Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan

Part 5

Consultation Statement

January 2025

CONTENTS

1. Background

In September 2013 Copmanthorpe Parish Council (CPC) formally submitted an application to City of York Council (CYC) for the designation of the whole Parish area as a neighbourhood plan area as a first step towards preparing the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan (CNP).

Copmanthorpe Parish Council's application underwent the statutory 6 week consultation period which allowed people who live, work and conduct business to comment on the application and the area boundary.

The City of York Council received over 120 responses, all supporting the application by Copmanthorpe Parish Council. The neighbourhood plan area was approved by City of York Council on 7 January 2014.

2. Compliance with Regulation 15 (Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012)

This Consultation Statement complies with requirements of Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations and provides the response to Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations (pre-submission statutory consultation) 2012.

This document is a consultation statement detailing the extensive consultation undertaken with the community of Copmanthorpe, ie. those who live and work in the Parish. It includes the further consultations which took place during the pre-submission consultation.

Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- explanations of how they were consulted;
- summaries of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- descriptions of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

This Consultation Statement summarises all statutory and non-statutory consultation undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders in developing Copmanthorpe`s Neighbourhood Plan. In particular it describes how concerns have been addressed and the changes which have been made to the final CNP as a result of statutory pre-submission consultation.

A Consultation Evidence File providing a record of all consultation exercises, comments and feedback is available on the Neighbourhood Plan website (www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk).

3. Consultation on Neighbourhood Development Plan

In Autumn 2012, CPC declared its intention to develop a Neighbourhood Plan and the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Planning Group (CNPG) was formed, comprising Parish Councillors, representatives of various stakeholders in the community and residents of the Parish.

A Public meeting in Copmanthorpe Methodist Church, attended by Ward Councillors and Julian Sturdy MP, took place on 1 May 2013 to explain the concept of a neighbourhood plan to residents. 65 residents attended.

On 23 May 2013 a Public Meeting was organised in the Methodist Church attended by Julian Sturdy MP, City of York Ward Councillors, and a representative from City of York Council. Over 200 residents attended this meeting.

The CNPG took on the responsibilities of the CNP process under the auspices of CPC.
In order to support the wider aspects of Community-led Planning, the CNPG has developed a Neighbourhood Plan which consists of one overarching Plan for the Parish and includes Neighbourhood Planning Policies and Village Design.

The aims of the CNP consultation process were to:

- Involve as much of the community as possible throughout the informal and pre-submission consultation stages of plan development
- Ensure the Plan was informed by the views of local people and local stakeholders from the start of the neighbourhood planning process.
- Ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken.
- Engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- Ensure that results of consultation were fed back to local people and were available to read; in both hard copy, in the Village News Letter, at local events and via the Parish Council`s website.

In preparing the CNP the CNPG has consistently ensured that residents and other stakeholders including local authorities, interest groups, land owners, businesses and statutory bodies have been consulted and that their comments have been noted and, where appropriate, incorporated into the Plan as it evolved.

CNPG has continuously sought to work with the City of York Council and other stakeholders in developing the Plan and has sought to ensure its work aligns with the published information of the early stages of the CYC emerging Local Plan.

The level of consultation that has been undertaken is in keeping with that required by the legislation and full details of all consultations are provided in the Consultation Evidence File that supports this Consultation Statement. The Consultation Evidence File is also available to view on Copmanthorpe Parish Council’s website.

4. Understanding the Issues

A number of consultation exercises were designed by the Parish Council, CNPG and Stakeholder Groups, in order to obtain and understand the "issues of importance" within the local community; one example being the Community Audit where all households in the village were surveyed in July 2013 by the Parish Council, the Methodist Church and consultants Action Planning. A total of 565 households responded, of which the great majority stated they were against further housing development in the village and that the Green Belt surrounding the village was of great importance.

During the period that followed, the views of local residents have been obtained through a variety of exercises including survey questionnaires, public events, open days and written contributions.

A member of the CNPG attended a 3 day planning camp organised by the Eden Project under the auspices of the Department of Communities and Local Government. This looked at how communities can take a leadership role in neighbourhood planning, how to engage people in the local area and what localism legislation means for local people.

Consultation Group

Outcomes from the planning camp were used to inform the processes and the level of community engagement involved, which in turn contributed to the development of the Neighbourhood Roadmap & Milestone programme, thus ensuring that the key stages of the process were accommodated. This resulted in the completion of a Roadmap & Milestones document which was used to guide the various stages of the process.

Community groups and businesses were consulted and invited to respond and/or provide submissions in writing, or by way of public meetings. CNPG contact details have been available on the website; **http://www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk** and in all CNP updates; sufficient notice has been given when advertising events, together with a statement encouraging full community engagement.

During the development of the CNP, local people were regularly consulted. This regular consultation has maximised the opportunities for those living and working in the Village to shape what is "their Neighbourhood Plan".

5. Overview of consultation approaches to engage the community

The central focus of all consultation information has been the CPC`s website. This has been a useful and well-publicised source of valuable and up-to-date information about all aspects, and stages of CNP development and includes information on all consultation outcomes.

All updates on the CNP process, and information about forthcoming consultation exercises and events, were published in Copmanthorpe Village Newsletter (free magazine delivered to each household on a monthly basis; this is particularly useful for those residents without e-mail).

Details of all documents used have been available for viewing and commenting upon through the website and at public events.

At regular intervals draft stages of the Plan and supporting documents were exposed to scrutiny by making them available at public events, and during these events discussions took place between individuals from the community and those responsible for preparing and writing the Plan.

Notices and posters were fixed to posts adjacent to well used “passing points” within the village in order to provide an additional means of communication, in addition to making full use of the numerous Parish notice boards, the local library and the various meeting halls within the village.

Several community surveys were conducted to help understand the issues in more detail, the findings of which provided the basis for developing the Planning Policies within the CNP; in line with the wishes of the Community.

Copmanthorpe May Day Fair

A series of events such as the May Day Fair held on 5th May 2014; and Copmanthorpe Carnival held on 28th June 2014 (and subsequently), provided opportunities to engage and discuss the development of the Plan with local people and the wider community

The events were attended jointly by members of the CNPG and CPC, this provided opportunities to directly engage with residents and to afford them the chance to discuss and expand upon proposed planning policies, their preferences and selection of sites and the size and range of development proposed within the Parish.

By attending such events this assisted the CNPG and CPC to gain a better understanding of the community’s wishes in relation to emerging issues within the Plan; and for the community to gain a better understanding of the consequential changes in the planning system, when converting to a Neighbourhood Plan.

Copmanthorpe Carnival

Parish Council Stall

In addition; a Public Open Day was held at the Howell Hall on 12th July 2014 to further engage and provide opportunities for informal discussion and information sharing with the community and other interested parties.

The Parish Council continued to give residents the opportunity to provide their feedback right up to the start of the CYC Formal Consultation including having a stand at 'Coptoberfest' (the annual charity beer festival, held in the village).

Consultation Group July 2014

The role played by Copmanthorpe Parish Council (CPC) has been supportive and integral to the CNPG in facilitating the various stages of plan development; in that CNPG activity was regularly reported to the Parish Council at the Council meetings; seeking the views from all Councillors and members of the public present.

Following the decision by CPC to take the lead in the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, on 8 May 2012, Neighbourhood Planning has been a standard agenda item at Parish Council meetings and is recorded in the minutes, which are published on the Parish Council Website available for all to see.

This Neighbourhood Plan website, created specifically by the Parish Council, continues to provide a comprehensive source of up to date information on all stages of the CNP and, going forward, will be used to inform the Community of the formal consultation process and referendum, along with other familiar methods of communications used for sharing information.

It is not the intention of this Consultation Statement to repeat the findings from the reports produced from the consultation exercises which are all clearly referenced in the CNP Evidence File (CNPEF)

However a summary of the findings are listed below:

6. Community Surveys

Survey 1: Community Audit

All 1,750 households in the village were canvassed in July 2013 by the Parish Council, the Methodist Church and consultants Action Planning. A total of 565 responses were received which showed 79% of respondents to be against any further housing development in the village and 87% of respondents who attached great importance to the Green Belt surrounding the village. The purpose of the survey was to gather up to date information on the profile of Copmanthorpe and to provide a holistic view of the Parish along with what mattered to local people, the key issues, including aspirations. The survey was developed for the purpose of informing a Community-led Plan and consequently questions asked were wider-reaching.

The survey was completed per household with the opportunity for young people within that household to respond to a section specifically developed for them.

Survey 2: Housing Quantity Survey

The Housing Quantity Survey canvassed all 1750 households in the Parish in November 2013, specifically to assess the level of new housing which residents considered the village could absorb and the most suitable sites for any development sites. The survey asked residents to consider seven possible sites for future development and rank them in order of preference as being suitable for development. The seven sites were those which landowners had confirmed could be made available for development in response to York City Council's 'Call for Sites' in 2012. There were 610 responses to this survey.

The consensus view of respondents in this survey published in March 2014 was that the village could absorb up to 135 new houses and the top four sites where development should take place were Temple Lane, New Moor Lane, Tadcaster Road, and Old Moor Lane.

Survey 3: Housing Needs Survey

The Housing Needs Survey canvassed all 1750 households in the Parish in June 2014 specifically to assess the type of housing need, specialist housing and impact on traffic flow. The survey asked residents household numbers, tenure, alternative accommodation needs and housing aspirations.

A total of 527 households comprising 994 adult residents responded to the survey with 11% of respondents (59 households) expressing a need for alternative accommodation.

Survey 4: Policies Questionnaire

A day-long exhibition of the draft Neighbourhood Plan was held on Saturday 12th July 2014. This was attended by approximately 300 residents. Copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan were exhibited, together with a range of site maps and expanded views of each of the CNP policies.

Those attending the open day were asked to complete and return an event questionnaire, which invited them to give their views of the proposals and to add any proposals of their own. The majority of responses agreed with the general direction of the policies and of the emerging Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.

Consultation Notice

- 6 week Statutory Pre submission Consultation published at; Library, Doctors' Surgeries, Recreation Centre. WI Hall, Hairdressers, Royal Oak, Youth Club (Howell Hall), Dentist, Post Office, Food Outlets, Co-op, Mace, Methodist Church, St Giles Church, Scout Hall, Tennis and Bowls Clubs
- Pre-submission Consultation phase to include amendments as required prior to Formal Consultation
- City of York Council 6 week Formal Consultation direct with residents of the Parish and other stake holders and interested parties
- Examiner reviews of the Plan, and responses to determine whether the Plan meets all the required standards. If approved:
- Examiner returns Plan to the village for a formal referendum
- If the Plan receives a majority within the referendum, then it passes into planning law

7. Conclusion of Surveys

For each of the above surveys the community was given a reasonable timeframe in which to respond, following which CNPG collated all responses by loading the data into an IT system so that the analysis of the data could be reviewed in a report format. The analysis and report findings were shared with the community at regular intervals throughout the year. These reports are available for crosschecking within the CNP Evidence File (CNPEF).

A significant outcome of these surveys was to provide the CNPG with up to date information on the wishes and aspirations of the Parish. This enabled the CNPG to ensure the content and direction of the draft CNP, and the findings and conclusions of the document, were in keeping with the views expressed by the majority of residents within the Parish.

8. Pre-Submission Consultation

Notices of the Statutory Pre-Submission Consultation process were published within the Parish, venues included; the Library, Doctors' Surgeries, Recreation Centre. WI Hall, Hairdressers, Royal Oak, Youth Club (Howell Hall), Dentist, Post Office, Food Outlets, Co-op, Mace, Methodist Church, St Giles Church, Scout Hall, Tennis and Bowls Clubs etc. (Appendix A)

Residents and Business owners were informed as to the purpose of the Pre-Submission Consultation and invited to formally respond to the Plan, its aims and its policies. (Appendix A)

Individual copies of the Neighbourhood Plan, together with various appendices and response forms, were made available free of charge in public places and businesses around the village from 1st September 2014 onwards; and included venues such as the Public Library, Village Recreation Centre, Women's Institute Hall, St Giles Church, Methodist Church, The Village Youth Club, Village Shops and the Doctors.

The Plan and response forms were also made available on line on both the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan websites:

- www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk
- www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk

Copies of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan, together with Appendices were also available on request to the Parish Clerk by 'phoning 01904 778087 (since changed to 801822).

A summary of responses can be found in Appendices B and C of this document and copies of the consultation return forms can be found on the Neighbourhood Plan website.

As part of the Pre-Submission Consultation all interested parties and statutory consultees were identified and directly mailed or emailed copies of the Neighbourhood Plan and Appendices seeking comments, examples of which include:

- City of York Council
- DPP One Ltd: Shepherd Homes
- Gladman Developments Ltd
- Natural England
- English Heritage Yorkshire
- Askham Bryan College
- National Grid
- Northern Power Grid
- Northern Gas
- Yorkshire Water

- Coastliner
- Network Rail
- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
- British Architectural
- Archaeology UK
- Yorkshire Consortium
- UK Agriculture
- DEFRA
- CPRE
- North Yorkshire County Council
- YLCA
- York Diocese
- Stephensons Property
- Barratt Developments
- Linden Homes
- Pike Hills Golf Club
- Sport England

A summary of interested parties and statutory consultees feedback can be found in Appendices B and C. The full response is available on the CNP website (www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk).

To meet the requirements of the consultees to the 2014 consultation a second pre-Submission Consultation was undertaken in June 2017. Details and feedback may be found in Appendices D and E.

Consultation Findings 2014: Parish Respondents

A total of 44 written responses from residents of the Parish were received, (both completed forms and online entries). This figure must be seen in the context of exhaustive consulting over the preceding eighteen months and the results of which already coincide with the Plan. Of the 44 responses, 78% of respondents indicated they were in agreement with the policies within the Neighbourhood plan. (See App B & C)

Of the 22% of respondents that indicated otherwise; most indicated that they were in favour of some policies but expressed reservations regarding others. The Policies that generated the greatest debate were; Policy 1 Housing Quantity, Policy 2 Allocated Sites and Policy 8 Green Belt and Infrastructure.

Table A

Policies	Agree	Disagree
Policy 1 Housing Quantity	**89.5%**	**10.5%**
Policy 2 Allocated Sites	**78.9%**	**21.1%**
Policy 3 Affordable and Special Housing	94.8%	5.2%
Policy 4 Local Occupancy	92.2%	7.8%
Policy 5 Community Facilities and Organisations	94.8%	5.2%
Policy 6 Green Belt,	**89.5%**	**10.5%**
Policy 7 Green Infrastructure	**89.5%**	**10.5%**
Policy 8 Parish Consultation	100%	0%
Policy 9 Village Design Statement	100%	0%

Policy 1
The majority of feedback disagreeing with Policy 1 was concerned that the Neighbourhood Plan had allocated too many new houses within the village, with only one response in favour of more housing.
This was balanced by the majority of respondents (89.5%) expressing the view that the housing allocation was appropriate, in keeping with the scale for the village and supported some development and growth.

Policy 2
The majority of feedback disagreeing with Policy 2 was concerned that the Neighbourhood Plan had identified the wrong sites and questioned the need for business use. Whist some concerns were raised regarding the sites chosen, very few offered an alternative site as part of the response, with only one response expressing a preference for sites to the West of the Village. This was balanced by the majority of respondents (78.9%) expressing the view that the site allocation, and use of sites within the plan, identified the most sensible options.

Policy 6
The majority of feedback disagreeing with Policy 6 was concerned that the Neighbourhood Plan had failed to adequately protect the Green Belt, in that land to the East of the Village was of equal importance to that on the West. Whilst the need to enhance and protect the Green Belt within the Parish is acknowledged by all, the majority of respondents (89.5%) recognised the arguments put forward within the Plan that as the Green Belt land to the West of the Village had no physical boundary recognised beyond that afforded by existing hedgerows; its role in determining the setting, character and identity of the village was therefore of prime concern.

CNPG Comments in Response to Feedback from Interested Parties and Statutory Consultees 2014

A summary of external body feedback is available at App B: The full response is available on the Neighbourhood Plan website (www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk). The policies referred to are as numbered in table A (previous page).

- **DPP One Ltd: Shepherd Homes**
  - The thrust of the response from DPP One was that the Neighbourhood Plan had ignored the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, that there was no independent evidence base from which to calculate an alternative objective assessment of housing need, the omission of the housing allocation known as ST13, the plan should be aligned to the higher order Local Plan and that City of York does not have an officially defined Green Belt boundary.
  - The main thrust of this feedback is that the Neighbourhood Plan is suggesting less housing than the City of York, in Copmanthorpe. The response from DPP appears to confuse a Neighbourhood Plan with a Local Plan by repeatedly referring to soundness; yet soundness is not the test that needs to be met.
  - The issue is not that the Neighbourhood Plan must be in conformity with all the National Planning Policy Framework, only that it has taken account of it; and local circumstances can require different solutions than those suggested by national policy. The majority of the issues raised in relation to compliance with the NPPF have been addressed within the Neighbourhood Plan Examination - Basic Conditions Statement.
  - Similarly, issues relating to general conformity with City of York Strategic Policies have been addressed within the same; where it is recognised that the degree of conflict between the Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging CYC strategy is limited to the absolute number of dwellings to be permitted in the Parish. There is no conflict with adopted strategic policies as expressed in the former Regional Spatial Strategy.

- **Gladman Developments Ltd**
  - Whilst Gladman Developments broadly agreed with the site allocations and use identified within the Neighbourhood Plan they believed there was evidence to justify a higher housing requirement than that currently proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan, suggesting figures for delivery of between 200 to 390 dwellings. In support of their argument they provided an independent evidence base and assessment relating to housing need.
  - In contrast the Neighbourhood Plan retains the essentially sound and acceptable approach for housing development within the Village through a number that is appropriate for Copmanthorpe. This approach is set out in Matthew Taylor's review of policies for the Countryside 'Living Working Countryside' and is at the heart of the Government's approach to sustainable development. The number of dwellings identified within the Plan is endorsed by the community, to meet the needs of the community as expressed in the housing needs survey and the sites allocated are sustainable for the scale of development proposed

- **Natural England**
  - Observations expressed by Natural England relate to Site 1 being approx 150m from Askham Bog, a site of special scientific interest (SSS); and concerns that there is a potential for development of the site to cause surface water to drain into the SSS. However, they go on to state that the impact of such development is likely to be diminished by the location of the A64 dual carriageway forming a physical barrier between the development site and the SSSI. Natural England welcomes a Policy which supports protection and enhancement of the Green Belt and encourages the Parish Council to work with City of York Council to integrate green infrastructure in the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan area into a wider network of green infrastructure in York

- **English Heritage Yorkshire**
  - English Heritage Yorkshire recognises that Copmanthorpe Conservation Area includes a number of important designated heritage assets and that the Parish Council should work closely with the Planning and Conservation Team at the City of York Council. English Heritage Yorkshire do not consider that there is a need to be involved in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan

- **City of York Council**
  (Comments forwarded by CYC cover all policy areas of the Neighbourhood Plan).
  - In relation to the number of houses and allocation of sites, the Council states it is not considering significant housing growth in small villages; however, the CYC does not need to consider significant housing in small villages, it needs to consider proportionate housing in small villages and the cumulative effect of proportionate housing development in all settlements.
  - That the Neighbourhood Plan would need to provide justification for the requirement not to permit small scale housing development over 5 units. In response; the justification being that the community consider that this scale of housing is appropriate for Copmanthorpe.
  - In CYC view, areas 1 and 2 failed the suitability assessment primary due to historic character and setting; and areas preventing coalescence and that the Green Belt policies within the RSS remain the strategic policies that all Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with. Area 1, 2, 3 and 6 are all in the general extent of the Green Belt. The Neighbourhood Plan response is that the Suitability Assessment is essentially a subjective opinion within CYC, a view which is not in keeping with the Residents of the Parish; and whilst the sites are supported by technical work undertaken by the Council, this does not necessarily make them “appropriate sites” locally. In addition, all sites in Copmanthorpe are technically in the general extent of the Green Belt including those put forward by CYC; however, it is appropriate for neighbourhood planning, particularly in the absence of an adopted local plan, to set the boundaries of the Green Belt locally.
  - In its comments CYC make reference to The Strategic Housing Market Assessment for York (SHMA) (2011) which identifies an affordable housing need across the whole city, including social rented housing; however, this approach would mean that Copmanthorpe was providing affordable housing for people who do not live locally at the expense of those who do. In addition, CYC state housing for older people is not a form of affordable housing; however, they can be a form of (intermediate) affordable housing if they are provided and secured at a sub market. However, Policy CNP3 has been re drafted to make clear that “affordable rental options” would be available within the Plan.
  - CYC have commented that, given the small geographical nature of York, there is a need to allocate land based on suitability and that all areas are expected to contribute. The Neighbourhood Plan is not in dispute with this statement and supports the supplementary planning guidance which affords priority for new homes for those with a local connection. The purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan is to provide locally appropriate policies, not to provide policies that address the needs of the whole of the Local Authority Area; nonetheless Policy CNP5 Local Occupancy has been amended to include a mechanism for allowing new properties to be offered/cascaded to a wider area through the inclusion of a 5th criteria; (after priority has been given to local connection) then the homes would be made available to anyone in housing need across the City of York.
  - In response to comments raised regarding Parish Economy, Transport and Employment: Evidence as to the willingness of the landowner is provided on the Parish Council’s website. In terms of justification; justification of the type of use described is not required, but it can be provided as the adjoining land could be safeguarded for future residential development and B2 uses are not compatible with residential use unlike B1 uses. Policies CNDP 1 & 2 have been amended to include additional arrangements for safeguarded land. The explanation as to why B2 users would not be permitted is as stated above (not compatible with residential use); and in addition this would protect the development for small scale users (local) and prevent their use by larger users who are less likely to be local.

- In terms of Parish Consultation; CYC support the proposal to encourage applicants to engage early with the Parish Council in pre-application discussions; however, they are less able to support "the weight in the decision making" argument as proposed. The Neighbourhood Plan process would rely on National Policy 134 and 135 which provides guidance on the weight to be given to certain considerations such as neighbourhood plans offering guidance to the decision maker, on the weight to be accorded to material considerations which the Parish Council highlight. This is entirely in accordance with the purpose of a locally derived Neighbourhood Plan.
- Overall, the Neighbourhood Plan does not undermine the general strategy of the adopted strategic policies (the RSS Greenbelt policies) nor does it undermine the intentions of CYC in its plan making. There is ample scope for the overall strategy for City of York Local Plan to be implemented with the Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan in place.

- **Yorkshire Water**
  - Welcomed the provision of pre-submission copies of the Neighbourhood Plan, commenting there was a fee of £150 + VAT in order for them to provide a formal response.

- **Highways Agency**
  - Welcomed the provision of pre-submission copies of the Neighbourhood Plan, commenting they were pleased to see a focus around sustainable travel, the aim to reduce commuter based trips and activity to improve the Green Belt. However, they wish to make no formal comments on the document at this stage.

- **Sport England**
  - No response

- **Askham Bryan College, Barratt/David Wilson Homes Ltd, Linden Homes Ltd**
  Had no objection to the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan in principle and accept that there is no legal reason to prevent a Neighbourhood Plan preceding a Local Plan; but in their view to do so would render the process flawed and at odds with the purpose of the NP as to Wednesbury unreasonable.

  - Objection in its entirety to Policies CNP1 and CNP2
  - Objection to Policies CNP3, CNP4 and CNP5 as being over restrictive and confusing
  - Policy CNP6; questions the need for size limitation to criterion 1
  - Objection in its entirety to Policy CNP8; until detailed boundaries of the Green Belt are established in the YLP, there can be no presumption that land on the edge of York or surrounding settlements is the "Green Belt".
  - The Neighbourhood Plan does not identify any safeguarded land.

  Given the opening statement by Askham Bryan College, Barratt/David Wilson Homes Ltd, Linden Homes Ltd which presupposes the Neighbourhood Plan process to be flawed and at odds with the purpose of the NP as to Wednesbury is unreasonable, there is little to respond to, save that Policy CNP 2 has been amended to include additional arrangements for safeguarded land.

9. Parish Council Amendments to Plan

In considering the pre-consultation feedback from all residents, interested parties and external consultees who responded the Parish Council have adopted the following amendments to the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.

- Policy CNP3 Affordable and Special Housing:
  Making clear the Parish Council's intentions as to how it will make use of off-site funds

- Policy CNP4 Local Occupancy
  Identifying a mechanism for allowing new properties to be offered to a wider area through the inclusion of a 5th criteria; i.e. "A person or household who currently live within the City of York and has done so for a continuous period of at least five years with essential need for property for issues such as age, disability or illness"

- Policy CNP5: Parish Economy, Transport and Employment
  Reinforcing the Policy to ensure this Policy is responsive to the local economic needs: i.e. encourage the provision of high speed broadband at business facilities and deliver these units as hubs to support small business start-ups and local enterprise.

- Policy CNP5 Community Facilities and Organisations
  Extending the scope of linking proposed leisure and recreation site and the existing recreational site by most appropriate / economical means such as: footbridge, underpass etc.

10. Appendices

- (A) Notice: Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-submission Consultation
  - Placed in Copmanthorpe Village Newsletter as a four page insert.
  - The Newsletter is delivered to every house in the village before the start of the month

- (B) List of Respondents

- (C) Summary of Pre-Submission Consultation feedback
  - Summary of Feedback from residents of the Parish
  - Summary of Feedback from interested parties and statutory consultees

- (D) The policies referred to are as in table A on page 11.

Copmanthorpe Parish Council
Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2030

Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan – Pre-Submission Consultation

Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan is nearing its final stages. After more than two years of work by Parish Councillors and residents, including several public meetings, surveys and the Draft Plan Exhibition on 12th July, the Plan is now ready for its Pre-Submission Consultation.
The purpose of this six-week Pre-Submission Consultation is to give residents and business owners in the Parish the opportunity to formally respond to the Plan, its aims and its policies. At the end of this Pre-Submission Consultation phase and following any amendments that are required as a result of comments received, the final Plan will be submitted by Copmanthorpe Parish Council to City of York Council who will undertake a six-week Formal Consultation direct with residents of the Parish.
On completion of the Formal Consultation City of York Council will forward the plan to an Independent Examiner, together with all the responses from the consultation process. The Examiner will review the plan and responses and determine whether the Plan meets all the required standards. Assuming it does, he or she will return the Plan to the village for a Parish Referendum.
The Plan requires a majority in support at the Referendum in order to pass into planning law.
Copies of the Plan, together with response forms, will be available in most public places and many businesses around the village from 1st September, including:

Library - Rec Centre - WI Hall - St Giles Church - Youth Club - Methodist Church
Plus
Many Village Shops - Hairdressers - Takeaways - Doctors, etc

The Plan and response forms will also be available to read and/or download on both the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan websites:
www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk and **www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk**

Copies may also be obtained from the Parish Clerk by 'phoning 778087 *(since changed to 801822).*

The Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan has been created under the Government's Localism Act 2011 and is designed to ensure that the development of our village over the next fifteen years is in accordance with the needs, views and aspirations of residents and is sympathetic to the location of the village and the environment.

The Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group hope you will give us your feedback, either using the forms provided, by letter or email or by using the online feedback form available via a link on the websites.
The closing date for this pre-submission consultation is Sunday 12th October 2014

Thank you,

Copmanthorpe Parish Council & Neighbourhood Planning Group

In writing the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan we asked residents and business owners for their views on a variety of topics through three surveys and many face to face discussions at village Street Fairs, Carnivals, public meetings and, most recently, at an exhibition at Howell Hall.

You told us that:

- on average, most residents would accept no more than 135 new houses being built in Copmanthorpe over the next fifteen years. The huge majority foresaw no need to move house
  this is the maximum number of houses allowed in the Plan

- these new houses should not be in large developments
  the plan states that the 135 new houses will be built, mainly, on two separate sites, one at either end of the village

- there must not be any development on the Green Belt prime agricultural land to the west of the village
  the plan states that this land must be formally protected

- there should be some business units for fledgling and small businesses to grow and provide employment for local people
  the plan includes such provision

- there is a need for more recreational open space, including football pitches and a skateboard/scooter park
  the plan includes provision for both of these, and more – including more allotments

- there is a need for houses for older residents to move in to where they can continue to live independently without the difficulties presented by larger properties
  the plan includes a strong percentage of such accommodation and acknowledges that this will also free up established housing for young families

- most residents who work do so in York and Leeds and that they travel by car, most using Manor Heath
  the plan seeks to mitigate the impact of additional housing by spreading most development between two locations at opposite ends of the village where new residents might find it easier to use other access routes to and from the village

- the current ambience of the village, with its hedgerows and green spaces, must be protected and, where possible, enhanced
  the revised Village Design Statement (which is incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan) provides this protection

- the use of any of the Green Belt agricultural land for any non-domestic scale renewable energy projects was completely unacceptable
  the Plan states that any non-domestic renewable energy projects will not be permitted within the Parish

Above are just some of the main points you raised. The Neighbourhood Plan document sets out the background to the Plan, reasoned justification and polices. For the Plan to become law we need your feedback to ensure that it fully represents the needs, views and aspirations of Copmanthorpe. Please take the time to read the Plan and its associated documents and to let us know what you think – even if you think it already does its job.

List of Respondents **App B (2014)**

Pre-Submission Consultation	Replied	Details
Residents of the Parish	44	Document details, please see Parish Council website: Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk

Pre-Submission Consultation External Bodies	Provided Comments	Details
DPP One Ltd: Shepherd Homes	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
Gladman Developments Ltd	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
Natural England	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
English Heritage Yorkshire	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
City of York Council	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
Yorkshire Water	NO	E mail reply Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
Highways Agency	QUALIFIED	E mail reply Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk
Sport England	NO	E mail reply Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk

Askham Bryan College Barratt/David Wilson Homes Ltd Linden Homes Ltd	YES	Document details, please see Parish Council website: www.copmanthorpeparishcouncil.org.uk Neighbourhood Plan website: www.plan4copmanthorpe.org.uk

Summary of Pre-Submission Consultation Feedback **App C (2014)**
Summary from residents of the Parish
Summary from Interested Parties and Statutory Consultees

Pre-Submission Consultation: 45 respondents

Feedback: Parish Residents				
	Agree	**Disagree**	**Comments**	
			Summary of Comments Agree	**Summary of Comments Disagree**
Overall Plan	78.%	22.%	Agree with all parts set out in the plan Consultation gives all residents an opportunity to get involved, production of documents are welcomed Well considered plan which I believe accurately reflects the views of the majority of the village Business Units could provide employment within the village Green Belt must be protected Scale, timetable and locations will allow the village to retain its identity whilst offering an opportunity for new residents to move to Copmanthorpe The Parish Council should use 106 monies to kick start the development of open space land In keeping with the needs of the community and character of the village Excellent submission Excellent work; agree with proposals Copmanthorpe plan provides a sensible balanced plan for development within the village A fair proportion of houses in response to the proposals indicated in the City of York expansion Green Belt around Copmanthorpe provides a needed brake to over development Completely agree with site 1 Reasonable compromise that allows for some development and growth	Needs of residents who use public transport need to be recognised more forcefully Concerned about further incursions on the Green Belt Business Area site 3 should be moved opposite existing Collier Plant Hire site Concerns about access to Old Moor Lane site 6 No building on Green Belt Concerns about location of footbridge from site 2 Questions need for additional allotments Concern site 1 will erode Green Belt land Need to over supply the demand for housing in order to depress demand Partial allocation of housing on site 4 would leave the remainder as Green Belt safeguarded land Site 2 not appropriate for industrial use; currently used as a pleasant stroll in countryside Why does the village need industrial units City of York should establish a newly defined Green Belt to West, South and East of the City
Policy 1	89.5%	10.5%	Appropriate scale for village Number of houses at upper end of acceptable Don't believe we need 135 houses this is an absolute maximum Policy provides a reasonable compromise which maintains village feel Demonstrates understanding for housing whilst keeping within the context of the village Agree 135 max; I applaud the logic of aiming at this figure We can't accommodate large numbers of new homes Housing quantity is about right with good locations	Number of housing should be reduced Number of houses too many Further expansion would create a small town rather than a village Number of houses woefully short of what is required City of York draft Local Plan is flawed and Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan does nothing to address the issue of development on prime agricultural land. York needs to develop housing growth; Copmanthorpe is ideally located and 135 dwellings is too low

Policy 2	78.9%	21.1%	Right locations, better than one large site Recreational proposal sensible options as more housing will require more recreational space Proposed sites make good sense for all reasons outlined in the plan completely agree with choice of sites Best selection of available sites Least upset and disturbance to existing homes Sites allocated are the obvious ones to fill	Disagree site 2; housing should be re allocated to council allotments. Western fringe is obvious place to build No case made for business need within the village Building on site 1 will erode the Green Belt No surprise residents voted for site 3; as most of them live as far away as possible Suggested sites are insufficient and of poor quality given proximity to the railway
Policy 3	94.8%	5.2%	Important we have a mix of housing as Copmanthorpe is often seen as a rich village Smaller houses, affordable for young couples Proposals should take account of disabled groups Housing for young people is a genuine concern Great to think older people could be cared for within the village Great to have a variety of housing Agree, especially when combined with local occupancy % figures quoted are OK Some small-scale developments like Fox and Hounds site could meet the needs of older people	Quantities identified too low to meet demand Should be dictated by market forces May result in patchy provision; should be provided by market forces Site 6 concerns about access of older people Should not be restricted by local occupancy
Policy 4	92.2%	7.8%	Agree Critical for village I would hope all housing would be reserved for local inhabitants There are several young prospective homeowners who would be grateful to be given priority Criteria are correct	Difficult to implement in practice Not sustainable
Policy 5	94.8%	5.2%	Small area set aside would enhance the village Increase in local goods or services can only be good Could provide employment for residents Need a better bus service It would be great having it if there were some small industrial office units in the village Transport links should be upgraded	Train station not feasible Underpass rather than bridge should be provided Does village need 20 industrial units Would be more appropriate to combine employment site as part of a larger residential expanse
Policy 6	89.5%	10.5%	Strong feeling that Green Belt must be preserved No housing on Green Belt Vital to character and preservation of village Agree but concerns over further excursions into Green Belt	Green Belt to the East is equally important as that to the West. Policy focuses on land to West of the village, farming land to the East has hedgerows and wildlife No building on Green Belt, brown field sites should be maximised Land to West of the village is not an area of high landscape value;

			Developments need to preserve hedgerows, trees and pavements in their design Green Belt must be preserved; farmers need land to feed us Imperative to maintain Green Belt to West of the village	development to the West could create a soft edge to enhance the settlement
Policy 8	100%	0%	First class job Commendable Directs planning for the future Sensible Policy Important role in representing views of the village I agree Works well	N/A

Pre-Submission Consultation Interested Parties and Statutory Consultee's

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Shepherd Homes DPP One Ltd		Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan has ignored the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework / Guidance. Specifically, the omission of the housing allocation known as ST13
Policy 1		Neighbourhood Plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area No independent evidence base which has calculated an alternative objective assessment of housing requirement Villages which surround the City of York are of different sizes some of which cannot accommodate sustainable growth Assumption that there will be appropriate sites within other villages around York Not in conformity with the Local Plan
Policy 2		Basis for omission of ST13 – no justification given for not allocating ST13 Assumption that the Western side of the village makes a greater contribution to openness of the Green Belt Site ST13 has clear defensible boundaries Not clear if Site 1 is available for development or that development is achievable. Allocation of site 1 appears unsound Neighbourhood Plan should add to and supplement higher order Local Plan It seems illogical and contrary to good planning practice to direct growth to less sustainable location than Copmanthorpe
Policy 3		Plan states that 30% affordable housing is split between discounted/part ownership, housing for older people and custom /self build. Older persons dwellings, and custom/self build does not meet definition of affordable housing

		Plan is fundamentally flawed; cannot dictate that 10% of all new houses should be reserved for a demographic proportion of the population
Policy 4	Agree; within the context that affordable housing local residents should have first refusal	But; must have mechanism for allowing properties to wider area if no local interest
Policy 5	No comment	
Policy 7 (NB CNP7 is now CNP6)	No comment	Copmanthorpe is a far more sustainable location to locate new housing developments within than many other settlements within the City of York
Policy 7		City of York does not have an officially defined Green Belt boundary The Green Belt around Copmanthorpe remains at best "draft" Plan prohibits renewable energy projects within the Green Belt; The Neighbourhood Plan is therefore in conflict with the NPPF and is unsound
Policy 8		Inappropriate as the weight to be given to the Parish Council is a matter for the decision maker which is City of York Council. The approach of the Parish Council should be to concentrate on producing a sound Neighbourhood Plan

Summary	**Summary of Comments Agree**	**Summary of Comments Disagree**
Gladman Developments	Gladman believe there is evidence to justify the adoption of a higher housing plan requirement than currently proposed by the Parish Council	
Policy 1	Non site-specific independent evidence base has provided an alternative objective assessment Land south of Tadcaster Road which can be developed to deliver a high number of dwellings	Evidence to justify higher level of growth
Policy 2	Allocation of sites justified and sensitive to objectives of the Green Belt Site 1; Walking distance accessing existing services; Public right of way (PROW) provides direct access to village centre Walking distance to Park and Ride; affording direct access to York City Centre	Current extent of Site 1 suitable for delivery of up to 200 dwellings The full allocation of land within Site 1 could support the delivery of 390 houses
Policy 3	Requirements outlined by this policy are compliant to proposals of the emerging Local Plan except where justified or otherwise by the 2014 Housing Needs Survey	Unclear how 10% provision can be implemented

	Approach found to be sound Recognition of emerging needs	
Policy 4	Provisions made by policy are reflected in the evidence, and criteria made to be well thought out.	Should none of the criteria be met; extend to; “a person or household within the Local Authority”
Policy 5	Parish should ensure the need for the use of classifications is responsive to the local economic needs of the Parish	Missed opportunity to encourage high speed broadband
Policy 6	Support objectives to secure improvement to community facilities	
Policy 7	Sustainability credentials of site is common ground between Gladman and Parish Council Separation from City of York and unrestricted Urban Sprawl provided by A64 and East Coast Main Line Land to West of village has no physical boundary recognised beyond that afforded by existing hedgerows	
Policy 8		Unnecessary statutory requirement for developers to engage community ahead of planning application

Summary	**Summary of Comments Agree**	**Summary of Comments Disagree**
Natural England		
Policy 1		
Policy 2	Impacts are likely to be largely diminished by the location of the A64 dual carriageway.	Site 1 appears to lie less than 150m from Askham Bog, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSS) Potential for development to cause surface water to drain into the SSS.
Policy 3		
Policy 4		
Policy 5		
Policy 6	Welcome Policy which supports protection and enhancement of the Green Belt Encourage Parish to work with City of York Council to integrate green infrastructure in the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan area into a wider network of green infrastructure in York	
Policy 7		
Policy 8		

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
English Heritage Yorkshire	Copmanthorpe Conservation Area includes a number of important designated heritage assets which are itemised on the attached schedule. The Planning and Conservation Team at the City of York Council are best Placed to assist in the Development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, EH do not consider that there is a need to be involved in the development of the Plan	
Policies 1 – 8	No Comments	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
City of York Council	The Local Plan will provide a clear view of the council's intentions and aspirations for the city. It is recognised that the Preferred Options Local Plan is not a final document and therefore the policies and allocations within it are subject to change but we have noted that some elements of the Neighbourhood Plan do not reflect the evidence produced in the preparation of the Local Plan and we therefore cannot support this. If screening shows that environmental assessments are needed, they should be prepared by the body preparing the Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the relevant legislation and national level guidance.	
Policy 1		Need to provide justification for the requirement in the policy to not permit small scale housing development over 5 units.
Policy 2		Sites failed primary constraints due to Historic Character and Setting, an area preventing coalescence.
Policy 3		Need for social rented housing across the whole city The overall housing need should form part of a cascade agreement. This would mean that after priority has been given to local connection then the homes would be made available to anyone in housing need across the city.
Policy 4		
Policy 5	The Council would support Site 2 as an open space site in principle	However, there is no evidence of a willing landowner and this would need to be confirmed before the Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to the Council
Policy 6		The Historic Character and Setting Technical Paper Update (2013) define those areas which are considered to have a key role in preserving the historic character and setting of York. The land to the west of Copmanthorpe is not identified in this study and therefore this policy does not accord with the evidence or policies within the draft Local Plan.
Policy 7	We support the proposal to encourage applicants to engage early with the Parish Council in pre-application discussions and to provide a statement to this effect when submitting an application.	However, we would not be able to support policy CNP8, as weight in the decision making process is based on the merit of the planning argument only and not the identity of the respondent.
Policy 8		

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Yorkshire Water	Thank you for your e-mail dated 31/08/2014 regarding the Neighbourhood Plan for Copmanthorpe. There is a fee for this service of £150 plus VAT.	
Policy 1-8	No Comment	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Highways Agency	Pleased to see the focus around sustainable travel the aim is to reduce commuter-based trips and actively improve existing green infrastructure. In regards to the Highways Agency, it wishes to make no formal comments on the document, and this will no doubt form part of the wider York City Local Plan consultations.	
Policy 1-8	No comment	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Sport England	No Comment	
Policy 1-8)	No comment	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Askham Bryan College: Barratt/David Wilson Homes Ltd: Linden Homes Ltd	In our view, the draft NP fails to meet at least three of the *basic conditions* in that: It fails to comply with national policy and advice/guidance issued by the Secretary of State particularly with respect to supporting local strategic policies, significantly boosting the supply of housing and providing for long term development by identifying safeguarded land. It fails to achieve sustainable development by under-providing for housing in a highly sustainable and accessible location and by failing to contribute proportionately to York's current and long-term housing needs and, further, by its restrictive housing occupancy policies, and It is in breach of Human Rights requirements.	
Policy 1		We object to this policy in its entirety
Policy 2		We object to this policy in its entirety
Policy 3		These policies both individually and cumulatively are over-restrictive and inconsistent with the emerging CYC Local Plan and the NPPF.
Policy 3		
Policy 4		These policies both individually and cumulatively are over-restrictive and inconsistent with the emerging CYC Local Plan and the NPPF.
Policy 5		Question whether there is any evidence to support the size limitation proposed at Criterion 1.
Policy 6		
Policy 7		The approach to Green Belt in the draft NP is flawed. Until detailed boundaries of the Green Belt are established in the YLP, there can be no presumption that land on the edge of the York main

		urban area or surrounding settlements is in the Green Belt. The draft NP seeks to predetermine decisions on the boundaries of the York Green Belt which should properly be made through the YLP. We object to the totality of Policy CNP8: Green Belt and Green Infrastructure. We note that the draft NP does not identify any safeguarded land.
Policy 8		

Copmanthorpe Parish Council
Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-Submission Consultation

The Parish Council engaged consultants to undertake more work to satisfy the requirements of consultees including City of York Council, Natural England and Historic England. A second round of consultation was then initiated in June 2017.

Local residents were invited to attend an exhibition in Copmanthorpe Library where Councillors were on hand to answer questions and collect feedback. The consultation documents were also available throughout the consultation period at the Library and on the Parish Council's dedicated Neighbourhood Plan website. The attention of residents was drawn to these resources through the Copmanthorpe Village Newsletter (hand distributed to all households in the village), the Parish Council Twitter feed and Parish Council notice boards

Local businesses received letters inviting them to review the revised documents and provide feedback and statutory consultees received emails.

The same list of statutory bodies was contacted as for the 2014 consultation.

Summary of pre -Submission Feedback (2017)
Summary from residents of the Parish
Summary from Interested Parties and Statutory Consultees

Pre Submission Consultation:

Feedback: Parish Residents	25 responses	
	Summary of Comments Agree	**Summary of Comments Disagree**
Overall	Excellent, well thought out (3)	
	Remember these are residents preferred sites (3)	
	Sensible proportionate plan (2)	
	Worried water will collect in Site1 (2)	
	Manageable number of houses (2)	
	More affordable housing would attract younger residents (1)	
	Concerns about development near Station Road and south of village (1)	
	Serious efforts are required to ensure plan is adopted by CYC (1)	
	Thank you for all your hard work and for listening and incorporating the concerns of the residents. Also pleased to note there is awareness of future sewage placing, i.e. not into existing outlets (1)	
	Traffic flow along Station Road could be improved	
	General worry about village expansion	
Policy 1		No justification for further development, what about filling 'Brownfield sites'.
		5 small sites too many - 3 enough
Policy 2		No consideration for access to sites. He feels that centre village residents will suffer from outer village development traffic
	Worry about flooding – New Moor Lane	
	Site1 Has space for whole field to take more housing	
Policy 3	CYC has built 100's of units for York students we need more non-university students at Copmanthorpe	
Policy 5		Disagree with area for economy, employment etc. It should be in Old Moor Lane
	Biggest problem is the junction at the top of Manor Heath: It is a problem at rush hour now	
	Little plan for employment therefore new residents will commute	
	What is the purpose of designating greenbelt land only to build on it	
	Copmanthorpe is big enough already. Who will live in these new houses	
	The roads won't take any more traffic	
Policy 6		Area 6 is a popular leisure and dog-walking area. There is no justification for building on it
	School too full	
	No parking available in the village	
Policy 7	This is just creeping urbanization, we'll have no green space left	
	Green Belt must be protected	
	Policy says we support Green Belt and then build on it	

	Very worried about impact of water levels on Askham Bog			
				Again – wonder why site 1 is being considered when Brownfield sites in York are not being used
Policy 8	Puts great additional work on applicants			
	Parish policy must form part of the CYC planning decisions			
	Claim is we are going against the results of 79% of the village results.			
	We are not open with our information			
				We are going against our own statistics to preserve the Green Belt
				We are "untruthful in our claim to express the wishes of the residents of Copmanthorpe that we CLAIM to represent"

Pre-Submission Consultation Interested Parties and Statutory Consultee's

Summary	Summary of Comment Agree	Summary of Comment Disagree
Cundalls, on behalf of Mr D Brewster	Owner of 1 acre of land at Becket's Crossing near Learmans Way	
Policy 2	Requesting inclusion of this land in the area designated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan to form part of the area referred to as Tadcaster Road	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Natural England	"Natural England broadly welcomes the Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence base and assessment provided. In particular, we welcome the inclusion of criteria 3 and 4 of Policy CNP2, in line with the recommendations of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). However, we advise that you consider modifying the text for criterion 3 as follows in order to improve clarity and accuracy. In addition, we particularly welcome the consideration of local landscape character and green infrastructure in the section concerning Green Belt and Green Infrastructure including Policy CNP8"	
Policy 2		To change point 3 of CNP2 to read: "3. Developers will be required to ensure that the development of Site 1 does not result in damage to the notified features of Askham Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and nature Reserve through changes to water quality or water levels at Askham Bog. In particular developers should consider potential impacts on water quality and water levels at Askham Bog SSSI from water drainage into the SSSI as a consequence of the development of this site. water draining into Askham Bog or to a raised water table in the area generally or at Askham Bog in particular."

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Historic England		CNP Parts 1 & 2 do not include policies relating to:
		Listed Buildings and their settings
		Non-designated historic buildings and sites
		Design and detail of development affecting non-designated heritage assets of the setting
		Areas of historic township worthy of designation of conservation area or of inclusion in the existing conservation area
		The effects of development on the historic character of York and its setting
		Part 1 needs a policy requiring compliance with Part2, the VDS. Structure and wording of this should be significantly amended to embody robust policies in compliance with NPPF

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Environment Agency		
Policies 1 – 8	We have no objections to the proposed Plan or SEA.	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Development		They contend that though the CNP may be in conformity with the Emerging Local Plan it is at risk of being rendered out of date when the changes proposed by PB Planning are implemented. They contend that as a result the CNP fails to meet conditions a & e of the National Planning Policy Framework
Policy 1		The Housing Needs Survey only sought to determine the needs of the existing population. The evidence base fails to consider up to date population projections, migration patterns, impact of economic growth policies, affordable housing needs and changes to the makeup of households
Policy 2		The site in Manor Heath is a better Site than Site 1 in Tadcaster Road because Site 1 may have an impact on the SSSI site at Askham Bog. Historic England was concerned that Site 1 may involve loss of heritage assets and affect the historic character and setting of the City of York
Policy 3		The Housing Needs Survey is not consistent with emerging strategic local planning guidance as it does not consider the needs of the wider area Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy framework requires local planning authorities to prepare a strategic Housing Market assessment to assess full housing needs which should address all housing needs including those of older people. The Housing Needs Survey is not robust enough to justify this policy and the policy would create an unnecessary burden and restriction on a developer.

Policy 4	PB Planning generally support the policy but say that care is needed to ensure sufficient flexibility is provided for the policy to be deliverable	
Policy 5		A comprehensive review of the deliverability of the site has not been undertaken
Policy 6	PB Planning supports the recreational allocation but believes it is dependent on the housing allocation in Manor Heath.	
Policy 7		PB Planning believes that CYC needs to release additional land to the west of Copmanthorpe for housing purposes. It believes that the site in Manor Heath does not fulfil any of the 5 Green Belt purposes.

Summary	**Summary of Comments Agree**	**Summary of Comments Disagree**
Gladman	Contend that simple modifications enabling CNP to be consistent with National Planning Policy and thus meet basic conditions required of Neighbourhood Plans are required.	
Policy 1	Tadcaster Road site can be developed with an increase in the level of housing growth with the restriction of the reference to maximum and scale of additional development being removed as contrary to basic conditions of a NP	No evidence to support level of growth sufficient to meet needs of level required to maintain village current services and facilities.
Policy 2	Gladman fully support the allocation of site 1, Tadcaster Road, on a number of grounds. It does not perform any Green Belt function, is supported by local community, its location and ability to provide many additional community benefits.	Policy supports CNP 1 to provide additional housing growth
Policy 3	Affordable and Special Housing. Agree. Viability to be in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework Paras 173 and 174	Disagree. S106 financial contributions cannot be spent on provision of recreational facilities as contrary to Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations Housing for Older People Disagree. Not a planning policy as does not meet Basic Condition (a) of Schedule 4b Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Not a land use policy but a statement of intent and need not be included in CNP except as in an Appendix with additional criterion as to what would happen should no person fulfil the first five criteria.
Policy 4	No response	
Policy 5	No response to these Policies as no need to amend by modification and/or deletion to allow a more flexible and positive approach consistent with national policy and guidance.	
Policy 6	Agree. Site at Tadcaster Road to be removed from Green Belt	Disagree. Blanket approach to development which harms character and setting of York or Copmanthorpe which is contrary to the balance approach advocated in National Planning Policy Framework.
Policy 7		Not a land use policy and to be contained in an Appendix.

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	"The Trust is pleased to see that the plan mentions that allocated sites should not affect the drainage at Askham Bog. There could also be potential for extra impacts from an increase in the number of people living nearby. Connecting up areas for wildlife will be very valuable in the area, particularly as the roads and railway line near to Copmanthorpe tend to divide up the nearby countryside." "The Trust would like to see an addition to policy CNP8 so that the important green spaces around the village are enhanced for biodiversity rather than damaged by any development."	

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Highways Agency		
Policy 1-8		

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Sport England		
Policy 1-8		

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Askham Bryan College		Funds raised from the sale of land on Manor Heath [which is not included in the Neighbourhood Plan] would be reinvested in the York campus

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
City of York Council	General changes or amendments to format and Foreword, Summary, The Nexrt Steps, and Relationship between Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. Various references to the offer of advice gained from the Poppleton NP Examiners Report	
Policy 1		Inclusion of information and quotes from Preferred Options Draft Local Plan 2013. Calculation of housing figures is not the approach used by CYC
Policy 2		Primary evidence from Housing Quality Survey and lthe ack of a defined methodological approach. Site assessment is inconsistent with SEA. VDS application is to geographical area and not restricted to built up area. New Policies for nature conservation and water drainage are required
Policy 3		Need for additional survey carried out in consultation with NYYC Rural Housing Enabler Team.

		Previous references to emerging Local Plan to be removed. S 106 Contributions cannot be spent on recreational facilities Unfair priorities for definition of people with local connections
Policy 4		Policy remains unchanged from Submission stage November 2014
Policy 5	Additional criteria requiring broadband and solar panels	Removal of Permitted Development Rights only done by Local Planning Authority
Policy 6	Connectivity across village over railway line with caveat regarding possibility and expense	Evidence of willing landowner for site 2 as open space.
Policy 7		Green Infrastructure to be a separate policy
Policy 8	Proposals to applicant to engage with Parish Council	Criteria 2 requiring appropriate weight to Parish Council comments

Summary	Summary of Comments Agree	Summary of Comments Disagree
Shepherds		Fails to comply with TCP Act 1990 S 8(2) (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g)
Policy 1		Fails (a), (d), (e)
Policy 2		Fails (a), (d)
Policy 3		Fails (a), (d)
Policy 4		Flawed and needs to provide clear measurable requirements for developers
Policy 5		Requires clarification
Policy 6		Fails (a), (d), (e)
Policy 7		Agree that pre-consultation but no need for statement confirming that taken place

Published by Copmanthorpe Parish Council
January 2025