

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
General**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Comment - Murton Parish Council recognises the urgency of creating and finalising a Local Plan. The Parish Council also recognises the urgency in legalising the de facto green belt. The Parish Council was impressed by the amount of detail in the draft Plan and many of the documents supporting it.	69/13849	Murton Parish Council
	Objection - there are a number of references relating to special provisions for Gypsies and Travellers, and Showpeople, but very few references to special provisions for much more important elements of society, especially children and young people. The balance is somehow wrong. Of particular importance to the Conservation Area Advisory Panel, much of the new proposed development will impact directly or peripherally on Conservation Areas. Will there be the staff in post to deliver the conservation skills required to reduce the impact of the worst excesses and threats? The Plan contains far too many fine words with unattainable and meaningless aims, e.g. low-carbon sustainable lifestyles and beautiful, legible and healthy city. Such statements have no place in the Plan unless they really can be proved to be achievable on past experience, and genuinely will be achieved.	88/12793	Conservation Area Advisory Panel
	Objection - the intended plan period is unclear, the Spatial Vision (page 27) and the Green Belt Local Context section (page 59) suggest a 15 year plan whilst the text refers to an 18 year period between 2012 and 2030 (paragraph 3.7). It can only be presumed this means anticipated adoption the Local Plan in 2015. The plan period needs to be very clearly stated. For the house building industry, this is especially important as a basis on which to assess the evidence for calculating housing requirements.	145/13854	Home Builders Federation
	Objection - the plan is not detailed enough for business and is not economically driven enough considering the main priority of creating jobs and growing the economy. There is a gap in the evidence base. Inward investment opportunities are not prominent in the plan.	153/14983	Without Walls (York Economic Partnership Board)
	Objection - the plan focuses almost exclusively on the historic city of York and makes few references to the circumstances of the surrounding villages. The document is worded in such a way that it often seems only the historic city is referred and the surrounding villages, an integral part of the local authority area, are disregarded. Suggested that there should be a general statement defining the terminology used to refer to the contrasting part of the local authority area (urban and rural) and that those definitions should be used consistently throughout the whole document. An appropriate place for the definition would be in Section 2 and the sub section entitled geography. Suggest wording as follows 'in this document term historic city is used to	188/13928	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
General

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	denote the urban city of York as defined by the current inner edge of the green belt. The term rural York refers to the surrounding villages in their rural setting.		
General Continued	Objection - no mention of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, presumably because national policies control these, but a list of York's Scheduled Ancient Monuments should be included. Also no mention of Village Design Statements. These have been approved and accepted as material considerations for planning applications. Reference to these needs to be included.	192/14023	
	Objection - whilst many elements of the policy framework are welcomed concerned that York's historic environment is given far less prominence that was the case in the Submission Core Strategy. The Core Strategy made clear that the starting point for the plan was the need to ensure that York's unique historic environment was appropriately conserved and managed. In the Local Plan this has been replaced by the desire for economic growth. The foundation for any plan in York should be to ensure that whatever strategy is adopted it will safeguard and reinforce those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of York.	238/14128	English Heritage
	Comment - many of the principles of the Local Plan dovetail in well with the priorities identified in the emerging Tourism Strategy. The final Tourism Strategy will need to be taken into account in considering ongoing refinements to the Local Plane.	334/14190	York Tourism Strategy Steering Group
	Support - the Local Plan is a great improvement on the Local Development Framework, identifying and offering more protection on the most valuable areas of greenery and tackling all of the concerns raised in the Core Strategy. Find that all previous concerns have been tackled in one document. Though there are areas that could easily be more ambitious, there are many areas that are extremely optimistic and radical in favour of supporting York's economy, population, environment or heritage.	525/16644	
	Objection - the plan is fundamentally unsound. The outcome of the flawed analysis is that a development plan compliant appropriate strategy is not identified and in turn reasonable alternatives are not considered. The failure of the plan and its evidence base in respect of the spatial framework to recognise the status and terms of Regional Spatial Strategy policy creates a fundamental flaw that underpins the whole plan.	544/16741	
	Objection - the intended plan period is unclear. The Spatial Vision and the green belt local context section suggests a 15year plan whilst the text refers to an 18 year period between 2012 and 2030 (paragraph 3.7). Assume anticipated adoption of the Local Plan in 2015. The plan period needs to be very clearly stated especially for the purpose of setting a long term green belt boundary.	673/16833	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
General**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General Continued	Objection - the period of the plan is difficult to ascertain but the extent of development proposed is too long. It is impossible to predict the economic position with any degree of certainty.	703/16874	
	Support - clear well thought out plan.	973/227	
	Comment - disappointed that cannot tell what is intended in concrete form or how it will be achieved.	1190/17100	
	Support - welcome the efforts made to incorporate biodiversity into forward planning, in particular the attempts to provide local policy to guide new development in relation to all biodiversity resources.	1399/17354	RSPB
	Objection - the intended plan period is unclear. The Spatial Vision and the green belt local context section suggests a 15 year plan whilst the text refers to an 18 year period between 2012 and 2030 (paragraph 3.7). Assume anticipated adoption of the Local Plan in 2015. The plan period needs to be very clearly stated especially for the purpose of setting a long term green belt boundary.	1514/17465	Monks Cross North Consortium
	Objection - several topics that have not been specifically addressed, in particular, tourism and neighbourhood planning. There is not recognition that the majority of the land within York, outside the urban area, is agricultural and that agriculture not only contributes significantly to the local economy but can introduce features into the countryside which have the potential to harm the setting of York. Considered that these topics are not appropriately addressed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. If the plan is to be found sound then these matters need to be fully addressed with appropriate policy considerations and supporting evidence.	1592/17622	York Civic Trust
	Objection - request that site at New Lane, Huntington that has planning permission for 87 homes is shown on the proposals map, alongside all other committed developments.	1668/15019	Barratt & David Wilson Homes
	Objection - query boundary of Hopgrove which is drawn too tightly round the houses on both Hopgrove Lane North and Hopgrove Lane South. Given that the Public House and Hotel site lie to the centre of the village where Hopgrove Lane South and Hopgrove Lane North connect with Malton Road submit that it is unjustified to not include the site. The effect of leaving the site outside of the defined settlement of the village will have a significant detrimental impact on the existing businesses by not recognising the site as a developed part of the village.	1672/15050	Mitchells & Butlers PLC
	Objection - the document is unnecessarily long and includes a level of background detail that is not required within this document. The length of the consultation document is likely to have had a significant impact discouraging people and	1705/9774	Gladman Developments

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
General

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	organisations from reviewing the document and providing comments and objections.		
General Continued	Objection - not one of the proposals can be considered a plus.	1889/38	
	Support - pleased that the plan makes appropriate proposals for the needs of a modern city and is not lacking the necessary imagination to foresee what is needed.	1918/9911	
	Comment - blank response form returned because considered that decisions have already been made.	1936/165	
	Comment - it is necessary for health and well being to have open green spaces and important to protect the countryside for future generations.	2213/2114	
	Comment - query legality of the two publications distributed in the west areas of the city about the plan; a liberal democrat publication and one from the Knapton and West York Greenbelt Action Group. See response for detail.	2412/6573	
	Comment - need to retain villages and village lifestyle as part of our heritage and country life. Options of lifestyles are important.	2707/7172	
	Support - in full agreement with the Local Plan document.	2765/7306	
	Comment - appreciate what a significant and complex task it is producing such a plan.	4413/11429	Carstairs Countryside Trust
	Support - support the efforts made.	4432/11746	
	Support - excellent and very good: like the maps.	4450/11745	
	Comment - overall there appears too much generalisation, a lot more detail is needed.	4490/11512	
	Objection - to the entire local plan.	4625/11577	
	Comment - how does the plan address the pockets of deprivation that are referred to in the analysis of ward statistics? Similarly the disadvantage of residents without qualifications is referred to but then is not specifically followed up. It is not clear whether there is going to be proactive actions to address deprivation issues that are manifested in social inequality and presumably are part of the commitment to address poverty.	5124/12239	
	Comment - broadly in support of the Local Plan.	5386/14618	
	Comment - the purpose of the plan is to protect the quality of York's historic, natural and built environment while aiming to ensure a balance between development, conservation, sustainability and the environment. Agree that development is an important part of ensuring continuing enrichment, however in current times with ever rising concerns of the environmental and other wider consequences of our actions; this must be done in a sustainable manner.	5813/13754	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
General**

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Comment - don't destroy this beautiful city, destroying the green surrounding areas.	5850/13845	
Continued	Objection - horrendous plans proposed, agree with everything Julian Sturdy MP is saying.	5890/15193	
	Objection - horrified at the contents of the Local Plan and opposed to the Plan.	5913/15237	
	Objection - in the event of a world crisis, where do you think our food will come from? What is the obsession with concrete, and ugliness? Take a look at the mess already created and then leave area in peace.	5923/15255	
	Comment - the Local Plan is not all bad, very far from it, the city should be bolder. It is no longer possible to continue on the basis of trying to preserve everything that currently exists just as it is. Such an approach is illusory. The impact of climate change will transform the city whether we act to mitigate its impact or not, but if we choose to turn away from trying our utmost to mitigate and adapt the city will pay the price. Targets for reducing carbon emissions, improving energy efficiency, increasing take up of renewable energy generation, managing the switch to more sustainable forms of transport can all be more ambitious.	6137/15598	
	Comment - whole heartedly agree with the statements made about the plan in the Fulford Parish Council Newsletter of July 2013.	6262/15836	
	Support – for the direction of travel specified in this plan and welcome the opportunity to target resource in fair ways to benefit the wider community.	6335/16004	Fairness & Equality Board
	Comment - largely supportive of the approach to growth however certain housing sites present a relatively high risk approach to actual delivery. The plan needs to be more flexible in its delivery.	6351/16049	Gladedale Estates
	Comment - it would be helpful for the maps to show the river and the railway line.	6509/16282	Cllr Gerard Hodgson
	Objection - not convinced that the proposed policies in this draft plan are supported by the evidence base. Do not believe that it provides a sound basis to support this administrations desire to expand the City by 25% over the next 15 years.	6516/16349	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group