufficient to meet the NPPF as it pertains to the intended permanence of Green Belt boundaries in the long term so they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period. • Site ST15 is in a remote location and will require significant investment in public transport infrastructure. The cumulative impact of this proposed new settlement on the highways network, along with the proposed expansion of York University (Site ST27) and the employment allocation at Elvington Airfield will need to be mitigated. Selby District Council need more detail to that shown in the Transport Topic Paper, before providing any further comments on the potential impact this allocation may have on Selby district. • CYC as education authority, will need to be satisfied that

Summary of Prescribed Body Representations on City of York Local Plan Pre Publication Draft (Regulation 18) Consultation, 2017	
Prescribed Body	Summary of Representation
	<p>Wheldrake with Thorganby CE School is capable of meeting any additional demand generated by Site ST33, without any detriment to the population of Thorganbury (in Selby District)</p> <p>.</p>
York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (YNYER LEP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quantum and nature of the proposed development will be of great strategic benefit to this LEP area and it is important that the Local Plan is advanced to adoption quickly to allow delivery of these sites. • Past issues of under delivery of housing, together with recent market signals for York mean that it will be essential to achieve the proposed minimum annual provision of 867 dwellings over the plan period, together with any additional homes to reflect under delivery. • Concerned at only 60,000m² of B1a office space at York Central, given the significantly higher figure in the EZ proposal and the pivotal role of such development on this site for the economy of York and the LEP area • Welcome the funding from WYCA to undertake feasibility and business case development for dualling the A1237 • Grimston Bar junction, that already has capacity problems and faces increasing pressure through the Local Plan proposals, is important for east-west connectivity

This page is intentionally left blank

The 'Better Decision Making' tool should be completed when proposing new projects, services, policies or strategies.

This integrated impact assessment tool was designed to help you to consider the impact of your proposal on social, economic and environmental sustainability, and equalities and human rights. The tool draws upon the priorities set out in our Council Plan and will help us to provide inclusive and discrimination-free services. The purpose of this new tool is to ensure that the impacts of every proposal are carefully considered and balanced and that decisions are based on evidence.

Part 1 of this form should be completed as soon as you have identified a potential area for change and when you are just beginning to develop a proposal. If you are following the All About Projects Framework it should be completed before going through Gateway 3.

Part 2 of this form should be filled in once you have completed your proposal and prior to being submitted for consideration by the Executive. If you are following the All About Projects Framework it should be completed before going through Gateway 4. Your answer to questions 1.4 in the improvements section must be reported in any papers going to the Executive and the full 'Better Decision Making' tool should be attached as an annex.

Guidance to help you complete the assessment can be obtained by hovering over the relevant text or by following this link to the 'Better Decision Making' tool on Colin.

Guidance on completing this assessment is available by hovering over the text boxes.

Please complete all fields (and expand if necessary).

Introduction

Service submitting the proposal:	Strategic Planning
Name of person completing the assessment:	Alison Cooke
Job title:	Development Officer
Directorate:	Economy and Place
Date Completed:	23rd January 2018
Date Approved: form to be checked by service manager	

Part 1

Section 1: What is the proposal?

1.1	Name of the service, project, programme, policy or strategy being assessed?
	Pre Publication Draft Local Plan 2017
1.2	What are the main aims of the proposal?
	The main aim of the report is to update Members on the response to the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan Consultation 2017. It presents a background summary of previous iterations of draft policies and the circumstances which led to the rationale of the Executive decision to approve the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan for consultation. It also provides a summary of the present national policy and legislative context, and Officers' advice on appropriate responses to the Consultation outcomes.
1.3	What are the key outcomes?
	The Local Plan is the planning policy document through which we aim to deliver York's sustainable development objectives in a spatial way through identifying policies to inform decision making and site allocations to meet development needs.

Section 2: Evidence

2.1	<p>What data / evidence is available to understand the likely impacts of the proposal? (e.g. hate crime figures, obesity levels, recycling statistics)</p> <p>The proposed changes as a result of the Consultation responses are set out in Annex A against each of the sites and policies.</p>
2.2	<p>What public / stakeholder consultation has been used to support this proposal?</p> <p>The Local Plan process has been subject to several consultations, the latest of which was the Pre Publication Draft (2017). This set out the Council's preferred housing and employment need as well as sites to satisfy the demand. The outcomes of this consultation have been reviewed and incorporated into the emerging position. Annex A accompanies this report setting out the proposed changes, supported by the evidence base. Further consultation, subject to members decision, will take place in Spring 2018.</p>
2.3	<p>Are there any other initiatives that may produce a combined impact with this proposal? (e.g. will the same individuals / communities of identity also be impacted by a different project or policy?)</p> <p>This report will ultimately feed into the Regulation 19 Local Plan wherein it is likely to be positive through meeting the city's spatial development needs and contribute towards meeting York's sustainable development objectives. Specifically in relation to communities, this will effect all people in York who engage with planning such as through obtaining planning permission as well as ensuring planning policies in place to meet the city's objectives for sustainable development.</p>



Part 1

Section 3: Impact on One Planet principles

Please summarise any potential positive and negative impacts that may arise from your proposal on staff or residents.
 This section relates to the impact of your proposal on the One Planet principles.

For 'Impact', please select from the options in the drop-down menu.
 If you wish to enter multiple paragraphs in any of the boxes, hold down 'Alt' before hitting 'Enter'.

Equity and Local Economy

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.1	Impact positively on the business community in York?	Positive	The policies of the Local Plan support the delivery of the city's economic objectives and will enable York to realise its economic growth ambitions as set out in the city's economic strategy (2016). It will promote private sector employment growth through the provision of sites and infrastructure to deliver new jobs over the plan period for current and future residents. The Employment Land Review (2016 and update 2017) sets out our assumptions for identifying employment need. Meeting York's housing requirements is also likely to have a positive outcome for provision of affordable housing for workers within York.
3.2	Provide additional employment or training opportunities in the city?	Positive	The policies of the local plan support the delivery of the city's economic objectives and will enable York to realise its economic growth ambitions as set out in the city's economic strategy (2016). It will promote private sector employment growth through the provision of sites and infrastructure to deliver new jobs over the plan period for current and future residents. Housebuilding and commercial development as a result of allocations in the LocalPlan may provide some certainty over jobs in construction. The scale of employment activity depends on the growth targets agreed.
3.3	Help individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds or underrepresented groups to improve their skills?	Positive	The plan supports the delivery of the city's economic objectives and social objectives, including promoting social inclusivity. The plan will help to unlock the further potential of the higher and further education sector in York through development and redevelopment.

Health & Happiness

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.4	Improve the physical health or emotional wellbeing of staff or residents?	Neutral	The Local Plan aims to support healthy lifestyles and healthy environments across the city. The plan includes policies to conserve and enhance York's green infrastructure, providing opportunities for a healthy lifestyle and optimising its role in contributing to York being a healthy city, drawing on the Open Space Study (2014) and its 2017 update. Providing homes to meet the needs of people will also have a positive impact on people's well being.
3.5	Help reduce health inequalities?	Positive	The community facilities section of the plan has been revised to have a greater focus on health and wellbeing. The new section covers the protection and enhancement of sports, healthcare, childcare, and community facilities. An additional policy related to healthy placemaking has been added which encourages designing environments that encourage health-promoting behaviours, helping to delivery York's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Council Plan. There are also opportunities as part of new development for the provision of new services. These will have to be developed in tandem to avoid negatives impact in the short-term.
3.6	Encourage residents to be more responsible for their own health?	Neutral	The Local Plan encourages healthy lifetsyles through the safeguarding and provison of different types of openspace and recreational opportunities. The plan includes policies to conserve and enhance York's green infrastructure, providing opportunities for a healthy lifestyle and optimising its role in contributing to York being a healthy city. See Annex 7 to this report to see updates to these policies.
3.7	Reduce crime or fear of crime?	Positive	The plan includes a placemaking policy which seeks to balance the needs of urban design principles for good design against 'secured by design' principles to design out crime, helping to delivery the City of York Streetscape Strategy Guidance (2014). See Annex 7 to this report to see updates to these policies.
3.8	Help to give children and young people a good start in life?	Positive	The Local Plan seeks to respond to the need to increase primary and secondary education provision, including addressing need arising from strategic development sites and supporting proposals to ensure that existing facilities can continue to meet modern educational requirements. See Annex 7 to this report to see updates to these policies.

Culture & Community

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.9	Help improve community cohesion?	Neutral	Community cohesion and the development of strong, supportive and durable communities is promoted through the creation of sustainable, low carbon neighbourhoods.
3.10	Improve access to services for residents, especially those most in need?	Positive	The plan will prioritise tackling existing gaps and prevent gaps from being created in the provision of key services and public transport, helping to support the Council's Transport Plan 2011-2031. The Plan's spatial strategy also uses access to services and transport as a key indicator for sustainability and uses this to help determine suitable sites for development. The majority of strategic allocations are also expected to incorporate local provision on site and have access to sustainable transport.
3.11	Improve the cultural offerings of York?	Positive	A new cultural provision policy has been developed as well as strengthening references to culture throughout the plan. The new policy supports development proposals where they are designed to sustain, enhance and add value to the special qualities and significance of York's culture. See Annex 7 to this report to see the new and revised policies.
3.12	Encourage residents to be more socially responsible?	Positive	Through consultation the local plan process actively encourages residents to shape their communities by commenting on the policies that will shape development in the future in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2007)

Zero Carbon and Sustainable Water

Does your proposal?	Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
---------------------	--------	---

3.13	Minimise the amount of energy we use, or reduce the amount of energy we will use/pay for in the future?	Mixed	The plan will respond to the opportunities offered by the city's natural resources whilst at the same time protecting current and future residents from environmental impacts. It will help York become a sustainable, resilient and collaborative 'One Planet'. It will create energy efficient buildings, support the use of energy from renewable sources and ensuring York is climate ready. Notwithstanding this, development in York is likely to increase the city's resource consumption. LocalPlan policy relating to climate change, renewable energy and sustainable design have been updated in line with new/updated evidence base and legislation. See Annex 7 to this report for updates to these policies.
3.14	Minimise the amount of water we use or reduce the amount of water we will use/pay for in the future?	Mixed	The plan will respond to the opportunities offered by the city's natural resources whilst at the same time protecting current and future residents from environmental impacts. It will help York become a sustainable, resilient and collaborative 'One Planet' city, ensuring that new development uses water efficiently and delivers sustainable drainage solutions. LocalPlan policy relating to climate change, renewable energy and sustainable design have been updated in line with new/updated evidence base and legislation. See Annex 7 to this report for updates to policy.
3.15	Provide opportunities to generate energy from renewable/low carbon technologies?	Positive	A revised climate change section now more strongly ties the policies to the social and economic benefits of low carbon developments which consider sustainable design and construction principles. See Annex 7 to this report for updates to policy.

Zero Waste

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.16	Reduce waste and the amount of money we pay to dispose of waste by maximising reuse and/or recycling of materials?	Positive	The plan will contribute to the reduction of waste through supporting innovation and improvement of current waste practices and the promotion of recycling. Sustainable design and construction principles will be embedded in new developments. Local Plan policy relating to Waste management has been revised in line with the emerging Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan being prepared by North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and North York Moors National Park. See Annex 7 to this report for updates to policy

Sustainable Transport

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.17	Encourage the use of sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling, ultra low emission vehicles and public transport?	Positive	The plan will help deliver a fundamental shift in travel patterns by ensuring that sustainable development and travel planning is a key component of future development, promoting sustainable connectivity, reducing the need to travel, helping to deliver the infrastructure to support sustainable transport and managing private travel demand. Helping to support the Council's Transport Plan 2011-2031. This has also been translated into the Site Selection process as a key stage in considering suitability of a potential development site. The outcomes of sites are referred to in annexes 3-5. See Annex 7 for revisions to policy.
3.18	Help improve the quality of the air we breathe?	Positive	The plan supports measures to help reduce the emissions of Nitrogen Dioxide, Particulate, Carbon Dioxide and other greenhouse gases from both transport and other sources helping to deliver the Council's Low Emission Strategy (2012) and therefore features as a consideration throughout the Local Plan. See Annex 7 to this report for detailed updates to policy.

Sustainable Materials

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.19	Minimise the environmental impact of the goods and services used?	Mixed	Development advocated by the Local Plan will have an inevitable impact on the use of resources and waste. However, sustainable design and construction principles will be embedded in new developments through policy. See annex 7 to this report for detailed policy updates.

Local and Sustainable Food

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.20	Maximise opportunities to support local and sustainable food initiatives?	Neutral	n/a

Land Use and Wildlife

Does your proposal?		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
3.21	Maximise opportunities to conserve or enhance the natural environment?	Positive	York's Green Infrastructure, including open space, landscape, geodiversity, biodiversity and the natural environment will be both conserved and enhanced. This is a key consideration in the Local Plan and evidence base such as the Green Infrastructure and Openspace Study (2014, Openspace update 2017). The vision, spatial strategy and specific policies all support the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Furthermore, this is translated into the Site Selection methodology to determine a potential site's suitability for development . See Annex 7 for updates to specific policies and annexes 3-5 to see comments in relation to specific sites.
3.22	Improve the quality of the built environment?	Positive	The Local Plan will help York to safeguard its outstanding heritage for future generations by promoting development which respects the city's special character and culture and encourages opportunities for rediscovering and reinterpreting those assets which make it an attractive, beautiful and accessible city. The Plan will do this through the conservation and enhancement of six defining characteristics of York's built environment; strong urban form, compactness, landmark monuments, unique architectural character, archaeological complexity and landscape setting set out in the Heritage Topic Paper (2014) and Heritage Impact Appraisal (tbc 2017).
3.23	Preserve the character and setting of the historic city of York?	Positive	The plan will help York to safeguard its outstanding heritage for future generations by promoting development which respects the city's special character. The Local Plan will ensure that the city's heritage assets are preserved and enhanced. Beyond the city centre, the key radial routes are of particular importance, and the surrounding villages and Green Infrastructure, including its valued strays, river corridors and open spaces that contribute to the city's setting. The Historic Character and Setting evidence base (2003 updated in 2013 and 2014) identifies areas of primary importance for this. The Plan will also create a Green Belt for York that will endure beyond the end of this plan period providing a lasting framework to shape the future development of the city. Its primary aim will be to preserve and enhance the special character and setting of York. It will also have a critical role in ensuring that development is directed to the most sustainable locations.

3.24	Enable residents to enjoy public spaces?	Positive	Development will not be permitted which would harm the character of or lead to the loss of open space of environmental and or recreational importance unless it can be satisfactorily replaced. All residential development should contribute to the provision of open space for recreation and amenity. As supported by the open space study (2014) and its update and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
------	--	----------	--

3.25	Additional space to comment on the impacts		

Part 1

Section 4: Impact on Equalities and Human Rights

Please summarise any potential positive and negative impacts that may arise from your proposal on staff or residents. This section relates to the impact of your proposal on **advancing equalities and human rights** and should build on the impacts you identified in the previous section.

For 'Impact', please select from the options in the drop-down menu.
 If you wish to enter multiple paragraphs in any of the boxes, hold down 'Alt' before hitting 'Enter'

Equalities

Will the proposal **adversely impact** upon 'communities of identity'?
 Will it **help advance equality** or **foster good relations** between people in 'communities of identity'?

	Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?	Relevant quality of life
4.1 Age	Positive	The plan will meet housing needs and provide a range of house types for all ages. The SHMA (2016) and SHMA update (2017) provide relevant evidence for this. It will also improve the safety and accessibility of the city's streets and spaces.	Comfortable standard of living
4.2 Disability	Positive	The plan will meet housing needs and provide a range of house types for all ages. The SHMA (2016) and SHMA update (2017) provide relevant evidence for this. It will also improve the safety and accessibility of the city's streets and spaces.	Comfortable standard of living
4.3 Gender	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.4 Gender Reassignment	23rd January 2018	None deemed likely	n/a
4.5 Marriage and civil partnership	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.6 Pregnancy and maternity	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.7 Race	Positive	Meeting Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation needs, supporting the outcomes of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2017)	Comfortable standard of living
4.8 Religion or belief	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.9 Sexual orientation	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.10 Carer	Neutral	None deemed likely	n/a
4.11 Lowest income groups	Positive	The plan will meet housing needs and provide a range of house types. The SHMA (2016) and SHMA update (2017) provide relevant evidence for this, including the need for affordable housing.	Comfortable standard of living
4.12 Veterans, Armed forces community	neutral	The emerging Local Plan and supporting evidence considers the potential of the MOD sites in York for development following the Defence Infrastructure Estates Review (2016). The closure of these sites will have an impact on the armed forces community which is out of the remit of the Local Plan.	n/a

Human Rights

Consider how a human rights approach is evident in the proposal

		Impact	What are the impacts and how do you know?
4.13	Right to education	neutral	None deemed likely
4.14	Right not to be subjected to torture, degrading treatment or punishment	neutral	None deemed likely
4.15	Right to a fair and public hearing	neutral	None deemed likely
4.16	Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence	neutral	None deemed likely
4.17	Freedom of expression	neutral	None deemed likely
4.18	Right not to be subject to discrimination	neutral	None deemed likely
4.19	Other Rights	neutral	None deemed likely

4.20	Additional space to comment on the impacts		

Part 1

Section 5: Developing Understanding

Based on the information you have just identified, please consider how the impacts of your proposal could be improved upon, in order to balance social, environmental, economic, and equalities concerns, and minimise any negative implications.

It is not expected that you will have all of the answers at this point, but the responses you give here should form the basis of further investigation and encourage you to make changes to your proposal. Such changes are to be reported in the final section.

Taking into consideration your responses about all of the impacts of the project in its current form, what would you consider the overall impact to be on creating a fair, healthy, sustainable and resilient city?

- 5.1 Given the wide range of policy areas covered by the Local Plan and its over all vision which responds to the issues, opportunities and challenges facing the city it is considered that the plan will have a strongly positive impact overall on creating a fair, healthy, sustainable and resilient city.

What could be changed to improve the impact of the proposal on the One Planet principles? (please consider the questions you marked either mixed or negative, as well as any additional positive impacts that may be achievable)

- 5.2 Preparation of the Local Plan is part of an ongoing process that involves monitoring the success and progress of its policies. The process will make sure it is achieving its objectives and making necessary adjustments to the plan if the monitoring process reveals that changes are needed. This enables the plan to maintain sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. Furthermore, the plan is subject to ongoing Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment which appraises the plan and site allocations against a bespoke social, economic and environmental objectives to understand how the plan is contributing the sustainable development objectives for York.

What could be changed to improve the impact of the proposal on equalities and human rights? (please consider the questions you marked either mixed or negative, as well as any additional positive impacts that may be achievable)

- 5.3 No mixed or negative impacts on equality and human rights are considered likely.

Section 6: Planning for Improvement

23rd January 2018

What further evidence or consultation is needed to fully understand its impact? (e.g. consultation with specific communities of identity, additional data)

- 6.1 Members will use the recommendations to decide the future approach for the Local Plan which will then be subject to public consultation. A publication draft plan will then be prepared before being submitted to the secretary of state for examination.

6.2 **What are the outstanding actions needed to maximise benefits or minimise negative impacts in relation to this proposal?** Please include the action, the person(s) responsible and the date it will be completed (expand / insert more

Action	Person(s)	Due date

6.3 **Additional space to comment on the impacts**

Part 2

Section 1: Improvements

Part 2 builds on the impacts you identified in Part 1. Please detail how you have used this information to make improvements to your final proposal.

Please note that your response to question 1.4 in this section must be reported in the One Planet Council implications section of reports going to the Executive.

1.1	<p>For the areas in the 'One Planet' and 'Equalities' sections, where you were unsure of the potential impact, what have you done to clarify your understanding?</p> <p>Given the wide ranging policy areas covered in the plan and the process taken so far in preparing the plan there are inherent links and good understanding of the one planet principles and equalities.</p>
1.2	<p>What changes have you made to your proposal to increase positive impacts?</p> <p>No changes considered necessary, however the monitoring element of the local plan process will ensure the success and progress of the policies are able to adapt to changing circumstances. For example, air quality will be monitored to ensure new development does not result in poorer air quality.</p>
1.3	<p>What changes have you made to your proposal to reduce negative impacts?</p> <p>No negative impacts anticipated.</p>
1.4	<p>Taking into consideration everything you know about the proposal in its revised form, what would you consider the overall impact to be on creating a fair, healthy, sustainable and resilient city?</p> <p>Your response to this question must be input under the One Planet Council implications section of the Executive report. Please feel free to supplement this with any additional information gathered in the tool.</p> <p>Given the wide range of policy areas covered by the Local Plan and its over all vision which responds to the issues, opportunities and challenges facing the city it is considered that the plan will have a strongly positive impact overall on creating a fair, healthy, sustainable and resilient city.</p>
1.5	<p>Any further comments?</p>