

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| General | Comment – it would be useful if the Plan could reflect the economic opportunities associated with the FERA site on the York/Ryedale boundary. | 6/11643 | Ryedale District Council |
| | Comment – 20,000 Higher Education students is a total figure not an annual enrolment, to avoid confusion suggest ‘totalling’ not ‘generating’. Turnover of both universities in 2011/12 was £302m, funded from student tuition fees, research grants and other grants. The two universities generated 8,136 jobs locally in 2011/12; this is 9.2% of all jobs in the City of York Council area. The total income associated with these jobs is £379m. | 38/12915 | York St John University |
| | Objection – the plan should accept the baseline scenario and reject scenario 2. The plan is unrealistic and over-ambitious in the current economic climate. The plan should provide that alternative sites could be selected for the provision of employment land based on the sites that were submitted through the call for sites or alternative options put forward through this consultation process. | 59/12636 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Comment – plans to increase the number of jobs in York should aim to promote jobs in areas that increase the sustainability of the city. Jobs which encourage increased natural resources consumption or which lead to increase in greenhouse gas emissions should not be encouraged. | 90/12822 | Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale) |
| | Support – support the overall objective to encourage sustainable economic development. | 244/14134 | McArthur Glen Designer Outlet |
| | Comment – it is important that the local plan recognises the importance of sustainable tourism and maximising on visitor economy opportunities. There is no specific policy to this effect. | 550/16784 | |
| | Comment – not the council’s ambition for ‘the City of York to become an international and enterprising city, and in time, the most competitive city of its size, not only in the UK but globally, leading to increased growth in the overall economy and jobs’. To achieve such an ambition will require housing growth to match the Council’s economic ambitions as they are inextricably linked. The construction industry is an important contributor to the local economy and provides a significant amount of direct and indirect employment through the supply chain. The 2011 Employment Topic Paper identified by 2021 construction, transport and other sectors could account for more than 20,000 direct jobs in the area. More ambitious housing targets will further increase this value source of employment. | 673/16844 | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd |
| | Comment - where are the jobs going to come from? All the industries have gone from York. York is a tourist town and nothing more than this. | 1045/81 | |
| | Objection – scenario 2 is wildly optimistic. | 1109/17183 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|------------|---|
| General Continued | Comment - how are you going to encourage new jobs for increased population? | 1272/212 | |
| | Support – welcome the Council’s ambition for York to become a ‘top five’ UK city and a ‘top ten’ mid-sized European city, also support the vision for York: ‘to become an international and enterprising city, and in time, the most competitive of its size, not only in the UK but globally, leading to increased growth in the overall economy and jobs’. The prompt delivery of the sites and infrastructure identified through the Local Plan will be crucial to achieve these ambitions. | 1523/17497 | Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd |
| | Comment – the preferred approach ignores other areas of employment that have real potential for economic growth: Specialist building growth and renewable energy and low-carbon technology. | 1665/12945 | York Environment Forum |
| | Objection – ‘Local Context’ should be revised to add the contributions of direct and indirect employment generated, total employment generated, revenue and capital spend in the city, the long term contributions of the local economy and direct activities in business start-ups and nurturing. | 1673/17643 | University of York |
| | Comment – any justification which argues upon growth around the attraction of hi tech/service industries which would require accommodation for staff is tenuous. | 1884/4 | |
| | Comment – the rationale behind the desire to see York advance in line with Scenario 2 is attractive but relies heavily on factors which the city cannot control, though it can encourage the environment for their development. Much depends on government policy and funding which may be directed towards already successful, but equally not. The sites chosen as priority areas for development show a presumption in favour of tertiary and quaternary sector growth which is difficult to foresee and predict and which tends to be footloose and often short term. | 2416/6599 | |
| | Support - supportive of the approach. | 3356/8567 | |
| | Objection – the plan is unrealistic and over ambitious in the current economic climate. There is also a danger that over ambition for economic growth would change the special characteristics of York. | 5178/12458 | |
| | Objection – over enthusiastic growth forecasts, the uncertainties created by the plan will deter investors. Investors and job seekers are attracted to York as it is now. | 6296/17236 | |
| | Comment – York will struggle to attract “advanced Manufacturing” as it no longer has a skill base in this area. | 6508/17662 | City Of York Council Conservative Group |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Site E3 Ford Garage, Jockey Lane | Objection – the proposed preferred options allocation of the site for B1 (a) office use, the site should be allocated for retail and associated “A” uses. | 4811/12125 | |
| | Objection – totally against any future developments in or around Huntington. Before any further development for shopping centres the outer ring road needs priority for a dual carriage way and also the A4 to Scarborough there is congestion at peak times. | 6025/15428 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Site E4 Land At Layerthorpe | Comment –This should be considered for other uses as well, such as retail and residential (student accommodation) | 6507/16280 | City Of York Council Property Services |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington | Objection – impact on amenity of existing residential property. Site extends along the boundary of the Hassacarr Nature Reserve, development adjacent to this would impact on this important habitat. Site lies beyond the existing boundaries of Chessingham Park and would intrude into open countryside. Site forms a buffer between existing industrial park and residential property in the village. Site is green belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change in its status. | 59/12640 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Objection – totally inappropriate, too close to Hassacarr Nature Reserve. | 1109/17182 | |
| | Objection – Proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, proximity to existing properties on Hassacarr Lane, intrude into the open countryside, greenbelt location. | 1457/17399 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr Nature Reserve, adversely affecting the vast amount of flora and fauna. | 1898/6045 | |
| | Objection – the proposals by the Council will lead to urban sprawl to the village, with the village ending up like other villages in the York area. | 1913/98 | |
| | Objection - will adversely affect nature reserve’s bird population obstructing their flight path. Why has Council not undertaken proper background work ahead of making this proposal? | 2335/3286 | |
| | Objection – going to have an impact on the Hassacarr Nature Reserve, the protected species that inhabit it and the waterways surrounding. Will affect land and waterways that drain water away Dunnington Village. Unresolved draining issues in the village. Extra traffic on Common Lane (and its junction with Hull Road) is not welcome particularly if involving additional heavy lorry movements. Seems to be little or no focus on the actual needs of businesses in the area, the specific job creation opportunities being envisaged to match the skills of the local workforce, and why further units are needed in this location? | 2349/6533 | |
| | Objection – adverse affect on Hassacarr Lane, already many empty units on chessingham park. | 2515/6798 | |
| | Objection – object to the proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve and a large number of units remain empty on Chessingham park. | 2516/6800 | |
| | Objection – adverse impact on nature reserve’s bird population and flight path. | 2543/4393 | |
| | Objection – extension will have detrimental effect on nature reserve and visual approach to the village. | 2556/6878 | |
| | Objection – adverse impact on nature reserve’s bird population and flight path. | 2593/6944 | |
| | Objection – surface drainage issues, sewerage system over loaded, change character and impact on geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity, increase in traffic and congestion. | 2594/6949 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – opposed to encroaching on the greenbelt, vacant units on Chessingham park, adversely affect Hassacarr nature reserve. | 2642/7002 | |
| | Objection – Chessingham Park trading estate setting aside the already known problems with traffic and the urgent need to improve the function Common road/Hull road. Chessingham park has several unused units and pieces of land that are nothing more than waste ground. Further development here at present is totally unnecessary. | 2661/7048 | |
| | Objection – will affect Hassacarr nature reserves bird population. | 2666/7058 | |
| | Objection – surface drainage issues, sewerage system over loaded, change character and impact on geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity, increase in traffic and congestion. | 2679/7114 | |
| | Objection – surface drainage issues, sewerage system over loaded, change character and impact on geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity, increase in traffic and congestion. | 2682/7124 | |
| | Objection – units still for sale and rent, land around Hassacarr nature reserve should be allowed to remain in it s present state. | 2711/7191 | |
| | Objection – increase in traffic would have serious consequences in terms of both highway congestion and road and pedestrian safety. | 2736/7251 | |
| | Objection – affect Hassacarr nature reserves bird population. | 2740/7259 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve and green belt location. | 2746/7271 | |
| | Objection – already plenty of vacant properties at Chessingham park. | 2761/7298 | |
| | Objection - There needs to be assurance that the extent of the development in terms of additional building has absolutely no impact on the Hassacarr Nature Reserve, The type of industry needs to be in keeping with other established businesses. That is to say there should be no other adverse impact on the environment in terms of the day to day operations. Can the City Of York Council demonstrate what impact the increase in business traffic will have on the village? That is, will larger vehicles be restricted from travelling through the centre of the village unnecessarily? How will traffic to and from Common Road and the A1079 be managed effectively and what consideration has been given to other road users in respect of safety in and around this area particularly given that there is a children’s nursery in the vicinity. | 2778/7353 | |
| | Objection - there is further concern for the residents whose visual amenity will be affected and for the large increase in additional traffic into the village along narrow country lanes. the closeness of Hassacarr Nature Reserve. This would greatly affect the large variety of rare species that live in this area. | 2779/7360 | |
| | Comment - there is a need to grow to provide employment and energy for the future. | 2793/7410 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 2812/7467 | |
| | Objection – surface water drainage issues, sewerage system issues, affect the character and aspect of the village, roads and junctions currently under pressure, increase demand for parking. | 2836/7511 | |
| | Objection – entry/exit junction on common land will be further congested, proximity to nature reserve. | 2842/7533 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 2909/7623 | |
| | Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic caused by the extra building will add to the chaos on local roads and the proposed building will cause flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields. | 2915/7639 | |
| | Objection – too close to Hassacarr Nature Reserve and would adversely affect the biodiversity. | 2939/7683 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr Nature Reserve, further development would have to be seriously considered so as not to impact on the flora and fauna. | 2941/7693 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 2947/7707 | |
| | Objection – attract unwanted road traffic to this area and additional control measures would be required to deal with it. Proximity to nature reserve. | 2956/7714 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. Has educational value. | 2957/7721 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, increase in traffic and congestion, risk of flooding and drainage issues, contaminated water as a result of run off. | 2984/3994 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, increase in traffic and congestion, risk of flooding and drainage issues, contaminated water as a result of run off. | 2985/3995 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr Nature reserve and its wealth of wildlife, educationally valuable, encroach on the village and damage the landscape, flight lines for birds would be impeded, buildings would keep out light and airflow needed for the ponds, unique habitat and landscape. | 3100/7995 | |
| | Objection – the village does not have the resources for any more development. | 3123/8049 | |
| | Objection – the village has reached its limit and local amenities are stretched enough. | 3146/8103 | |
| | Objection – too close to Hassacarr nature reserve and will have an adverse effect. | 3169/8155 | |
| | Objection – there is spare capacity in already-built units on the estate, so there is no need for further building, though there is need in the York area for more high-value employment opportunities. | 3172/8161 | |
| Objection – nature reserve needs to be protected from any development. | 3244/8321 | | |
| Objection – located in the green belt, already empty units, proximity to Hassacarr | 3262/8380 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| | nature reserve, part of the open aspect leading into the village, bring increased traffic nearer to the village. | | |
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3290/8439 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3291/8447 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3306/8480 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3307/8482 | |
| | Objection – Dunnington will be consumed into York’s Urban sprawl, loss of identity and community, impact on Hassacarr nature reserve, drainage issues. | 3310/8490 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3324/8508 | |
| | Objection – adversely affect biodiversity at Hassacarr nature reserve, increase traffic volumes, industrial activity encroaching on the village. | 3368/8640 | |
| | Objection – it is on the opposite side of common road and should not be developed, there are vacant units, is there proven need for more units. | 3383/6058 | |
| | Objection – adversely affect Hassacarr nature reserve’s bird population as buildings would obstruct their flight path. | 3400/8707 | |
| | Objection – concerned about the increase in traffic from an industrial proposal. | 3424/8746 | |
| | Objection – inappropriate in the greenbelt, surplus capacity already. | 3431/8756 | |
| | Objection – numerous empty properties on existing industrial land, issue of traffic volume. | 3434/8767 | |
| | Objection – numerous empty units, no need for more. | 3446/8828 | |
| | Objection – numerous empty properties on existing industrial land, issue of traffic volume. | 3464/8897 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3477/8917 | |
| | Objection – affect Hassacarr nature reserves bird population. | 3509/9425 | |
| | Objection – more disturbance to the traffic flow along common lane, proximity to Hassacarr Nature Reserve. | 3537/9492 | |
| | Objection – affect Hassacarr nature reserves bird population. | 3545/9506 | |
| | Objection – increased traffic, proximity to nature reserve. | 3589/9563 | |
| | Objection – risk of flooding, major investment needed for roads, water and sewerage capacity. | 3610/9605 | |
| Objection – surface drainage issues, sewerage system over loaded, change character and impact on geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity, increase in traffic and congestion. | 3679/9699 | | |
| Objection – vacant units at present, located in the flight path of birds. | 3689/9724 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3751/10147 | |
| | Objection – proposed buildings would obstruct bird’s flight path and adversely affect the nature reserves bird population. | 3756/10155 | |
| | Objection – proposed buildings would obstruct bird’s flight path and adversely affect the nature reserves bird population. | 3798/10232 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3816/10267 | |
| | Objection – serious detrimental effect on Hassacarr Reserve. | 3817/10271 | |
| | Objection – proximity to nature reserve, surface water management issues, unused units exists. | 3823/10294 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve and village. | 3829/6472 | |
| | Objection – Hassacarr nature reserve is precious and irreplaceable, development must be halted. | 3853/10352 | |
| | Objection – issues with speeding traffic in this area already, flooding, drainage and sewerage issues. | 3862/10377 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 3863/10379 | |
| | Comment – has work been done to see how many empty units there are? If development went ahead traffic lights would be needed at the end of common road and industrial traffic banned from the village. | 3871/10399 | |
| | Objection – proximity to nature reserve, affect the immense variety of flora, fauna. | 3932/10473 | |
| | Objection – proximity to nature reserve, affect the immense variety of flora, fauna. | 3934/10481 | |
| | Objection – site is too large and location is too close to Hassacarr Nature Reserve, additional traffic. | 3941/10491 | |
| | Objection – Hassacarr is identified as a sensitive site by the council’s planning department, planning permission was denied for an extension to Hassacarr house, greenbelt location, and impact on the local community. | 3944/10498 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 3952/10517 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, obstruct the flight path of bird populations using the nature reserve, flora and fauna will be affected, a survey must be carried out to establish the affects of such developments, vacant units in the are currently. | 3955/10529 | |
| Objection – Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) should be protected from loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. | 4009/10629 | | |
| Objection – SINC should be protected from loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. | 4010/10631 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – proximity of Hassacarr Nature Reserve, previous planning applications have been refused. | 4034/10672 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr Nature reserve and will affect the endangered species. Valuable educational resource. | 4045/10705 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, SINC site, encroach into t a much needed buffer, increase traffic and impact on pedestrian safety. | 4148/4866 | |
| | Objection – proximity to the village, traffic increase, roads not suitable for large trucks and vehicles, proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, key visual gateway to the village, drainage, flooding and sewerage issues. | 4227/10984 | |
| | Objection – proximity to nature reserve and affect on flora, fauna and rare species. | 4252/11025 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4256/11034 | |
| | Objection – proximity to nature reserve, contributes to urban sprawl, diminish green corridor and buffer. | 4257/11044 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4261/11050 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4265/11058 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, interfere with bird flight paths. | 4270/11078 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4337/11253 | |
| | Objection – supporting paper does not give adequate consideration to the impact any works would have on the adjacent nature reserve. | 4352/11278 | |
| | Objection – supporting paper does not give adequate consideration to the impact any works would have on the adjacent nature reserve. | 4353/11283 | |
| | Comment – existing premises are empty, could these not be re-used? | 4384/6464 | |
| | Objection – impacts adversely on the village and location is a green belt buffer. | 4387/11368 | |
| | Objection – seems a wasteful use of land as some units are vacant at present, all units should be used before expansion is considered? | 4472/11487 | |
| | Objection – seems a wasteful use of land as some units are vacant at present, all units should be used before expansion is considered? | 4473/11488 | |
| | Objection – improvements need to be made to the roads before any development is considered. | 4502/11531 | |
| | Objection – there is already a large industrial estate, other brownfield sites should be used first. | 4503/11537 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4509/11538 | |
| | 4510/11539 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4512/11541 | |
| | 4517/11542 | | |
| | 4524/11543 | | |
| | 4525/11544 | | |
| | 4527/11545 | | |
| | 4530/11546 | | |
| | 4546/11549 | | |
| | 4548/11550 | | |
| | 4549/11555 | | |
| | 4550/11556 | | |
| | 4553/11557 | | |
| | 4554/11558 | | |
| | 4555/11559 | | |
| | 4557/11560 | | |
| | 4563/11561 | | |
| | 4565/11562 | | |
| | 4575/11563 | | |
| | 4582/5990 | | |
| | 4583/11566 | | |
| | 4585/11567 | | |
| | 4593/11574 | | |
| | 4606/11575 | | |
| | 4621/11576 | | |
| Objection – buffer between commercial and village areas, proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, impact on openness and character of village, significant visual impact, poor drainage, flood risk, productive agricultural land. | 4626/11578 | | |
| Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4628/11583 | | |
| Objection – affect the bird population of the nature reserve, the site is on a floodplain, and has surface water drainage issues. | 4747/12031 | | |
| Objection – no demand for more industrial units. | 4782/12080 | | |
| Objection – adverse effects on flora and fauna of the nature reserve | 4796/12093 | | |
| Objection – adverse effects on flora and fauna of the nature reserve | 4798/12102 | | |
| Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4845/12160 | | |
| 4852/12161 | | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|------------|---------------------------------------|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4856/12162 | |
| | 4867/12163 | | |
| | 4870/12164 | | |
| | 4871/12165 | | |
| | 4887/12168 | | |
| | 4888/12169 | | |
| | 4894/12170 | | |
| | 4895/12171 | | |
| | 4898/12172 | | |
| | 4904/12173 | | |
| | 4913/12174 | | |
| | 4917/12175 | | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, interfere with bird flight paths. | 4931/12176 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 4935/12178 | |
| | 4938/12179 | | |
| | 4944/12180 | | |
| | 4973/12181 | | |
| | 4978/12182 | | |
| | 4979/12183 | | |
| | 4980/12184 | | |
| | 4984/12185 | | |
| | 4986/12186 | | |
| | 4988/12187 | | |
| | 4992/12188 | | |
| | 5007/12189 | | |
| | 5019/12190 | | |
| | 5026/12191 | | |
| | 5030/12192 | | |
| 5031/12193 | | | |
| 5042/12194 | | | |
| 5043/12195 | | | |
| 5050/12196 | | | |
| 5051/12197 | | | |
| 5053/12198 | | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|------------|---------------------------------------|
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 5054/12199 | |
| | | 5055/12200 | |
| | | 5056/12201 | |
| | | 5057/12202 | |
| | | 5060/12203 | |
| | | 5062/12204 | |
| | Objection – nature reserve must be protected from any kind of development. | 5099/12205 | |
| | Objection – evidence base must take full account of the environmental impact of such development. | 5174/12316 | |
| | Objection –proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, proximity to existing properties on Hassacarr Lane, intrude into the open countryside, greenbelt location. | 5178/12338 | |
| | Objection – supporting paper does not provide adequate consideration of the environmental impact of any works near the nature reserve. | 5181/12380 | |
| | Objection – impact on visual appearance to the village and impact on the nature area next to it. | 5191/12409 | |
| | Comment – further development of the industrial area could be acceptable with the proviso of compatibility with existing light industry and a green ethos given proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. It is to be noted, however, that there is currently more space than needed. | 5208/12436 | |
| | Objection – the proposal for light industry on Common Lane will adversely affect Hassacarr Nature reserve’s bird population as the buildings would obstruct their flight path. The nature reserve has a rich diversity of plants and animals and should be protected. | 5229/12526 | |
| | Objection – the village needs to be protected against further industrial development. | 5258/14345 | |
| Objection – vacant units at present, encroach on the green belt, increase in traffic, village needs to retain its green setting. | 5294/14427 | | |
| Objection – create problems for birds. Preserving the rich diversity of plants and animals should be a very high priority in the Local Plan. | 5300/14448 | | |
| Objection – Affect the Nature Reserve’s bird population due to proposed buildings obstructing their flight path, detrimental visual impact on entering the village, increase in traffic. | 5309/14470 | | |
| Objection – the site E6 as well as the land on the other side of Hassacarr Lane provides a buffer zone between commercial/business areas and the residential areas of Dunnington. This buffer zone is recognised as maintaining the openness and character | 5377/14590 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| | of the village and should be maintained. | | |
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – the proposal for light industry on Common Lane will adversely affect Hassacarr Nature reserve’s bird population as the buildings would obstruct their flight path. The nature reserve has a rich diversity of plants and animals and should be protected. | 5649/13286 | |
| | Objection – located in the greenbelt, the proposal for light industry on Common Lane will adversely affect Hassacarr Nature reserve’s bird population as the buildings would obstruct their flight path. | 5849/13844 | |
| | Objection – would have an extremely serious effect on the nature reserve, there at least 18 empty units which have never been occupied. | 5877/15165 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 5989/15368 | |
| | Objection – close to an establish nature reserve, which could suffer detrimental effects, any further development at this site should be restricted to ground level, to protect the diversity of bird and animal life at the reserve. | 6059/15509 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve. | 6067/15531 | |
| | | 6079/15532 | |
| | | 6080/15533 | |
| | | 6081/15534 | |
| | | 6107/15535 | |
| | | 6117/15539 | |
| | | 6118/15540 | |
| | 6119/15541 | | |
| Objection – feel they would both be detrimental to the character and appearance of the entrance of Dunnington. The existing office blocks and industrial site are set on the edge towards the Hull Road, which is acceptable but not ideal. Fear the nature reserve would be put at risk if these plans were to go ahead. Common Rd already has problems with fast traffic, overflow verge parking from sports club users and traffic turning in and out of the sports club and tennis club further along. Therefore, do not understand why the E6 proposal could be under consideration. | 6129/5989 | | |
| Comment – concerned about any development in the village that is likely to increase traffic in the centre of the village. | 6148/15630 | | |
| Objection – proximity to the Hassacarr Nature Reserve, remove it from this classification. | 6234/15803 | | |
| Objection – too close to Hassacarr Nature Reserve and would adversely affect the | 6242/6165 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| | immense variety of flora and fauna, including rare species of dragonfly and butterfly. | | |
| Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued | Objection – would be seriously detrimental to the Hassacarr Nature Reserve. Further building adjoining the reserve along one side will diminish its visual attractiveness, disturb its quiet. Contribute to making Common Road an undesirable ‘string development’. | 6257/6186 | |
| | Objection – want to be able to carry on teaching my children names of plants, insects and animals without having to resort to going deep into the country every weekend. All of the proposed land is green belt. Building so many houses will increase traffic to a seriously dangerous level. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident. What plans are in place for traffic control in and out of the village? The grass verges are already overflowing on a nightly basis, dangerous situation with cars and pole crossing. What are the plans to expand the primary school? | 6264/15839 | |
| | Objection – must be protected from any development close by including the extension of the business park termed E6. | 6301/15937 | |
| | Objection – opposed to the sites proximity to the Hassacarr Nature Reserve and the much increased traffic at the Common Road/A10789 junction apply. | 6328/6206 | |
| | Objection – the proposal for light industry on Common Lane will adversely affect the nature reserve’s bird population. | 6468/16190 | |
| | Objection – the nature reserve is well thought of by experts from York University and other conservation groups so must be protected from any development close by including the extension of the business park termed E6. | 6480/16205 | |
| | Objection –the nature reserve is well thought of by experts from York University and other conservation groups so must be protected from any development close by including the extension of the business park termed E6. | 6490/16216 | |
| | Objection – oppose the development of site E6 Common Road Dunnington. This field forms an important part of the buffer between the industrial estate and Dunnington village. It also adds to the open aspect of the southern entrance to the village. It forms a vital part of the flight path of birds coming to Hassacarr Nature Reserve and any building on it would be detrimental to the nature reserve and the environment. | 6519/16490 | Cllr Jenny Brooks |
| | Objection – it is important to preserve what remains. Must be protected from any development close by including the extension of the business park termed E6. | 6524/16514 | |
| | Objection – site will harm the amenity of the surrounding area. This site is not acceptable to develop. It is a greenfield next to Hassacarr Nature Reserve. The rural character of the village and openness will be changed if the industrial area is extended. If this field is covered in hard standing the management of surface water for the whole | Petition 20 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| | village will be very difficult. This development is unnecessary as there were about 24000 square feet of unused office and storage space in Chessingham Park in June 2013. | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Site E7 Wheldrake Industrial Estate | Comment – would have little impact on villagers as it is on the edge, backing onto farm land. | 4086/10773 | |
| | Comment – need to improve the infrastructure before any development goes ahead. | 4162/10886 | |
| | Objection – village is a conservation area to preserve the historic nature, development would be detrimental to the appearance of the village. | 4753/12052 | |
| | Support – will bring employment to the village. | 5560/13041 | |
| | Support –provision for light industrial on the same industrial area but away from the main entry point into the village. | 5616/13202 | |
| | Support – will bring employment to the village. | 5810/13749 | |
| | | 5872/15154 | |
| 5883/15177 | | | |
| Objection – Proposed development at end of village, on piece of land in front of the industrial complex, why build more units when there already empty one there! Destroy the initial view of the Village to visitors. There are plenty of these sites in York, that being the derelict building on Piccadilly. | 6209/15745 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Site E8 Wheldrake Industrial Estate | Objection - loss of high grade agricultural land needs significant consideration and request notification of intention to develop and reasons given. | 1742/2126 | NFU |
| | Objection – to develop the section adjacent to the road on the approach to the village would be an absolute eyesore and not in keeping with the rural aspect of the village, when there is excellent suitable land to the rear of the existing industrial development which would have so much less impact on the surroundings. | 3547/9511 | |
| | Objection – very close to the main road into the village and would affect people close to it as well as potentially looking unsightly. | 4086/10774 | |
| | Objection – located at western gateway of the village, important conservation area, detrimental effect on the village as a whole. | 4117/10819 | |
| | Comment – need to improve the infrastructure before any development goes ahead. | 4162/10887 | |
| | Objection – village is a conservation area to preserve the historic nature, development would be detrimental to the appearance of the village. | 4753/12053 | |
| | Objection – visual impact it will have on the approach into Wheldrake. | 5560/13040 | |
| | Objection – loss of the grassed area at the “entrance” to the village. | 5616/13201 | |
| | Objection – visual impact it will have on the approach into Wheldrake. | 5810/13748 | |
| | | 5872/15153 | |
| | | 5883/15176 | |
| Objection – proposed development at end of village, on piece of land in front of the industrial complex, why build more units when there already empty one there! Destroy the initial view of the Village to visitors. There are plenty of these sites in York, that being the derelict building on Piccadilly. | 6209/15744 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| Site E9 Elvington Industrial Estate | Objection – E9 measures 1ha and has the potential to offer 3980 sq m of floor space but this is not sufficient to meet demand for the Airfield Business Park from businesses looking to locate to the south and east of York other than in a central or northern locations. The evidence base and the local plan do not however recognise local markets within York or where pressures from demand derive from, which is a failing of the Local Plan. There is simple not spatial analysis of whether the Plan will respond to demand. | 1674/9757 | William Birch & Sons |
| | Objection – narrow and poor access, increased traffic and congestion, main sewerage and surface water drainage at capacity. | 3532/9482 | |
| | Objection – add to existing congestion, road surfaces are poor, narrow access roads, surface and sewerage drainage issues, a weight limit should be applied to Sutton bridge to limit access to village. | 3539/9497 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington | Objection – add traffic to roads in already poor condition, a weight limit should be applied to Sutton Bridge to limit the traffic accessing the village, surface water and sewerage issues. | 3598/9582 | |
| | Objection - infrastructure in Elvington is already at full capacity. It includes school, GP, B1228 road and anti-flood systems which are not always could protect village from flood. Infrastructure which needs investment even without proposed development. | 3936/10485 | |
| | Objection – the industrial estates in Elvington do not seem to employ local people and people working thee do not seem to use village facilities to a great extend. An extension would increase traffic and have a detrimental effect on the character of the village. | 5321/14492 | |
| | Objection – increase of articulated vehicles adding pressure to a B road. | 5592/13117 | |
| | Support – appropriate development on this land. Site lies within the existing Chessingham Park industrial area, appears derelict and therefore is in need of development. | 59/12641 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Support – allocation E10 is acceptable. | 1109/17184 | |
| | Support – Appropriate development on this land, lies within the existing Chessingham park industrial area, appears neglected and therefore is in need of development. | 1457/17400 | |
| | Objection – The proposals by the Council will lead to urban sprawl to the village, with the village ending up like other villages in the York area. | 1913/99 | |
| | Objection – Going to have an impact on the Hassacarr Nature Reserve, the protected species that inhabit it and the waterways surrounding. Will affect land and waterways that drain water away Dunnington Village. Unresolved draining issues in the village. Extra traffic on Common Lane (and its junction with Hull Road) is not welcome particularly if involving additional heavy lorry movements. Seems to be little or no focus on the actual needs of businesses in the area, the specific job creation opportunities being envisaged to match the skills of the local workforce, and why further units are needed in this location? | 2349/6534 | |
| | Support – most appropriate site for an extension if needed. | 2556/6879 | |
| | Objection – surface drainage issues, sewerage system over loaded, change character and impact on geological features, ancient native hedgerows and productive agricultural activity, increase in traffic and congestion. | 2594/6950 | |
| | Support – Development of this site would make sense, allowing an untied, unused area to become viable. | 2642/7003 | |
| Objection - Chessingham Park trading estate setting aside the already known problems with traffic and the urgent need to improve the function Common road/Hull road. | 2661/7047 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| | Chessingham park has several unused units and pieces of land that are nothing more than waste ground. Further development here at present is totally unnecessary. | | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – surface water drainage issues, flood risk, problematic sewerage system, encroach on the green open spaces, roads and junctions are already under pressure, development will increase the number of users and add to safety risks. | 2679/7115 | |
| | Objection – surface water drainage issues, flood risk, problematic sewerage system, encroach on the green open spaces, roads and junctions are already under pressure, development will increase the number of users and add to safety risks. | 2682/7125 | |
| | Objection – any increase to the industrial site cannot be justified while several units are for sale or let. It is essential that the land close to Hassacarr Nature reserve is protected. | 2711/7192 | |
| | Comment – the existing area has quite a few units to buy rent at present, why do we need more? | 2750/7276 | |
| | Comment – needs to be assurance that the extent of the development in terms of additional building has absolutely not impact on the nature reserve. The type of industry needs to be in keeping with other established businesses with no adverse environmental impacts, the potential increase of traffic should be demonstrated to the village and managed effectively to ensure safety. | 2778/7354 | |
| | Support – there is a need to grow to provide employment and energy for the future. | 2793/7411 | |
| | Comment – Dunnington is a very popular village to live in now. The extra traffic caused by the extra building will add to the chaos on local roads and the proposed building will cause flooding on Common Road and the surrounding fields. | 2915/7640 | |
| | Support – there is some space not being used, which if cleared could be used. | 2957/7722 | |
| | Objection – greenbelt area, site is a vital part of village life, character and nature, site is an important visual gateway to the village, proximity to the nature reserve, increase in traffic, lack of footpath. | 3080/7955 | |
| | Objection all further building developments with the village as these cannot be sustained and the village does not have the resources for such large developments. | 3123/8050 | |
| | Objection – any development would be detrimental to the traditional way of life in Dunnington, local amenities are stretched to the limit. | 3146/8104 | |
| | Objection – proximity to Hassacarr nature reserve, sever connectivity to other high quality habitat areas, increased traffic. | 3310/8491 | |
| Support – developed provided it does not encroach on or destroy the integrity of the nature reserve. | 3383/6057 | | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Comment – there are at present numerous empty properties on the existing industrial areas, however should demand exceed supply in the future the issue of traffic volume will be critical. | 3434/8768 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – increase in traffic, there are at present numerous empty properties on the existing industrial areas, however should demand exceed supply in the future the issue of traffic volume will be critical | 3464/8898 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Comment – all sites require major investment for roads, water and sewerage beyond present capacity. | 3610/9606 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – surface water drainage issues, flood risk, problematic sewerage system, encroach on the green open spaces, roads and junctions are already under pressure, development will increase the number of users and add to safety risks. | 3679/9700 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – adversely affect Hassacarr Nature reserve’s bird population as the buildings would obstruct their flight path, the nature reserve has a rich diversity of plants and animals. | 3756/11762 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – adversely affect Hassacarr Nature reserve’s bird population as the buildings would obstruct their flight path, the nature reserve has a rich diversity of plants and animals. | 3798/10238 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support – the site is an eyesore and will be much better if tied up and built on. | 3823/10295 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support – the site E10 should definitely be tidied up and used for further light industry/storage if required. | 3829/6473 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – while the generation of more employment opportunities is to be applauded, I have concerns about infrastructure and increased traffic. No more industrial sites should be considered unless the infrastructure is in place to cope with it. Any further development on Chessingham park will also further endanger the wildlife conservation area at Hassacarr Nature Reserve. It is too close to Hassacarr. | 3952/10518 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support – This is a derelict piece of land which requires improvement. | 4257/11043 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support – proposal is acceptable. | 4261/11051 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support – agree to the proposal. | 4270/11079 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support - would be the most suitable proposal, as it will offer employment in the area, and therefore being of benefit to the village. Further employment would benefit the local amenities (library, village shops and public houses) that hold the village together. This can therefore be seen as a benefit. | 5149/12280 | |
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Support - the site lies within the existing Chessingham Park industrial area, appears neglected and therefore is in need of development. | 5178/12339 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued | Objection – the village needs to be protected against any further industrial development. | 5258/14346 | |
| | Objection –the existing trade areas are not fully utilised so why do we need to encroach on green belt areas that define the village at this time. If all the current space is used it still will increase traffic in an already congested area particularly when trying to exit on to the A1079. | 5294/14428 | |
| | Comment – should note the units at Hassacarr Industrial Park (the Simpsons place) that have been unoccupied since they were constructed five years ago be put into use, along with one or two other units in that area that appear to be unoccupied before considerations are made to expand the complex? | 5341/14529 | |
| | Support – land should be developed providing its use is not heavy industry. | 5377/14591 | |
| | Objection – there is enough industry in Dunnington and that the traffic through the village at the 5pm rush hour will be a cause for concern. People leaving the industrial estates travel at speed through the village to access the A1079 road. Equally there is a long wait to exit onto the A1079 from common road. Increased commercial premises will only exacerbate the problem. | 5623/13234 | |
| | Objection – will spoil the character and appearance of the village, proximity to Hassacarr Nature Reserve and impact on wildlife. | 6148/15631 | |
| | Support – this would be an excellent place to develop. It is an eyesore at the moment and will be much better tidied up and built on. | Petition 20 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Site E11 Annamine Nurseries, Jockey Lane | Objection – Policy EMP2 should be amended to include office use in the range of use that can be accommodated on the former Annamine Nursery site. | 532/16696 | Shepherd Group Properties Ltd |
| Site E11 Annamine Nurseries, Jockey Lane | Objection – totally against any future developments in or around Huntington. Before any further development for shopping centres the outer ring road needs priority for a dual carriage way and also the A4 to Scarborough there is congestion at peak times. | 6025/15429 | |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Site E12 Land At York Business Park | Objection –the proposed A1237 Outer ring road housing proposals represent such “development sprawl”, swallowing up land around Monks Cross, Haxby, Wigginton, Strensall, Skelton and land to the north of Haxby, on land north of Clifton Moor and on land south of Strensall, allowing further Urban spread to occur. | 3428/8784 | |
| | Objection – land at Northminster Business Park or York Business Park should be allocated for a freight transshipment centre in connection with the proposed Low Emission Zone for the city centre. | 6518/16377 | York Green Party |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Site E13 End Of Great North Way | Objection –the proposed A1237 Outer ring road housing proposals represent such “development sprawl”, swallowing up land around Monks Cross, Haxby, Wigginton, Strensall, Skelton and land to the north of Haxby, on land north of Clifton Moor and on land south of Strensall, allowing further Urban spread to occur. | 3428/8785 | |
| | Objection –land at Northminster Business Park or York Business Park should be allocated for a freight transshipment centre in connection with the proposed Low Emission Zone for the city centre. | 6518/16378 | York Green Party |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Site E14 Site To The South Of York Business Park | Objection –the proposed A1237 Outer ring road housing proposals represent such “development sprawl”, swallowing up land around Monks Cross, Haxby, Wigginton, Strensall, Skelton and land to the north of Haxby, on land north of Clifton Moor and on land south of Strensall, allowing further Urban spread to occur. | 3428/8786 | |
| | Objection – land at Northminster Business Park or York Business Park should be allocated for a freight transshipment centre in connection with the proposed Low Emission Zone for the city centre. | 6518/16379 | York Green Party |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|
| Policy EMP3 Economic Growth In The Health And Social Care Sectors | Objection – the requirement for well connected and designed green infrastructure is not mentioned in this policy. Green Infrastructure in employment areas can have the same value as in housing areas with a wide range of ecosystems services being provided. | 42/11709 | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| | Support – the plan should provide generic local criteria to guide economic growth in the health and social care sectors. | 59/12637 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Support – welcome a specific policy to deal with the need to ensure the expansion of existing health and social care facilities and also the provision of new health and social care facilities, however there is concern that it is left to developers to identify the needs for residential care homes, and provision is to be catered for through the proposed housing allocations. The Council should identify in advance this need and set out specific proposals to meet that need. Policy could be included with community facilities chapter rather than employment chapter of the local land; this would assist with emphasis on the matter. | 1346/17303 | Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust |
| | Support – the plan should provide generic local criteria to guide economic growth in the health and social care sectors. | 1457/17396 5178/12335 | |
| | Support – yes to economic growth in Health and Social Care Sectors. | 6508/17663 | City Of York Council Conservative Group |
| | Support – provision should also be made in the major housing developments for local community health centres to minimise the need for travel into the centre. | 6518/16380 | York Green Party |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Policy EMP4 Loss Of Employment Land | Objection – the requirement for well connected and designed green infrastructure is not mentioned in this policy. Green infrastructure in employment areas can have the same value as in housing areas with a wide range of ecosystems services being provided. | 42/11710 | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| | Support – we accept the preferred approach. The plan should provide local level criteria to protect existing employment sites. | 59/12638 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Objection – policy unsound as contrary to national policy, it restricts the use of employment sites unless several criteria can be overcome with no regard to the sites continued viability for employment use. The council’s most recent Employment Land Review dates back to 2007; it is therefore questionable whether such a review undertaken during different economic conditions is still fit for purpose. This policy places additional and unnecessary burden upon the developer for which the National Planning Policy Framework does not provide a justification. Delete the first 3 criteria from the policy and replace with criteria which assess applications for alternative uses of land or buildings on employment sites on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities. | 145/13863 | Home Builders Federation |
| | Objection – object to how inflexible policy EMP4 is to allow non-employment uses on employment land and it is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 22. The criteria at policy EMP4 restricts the use of employment sites unless several strict criteria can be overcome with no regard to the site’s continued viability for employment use, Object to the Council requiring a statement is provided by a developer demonstrating that the criteria at Policy EMP4 is met before determining whether the loss of employment land is warranted. The Council’s most recent Employment Land Review was undertaken in two stages, in 2007 and 2009. It is questionable whether such a review is up to date and robust. | 659/15078 | Persimmon Homes |
| | Objection – contrary to national policy. Policy restricts the use of employment sites unless several criteria can be overcome with no regard to the sites continued viability for employment use. It needs to be more flexible. The policy places the burden of proof upon developers to identify; There is no need for the site to be retained for employment purposes either in qualitative or quantitative terms and is therefore redundant; There is a clear need for the proposed land use(s) in this locality; and There are no suitable alternative sites; within the locality, to meet the identified need of the proposed development. It is local authorities’ responsibility to keep its employment land portfolio up to date and undertake regular reviews. The Council’s | 673/16843 | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|--|-------------|---|
| | most recent Employment Land Review dates back to 2007, it is therefore questionable whether such a review undertaken during different economic conditions, is still fit for purpose. Policy EMP4 places additional and unnecessary burden upon the developer. Impact of the current policy will be to ensure sites no longer required for employment uses remain vacant for significant periods, inhibiting the site coming forward for alternative beneficial uses. Recommended the Council delete the above criteria from Policy EMP4. | | |
| Policy EMP4 Loss Of Employment Land Continued | Support – the plan should provide local level criteria to protect existing employment sites. | 1457/17397 | |
| | Objection – contrary to national policy. It restricts the use of employment sites unless several criteria can be overcome with no regard to sites continued viability for employment. It needs to be more flexible. | 1514/17475 | Monks Cross North Consortium |
| | Objection – policy does not provide any flexibility for different types of employment generating uses. | 1785/9861 | Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property) |
| | Support – the plan should provide local level criteria to protect existing employment sites. | 5178/12336 | |
| | Objection – the policy restricts the use of employment sites unless several criteria can be overcome with no regard to the sites viability for employment use. It needs to be more flexible. | 6351/17628 | Gladedale Estates |
| | Comment – agree with protecting against the loss of employment land. However existing employment sites such as Clifton Moor which are already struggling may in the future need to be re-developed as areas of housing. | 6508/17664 | City Of York Council Conservative Group |
| | Support – agree with the policy proposed. | 6518/16381 | York Green Party |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Policy EMP5 Business And Industrial Uses Within Residential Areas | Objection – the requirement for well connected and designed green infrastructure is not mentioned in this policy. Green infrastructure in employment areas can have the same value as in housing areas with a wide range of ecosystems services being provided. | 42/11711 | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| | Support – we accept the preferred approach. The plan should provide local level criteria to control business and industrial uses within residential areas. | 59/12639 | Dunnington Parish Council |
| | Support – The plan should provide local level criteria to control business and industrial uses within residential areas. These criteria should include measures for controlling the number and size of business vehicles that can be regularly parked on the public highway at any time in a residential area near or in the proximity of a single business, including its subsidiaries or associates. House drives should not be normally used for the parking of oversized or specialist vehicles or equipment. | 1457/17398 | |
| | Support – agree with the preferred approach. | 2846/7542 | |
| | Support – the plan should provide local level criteria to control business and industrial uses within residential areas. These criteria should include measures for controlling the number and size of business vehicles that can be regularly parked on the public highway at any time in a residential area near or in the proximity of a single business, including its subsidiaries or associates. House drives should not be normally used for the parking of oversized or specialist vehicles or equipment. | 5178/12337 | |
| | Support – agree with policy EMP5. | 6508/17665 | City Of York Council Conservative Group |
| | Support – generally support this. Comment – it should not preclude small scale home working and business start up within residential locations e.g. child minding, internet sales, web design etc. | 6518/16382 | York Green Party |
| Paragraph 8.04 | Comment – How many new graduates find jobs in York and ‘invest’ in the future. | 2662/7052 | |
| Paragraph 8.05 | Objection - Reference to Designer Outlet should refer to leisure based and specialist outlet retail uses. | 244/14136 | McArthur Glen Designer Outlet |

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 8: Economy Continued

April 2014

| Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc. | Comments | Ref. | Name (where business or organisation) |
|---|--|-------------|--|
| Question 8.01 | Comment - it is worth pointing out that the construction industry is an important contributor to the local economy and provides a significant number of direct and indirect employment through the supply chain. More ambitious housing targets will further increase this valuable source of employment. | 145/13862 | Home Builders Federation |
| | Support - should use the baseline scenario from Oxford Economic Forecasting assessment. Agree with preferred options for: economic growth in the health and social care sectors; the approach to the loss of employment land; and the approach to business and industrial uses within residential areas. | 188/13944 | |
| | Support - would in general support the use of brownfield sites to accommodate the need for employment/economy sites within the York area subject to the relevant policy background and the need to address environmental issues. Both Elvington and Naburn have profound issues in terms of surface water flooding and an infrastructure that often struggles to cope. | 190/13963 | York Consortium of Drainage Boards |
| | Support- the preferred approach to the economy of the city should be appropriate. | 943/16952 | |
| | Objection - disagrees with approach to employment growth, considered that the baseline scenario is most realistic – this projection foresees York outperforming regional and national growth. Agree with preferred approach to economic growth in Health and Social Care sectors, there needs to be expansion here. Agrees with approach to employment land, and to business and industrial uses within residential areas. | 1109/17185 | |
| | Comment - business and industrial units with in residential Areas, why can such areas not be converted to residential housing if the council thinks it has such a shortage? | 5228/12532 | |