

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	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)
<b>General Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP1 Strategic Employment Locations</b>	Support – approach will help to support sustainable patterns of development in the York Sub Area and reduce unnecessary development pressure beyond the green belt boundary. Agree with view that it is important for economic and housing growth to be linked.	10/11662	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – suggest that section iv be revised to add the contribution of: direct and indirect employment generated; total employment generated; revenue and capital spend in the city; the long term contributions to the local economy; and direct activities in business start-ups and monitoring.	38/12916	York St John University
	Objection – the requirement for well connected and designed green infrastructure (GI) is not mentioned in this policy. GI in employment areas can have the same value as in housing areas with a wide range of ecosystems services being provided.	42/11707	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Comment – would welcome a clearer statement regarding co-location of start-up social enterprises which are likely to contribute a significant proportion of the need for small office space, in some cases linked to Research & Development. A coordinated and co-location approach, tied into existing support services will provide a better chance of success and growth.	178/13897	York Council for Voluntary Service
	Support – welcome the ambitious economic growth targets.	187/13916	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Comment – support the identification of the designer outlet centre as a 'strategic employment location' but considers that to reach its full potential in delivering sustainable economic development in York, it should also be identified for further specialist outlet retail floorspace.	244/14135	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Comment – question the aims of the manufacturing industry as completely viable, there will be growth but specifics are difficult. Tourism sector needs attention and is controlled by a few key focussed organisations.	525/16632	
	Objection – The circulation of need is not convincing, it relies on a forecast creation of jobs (1000 per year) to justify dwelling numbers but does not explain how the jobs will be created. The projected availability of 15,000 jobs is unrealistic. The plans states that the city must guarantee 16,100 jobs but does not speculate on what industries will need to expand or be created to supply these jobs, Does this include full time, part time, permanent, temporary, job share, casual, agency, seasonal etc. The requirement is not properly defined and its feasibility is not explored.	835/16900	
	Comment – adequate assessment of the impact of the policy has not been provided, the agency proposed to work in partnership with THE COUNCIL to establish the implications and necessary mitigation measures.	1264/17154	Highways Agency

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP1 Strategic Employment Locations Continued</b>	Objection – the whole thrust of you employment plans centre on retail, office, tourism, hotel, recreation and leisure. This says a continuation of York’s “low wage” economy forecast of the workforce. Yes there will be migrants, but with this talk of top UK/European/international city, you must mean these are intellectual and creative jobs for the Bio-tech and IT, and financial sectors, etc: Wealth creators (yes) job creators (no).	1331/17258	
	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.	1457/17394	
	Common – there is no data to clarify the amount of empty space currently in and around the city, for example Clifton Moor. There is no clear way of predicting the levels of extra floorspace required if this is not taken into account.	1665/12946	York Environment Forum
	Objection – Local Context and Policy EMP1 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.	1673/17644	University of York
	Comment – the spatial distribution proposed seeks to concentrate jobs and economic growth in the city centre and to the north of the city. Infrastructure in these locations is already nearing capacity, if not in fact having exceeded it; Naburn Designer Outlet should be allocated for wider economic growth and delivery; not just for leisure uses that would not undermine those available in the city centre.	1736/9812	Oakgate Group PLC
	Comment – there should be opportunities for people from international life and education backgrounds.	2662/7051	
	Comment – jobs are being shed and redundancy is a heartache the many people face. The jobs on offer must be better paid to allow people to live in York. Between 2003 and 2011 employment fell by 11%. Growth must be controlled and sustainable.	4040/11758	
	Objection – with the development planning can the infrastructure cope?	4819/14291	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection – estimates of creating 1000 jobs per year is dubious.	4822/14214	
	Comment – this section assumes that sites for economic development are buildings, ignoring options for urban or semi-urban agriculture, or traditional farming. This sector of the economy supports retail, restaurants, tourism, improves the environment and mitigates climate change.	5124/12233	

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP1 Strategic Employment Locations Continued</b>	Comment – existing sites, both within the city centre and outside, should be fully occupied prior to any further speculative piecemeal development is allowed to take place.	5238/12563	
	Objection – economic growth is highly optimistic and questionable. More realistic figures should be adopted and a strong emphasis on stimulating local business growth which lasts. A balance of inward and internal investment would be a far more sustainable way of retaining current job levels, whilst ensuring money is spent in the local economy and jobs created for local people.	5599/13134	
	Objection – the target on jobs seems completely unrealistic and unachievable especially given the change to the demographic caused by new build.	5634/13262	
	Objection – feel that York is rapidly reaching saturation point when it comes to hotel accommodation.	5754/13594	
	Comment – employment provision will be required to match requirements across the plan period.	6327/17651	Blacker Brothers
	Comment – by comparison with similar cities York seems to be out of kilter in terms of employment land provision within the Local Plan. To benchmark with Durham, a city with just over half York’s population, and meet the shorter timescales of the JRSS would suggest a minimum general employment land requirement of at least 90Ha over the plan period.	6364/17711	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – growth is overly ambitious. This policy is not viable in the current economic climate and it more suited to the credit fuelled growth of the previous decade.	6508/17660	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – there is an implication in the plan ha growth at the proposed level is the only way to bring better quality jobs to the city and somehow displace existing lower paid jobs – and yet the sectors with a high proportion of low paid jobs continue to be at the heart of York’s economy. It is unclear how many of the proposed new jobs will go to existing York residents and how many will go to new residents. Concerned that the sector profile for projected jobs growth is short-term, out-dated and unimaginative. This is a plan to run until 2030 with a green belt to endure until 2040. By this time he impacts of climate change will be extensive, global energy prices could many times higher than they are now with significant global scarcity of food and other resources. There is little or no mention in table 8.2 and in the supporting evidence of a focus on creating local jobs in the green economy – jobs with will last and provide things we need to prosper in a changing global environment.	6518/16359	York Green Party
	Objection – policy is over ambitious and not viable in the current economic climate.	6519/16465	Cllr Jenny Brooks



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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP2 Provision of Employment Land</b>	Objection – the requirement for well connected and designed green infrastructure (GI) is not mentioned in this policy. GI in employment areas can have the same value as in housing areas with a wide range of ecosystems services being provided.	42/11708	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – Whitehall Grange site, Wigginton Road should be included for development for a combination of Class B1 offices and industry, hotel and restaurant. Partially previously developed site. Modest amount of further development on this site will complement the proposed park and ride facility.	152/14440	Raymond Barnes Town Planning Consultant
	Objection – employment allocations are heavily weighted to north and west of the City. No land allocated to the south and east in locations that are readily accessible to the dual carriageway section of the ring road. Revisit the employment land allocations with a view to allocating land to south and east of city to create a more balanced portfolio of sites that will appeal to the market.	187/13917	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Objection – promote the establishment of purpose built or refurbished incubator and growth space for a range of different types and scale of bio-based industry. Plan should help to achieve these space requirements in the city.	333/14189	Biovale Steering Group
	Objection – the designer outlet is dedicated to shopping, where is the leisure provision? York needs other leisure facilities other than eating, drinking and watching football. Healthy leisure activities should be encouraged for all age groups.	419/16529	
	Objection – the strategic approach fails to meet the quality and location requirements that knowledge based employees (advanced manufacturing, science and research) will look for. This is a weak part of the plan and will do little to promote or enhance York as a centre for knowledge based growth and expertise in the UK.	527/16655	
	Comment – provision of employment should be a priority in planning and there is plenty of land near the existing industrial estate.	945/16984	
	Comment – any employment suit should be developed in its entirety and not left for years with empty spaces to be complete with infilling.	969/16999	
	Comment – adequate assessment of the impact of the policy has not been provided, the agency proposed to work in partnership with the council to establish the implications and necessary mitigation measures.	1264/17155	Highways Agency
	Comment – the Council are aware that the masterplan for Whinthorpe is evolving at the present time. To ensure that Whinthorpe has a diverse range of uses which could deliver a sustainable community, this should include a range of employment opportunities. Objection – should be a reference to Whinthorpe as a location for employment and main town centre uses to ensure that is able to accommodate an adequate and	1337/17283	Halifax Estates

**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)
	proportionate mix if uses to sustain it as self-sufficient community.		
<b>Policy EMP2 Provision of Employment Land Continued</b>	Comment - 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.	1457/17395	
	Comment – should be noted that Policy EMP2 Employment Land sites E13 and 14 are fully developed and site E12 is beyond submission for planning following expiry of outline permissions granted by Harrogate Borough Council.	1589/17558	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – concerned that the policy is not ambitious enough, does not reflect local conditions, and simply reflects findings of the York Economic Base Report rather than actually looking at local demand in terms of other evidence that might have been collected. It is usual to interview local agents and look at vacancy rates, but no evidence of such work has been found. Concerned that the policy is not flexible enough and is simply responding to forecasts rather than actual local conditions.	1674/9760	William Birch & Sons
	Comment – the spatial distribution proposed seeks to concentrate jobs and economic growth in the city centre and to the north of the city. Infrastructure in these locations is already nearing capacity, if not in fact having exceeded it; Naburn Designer Outlet should be allocated for wider economic growth and delivery; not just for leisure uses that would not undermine those available in the city centre.	1736/9813	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – policy should be reworded excluding the reference to site allocated York City Centre ST20 as employment land.	1785/9860	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
	Objection – employment must be kept thriving without this creeping industrialisation of our rural communities.	2009/6487	
	Objection – the entire area allocated for “research and development, light industrial, storage and distribution” amounts to only 23 hectares. There is no real provision for tourist or “leisure” seems to be confused with “shopping”.	2673/7081	
	Objection – why is there a need for more office accommodation when the uptake at Poppleton and Clifton Moor is low?	3151/8120	
	Objection – impact on traffic out onto the A1079 at the junction of Common Road if the Local Plan goes ahead, especially those proposed for the industrial site.	3424/8747	
	Support – light industry brings potential employment and is much need in York City and its suburbs.	4029/10659	
Comment – little is done to create economic opportunities within the village to replace the agricultural, tanning and brickyard industries that once provided economic wealth to the community. There has been almost no investment in the infrastructure to	5189/12404		

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	attract businesses into the area.		
<b>Policy EMP2 Provision of Employment Land Continued</b>	Comment – existing sites, both within the city centre and outside, should be fully occupied prior to any further speculative piecemeal development is allowed to take place.	5238/12564	
	Comment – There is a lot of emphasis on the universities expanding. York is in danger of becoming a university campus and these developments need to be restrained rather than encouraged.	5717/13473	
	Comment – concerned about the increased risk of water runoff/flooding as a result of some of the proposed housing/employment developments.	5754/13598	
	Comment – proposals would provide employment however land close to private dwellings should not be used.	5983/15357	
	Objection – with the number of empty offices around, especially at Clifton Moor why is more office space required?	6169/15697	
	Objection – question the Council’s approach which does not seem to promote the intensification of employment or commercial mixed uses at the Murton Industrial Estate. It is well located to the strategic road network and there are good connections to current and future housing areas. Suggest that the Murton Industrial Estate should be identified as an employment location suitable for growth and expansion to the east of the City and that the two sites 160 and 161 are identified as potential areas of extension.	6362/16077	
	Objection – representations have been made on a number of occasions expressing a strong interest in developing the land at Grimston Bar for high quality employment uses.	6364/17707	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – growth is overly ambitious. This policy is not viable in the current economic climate and it more suited to the credit fuelled growth of the previous decade.	6508/17661	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Comment – the draft plan does not include any modelling work in order to link jobs growth to housing need and nor does it try to analyse how each of the drivers of housing demand – job growth, creation of new family units, commuting, over crowding – contribute to the housing growth figures. The development of small businesses is seen as desirable. More attentions needs to be paid to place such sites near to housing developments to decrease the necessity for car use.	6516/16325	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
Objection – it fails to acknowledge that, in the past, when such land allocations have been made, the out of City centre locations have not proved to be attractive premier employment opportunities. The plan needs to recognise that simply allocating	6517/16352	York Central Liberal Democrats	

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	potential development land does not in itself stimulate investment.		
<b>Policy EMP2 Provision of Employment Land Continued</b>	Comment – there is a critical shortage of small industrial units in the area and employment prospects in the own are very limited. Any future development must include provision for this by siting employment allocations near to residential areas.	6522/16507	Cllrs P & I Firth & Cuthbertson

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site ST16 Terry's</b>	Comment – part of this site lies within the Racecourse and Terry’s Conservation Area. The site also contains several Grade II listed buildings. Development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.	238/14057	English Heritage
	Support – the land and listed buildings are equally suitable for residential uses as business and office uses, could be argued that residential uses would be more appropriate and employment/business uses would be better directed towards the City Centre.	4355/11598	Henry Boot Development Ltd
	Support – policy clearly recognises that whilst consent currently exists there may be circumstances in the future when it might not be appropriate to renew this planning permission.	6349/16040	Linden Homes North
	Comment – if the old Terry’s site is to become a strategic mixed use site does it not warrant a new road from the A64?	6497/16238	

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site ST18 Monks Cross</b>	Comment – further office development in this area will generate additional road traffic, reassurance is needed from the council that the location of additional office development at this location can be accommodated by the Strategic Road Network in particular the A64 Hopgrove junction.	1264/17156	Highways Agency
	Objection – Monks Cross is to be the focus for immense over-development. It is damaging the city centre shops.	2652/7027	
	Objection – the increase in cars using the A1237 each day as a result of the proposed developments will rise dramatically, perhaps by an extra 8,000-10,000. The area will also become a construction site until 2030, and construction vehicles will add to the volume of traffic on the A1237, and also on roads and through local villages leading to it, resulting in major disruption and a lowering of the quality of life for visitors so affected. The proposed housing and commercial developments around the A1237 will also lead to a steep rise in air pollution from increased car exhaust emissions, as well as massive congestion and raised health hazards.	3428/8782	
	Objection – this development will substantially increase the traffic flowing from Huntington with a significant portion of this traffic likely to be coming from outside York. For such “external” traffic the impact will be felt first and foremost in Huntington and public transport is unlikely to supply a solution.	5678/13381	

**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 ST19 Northminster Business Park	Objection – serious concerns about the sequence of development of Northminster Business Park in a ‘chequer board’ fashion and request that this be reconsidered as being necessary given the number of empty units currently available in the vicinity. If the answer is yes then develop only adjacent plots during the currency of this plan.	74/12754	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – the existing site, together with the A59 park and ride already impacts on the green belt policies for York as defined by parliament. Any expansion of the site contravenes Government directives.	78/12782	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – object to the very high percentage of the total employment land required which has been allocated at Northminster. Removes a large area of green belt, will impact on the function of the A59 as a green finger running up to the urban edge of the city. Size is inappropriate especially in its proximity to Poppletons and Knapton and will impact visually on both villages which are part of special village-dotted green belt setting of York. Character has already been severely affected by the loss of green belt for the park and ride and associated highway infrastructure (enlarged A59 roundabout). Creeping ribbon development on the A59 from urban edge of York to Station Road. Traffic generated will recreate congestion problems for the A1237 and A59. If absolutely necessary any allocation of employment land at Northminster should be on a far more modest scale, in keeping with the location.	192/13995	
	Objection – some of the areas which are identified for future development could harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the city – in particular the south-easternmost site would conflict with the 1994 inspector’s report on the Green Belt Local Plan (see response for more details). It would substantially reduce the gap between the existing development at the business park and Knapton. As currently depicted, the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York.	238/14056	English Heritage
	Objection – inconsistent with development plan policy, proposal is without evidential support to justify growth points at outlying settlements not connecting towards the central urban core, but extending out into the countryside with no evidence to indicate such selections as sustainably preferable to development within an expanded inner boundary to the green belt.	544/16764	
	Objection – see response 9.	801/3707 895/3617 977/3846	
	Objection – see response 9. Concerns about the semi-rural community being lost in	1231/17129	

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	urban sprawl. Worried about increases in traffic, the pressure on schools and threats to wildlife.		
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9.	1579/17530	
		1580/17540	
	Objection – see response 9. The area is already over populated considering air pollution from tip near Rufforth and sewage plan at Rawcliffe. The problems need rectifying before contemplating causing more. Narrow roads throughout area concerned a major factor also.	1585/3655	
	Objection – see response 9. Is there really such a need when there are empty offices already? Shops closed in York, only restaurants, bars, cafes in the City Centre.	1588/4119	
	Objection – It is not felt that there is much likelihood of local employment due to York Business Park full developed and very little other local employment availability. This site is not a viable or deliverable site as it encourages urban sprawl and does not safeguard the country from encroachment.	1589/17559	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – see response 9.	1597/3903	
	Comment – the strategic employment site that is offset from the Northminster Business Park towards Burlands Lane but she incorporated in the Green Belt, this will allow strategic planting to be introduced to comply with Guideline 3 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement. In order to compensate for the loss of strategic employment the designated gaps between the two areas allocated to the south of Northminster Business Park should be designated as a strategic employment site to provide a more cohesive employment zone.	1599/9934	
	Objection – see response 9.	1891/7808	
	Objection – Employment must be kept thriving without this creeping industrialisation of our rural communities.	2009/6496	
	Objection – the extension of the Northfield lane industrial estate is another green belt “land grab” and that the estate down to the moor lane bridleway.	2536/6821	
	Objection – see response 9.	2550/6856	
		2580/6914	
		2600/3529	
Objection – see response 9. Too much development will upset the balance and create more traffic problems and pollution	2605/3553		
Objection – see response 9. Even with the new park and ride the increase in traffic will make Boroughbridge Road a nightmare to use.	2606/3561		

**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)
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9. Will cause serious congestion in the village.	2607/3569	
	Objection - 15 of out 23 hectares of employment land are at Northminster business park outside the outer ring road and therefore not in a sustainable location.	2673/7082	
	Objection – see response 9	2855/3599	
		2856/3608	
		2858/3630	
		2859/3637	
	Objection – see response 9	2860/3646	
		2861/3664	
	Objection – see response 9. Any developments which would turn the villages into suburban sprawl would be a blight to the wider area and utterly detrimental to York.	2862/3673	
	Objection – see response 9	2864/3689	
	Objection – see response 9. Object to any Green Belt development in any village around York.	2865/3698	
	Objection – see response 9	2867/3720	
		2868/3727	
		2870/3740	
	Objection – see response 9. This proposal would be the beginning of the end for Poppleton as a village, must be stopped at all costs	2872/4535	
	Objection – see response 9	2873/3755	
		2874/3764	
		2875/3773	
Objection – see response 9. Local Amenities are already at breaking point, the junior school is unable to take anymore children. There are enough people in this village without thousands more if you build these houses.	2876/3782		
Objection – see response 9. The village feel is being lost with every new house being approved and its local services are unable to handle this increase.	2877/3791		
Objection – see response 9. York is being turned into an overpopulated sprawl. Brownfield sites should be developed and the countryside kept as it is.	2878/3800		
Objection – see response 9	2879/3809		
	2880/3818		

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9	2881/4541	
		2882/3830	
		2883/3839	
	Objection – see response 9. Object to the principle of using Green Belt land for development purposes.	2884/3855	
	Objection – see response 9	2885/3864	
		2886/3877	
	Objection – see response 9. Have the council considered the gridlocked roads and overcrowded primary schools?	2887/3886	
	Objection – see response 9	2888/3895	
	Objection – see response 9. There should be a firm policy in place which maintains the physical separation between the City and the villages outside.	2889/3909	
	Objection – see response 9	2890/3917	
	Objection – see response 9. Infrastructure entirely inappropriate and insufficient to support development on this scale. Would alter the character of Poppleton and the surrounding area.	2892/3932	
	Objection – see response 9. Contrary to existing VDS and would alter the character of the area. Insufficient provision for infrastructure.	2893/3941	
	Objection – see response 9	2894/3950	
	Objection – see response 9	2895/3959	
	Objection – see response 9. This development will destroy for ever the village atmosphere of both Knapton and Poppleton.	2896/3968	
	Objection – see response 9. Why not use brownfield sites and leave the Green Belt alone?	2897/3977	
	Objection – see response 9	2911/4138	
		2912/4148	
	2962/4154		
	3004/7840		
	3022/7860		
	3029/4161		
Objection – see response 9. Will spoil and degrade the standard of life, landscape and special environmental nature of this super village.	3030/4170		
Objection – see response 9	3032/4177		

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
		3037/4186	
		3038/4193	
		3040/4207	
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9	3042/4222	
		3043/7894	
	Objection – opposed to the site.	3099/7991	
	Objection – any further development in the area will ruin the thriving community and impose a hardship on the surrounding native countryside.	3011/7848	
	Support – believe the modest expansion is reasonable, provided the infrastructure is upgraded.	3116/8030	
	Objection – see response 9	3248/4239	
	Objection – see response 9. The Green Belt should be preserved throughout this area.	3271/4255	
	Objection – see response 9	3278/8423	
	Objection – see response 9. The scale and extent of the proposed development causes concern.	3284/4265	
	Objection – see response 9. The scale of development is too large.	3285/4274	
	Objection – surrounding land is greenbelt and should not be earmarked for industrial development.	3378/8675	
	Objection – see response 9	3384/8688	
	Objection – see response 9. It is hoped that the council will build major roads and flyovers to cope with the traffic this will create.	3419/4289	
	Objection – see response 9	3423/4298	
	Objection – The increase in cars using the A1237 each day as a result of the proposed developments will rise dramatically, perhaps by an extra 8,000-10,000. The area will also become a construction site until 2030, and construction vehicles will add to the volume of traffic on the A1237, and also on roads and through local villages leading to it, resulting in major disruption and a lowering of the quality of life for visitors so affected. The proposed housing and commercial developments around the A1237 will also lead to a steep rise in air pollution from increased car exhaust emissions, as well as massive congestion and raised health hazards.	3428/8783	
Objection – see response 9	3441/8805		
	3443/8816		
	3468/8931		

**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)
		3472/8939	
		3473/8948	
		3474/8957	
		3475/8967	
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9. The current site is sufficient, we don't need	3479/8974	
	Objection – see response 9	3481/8983	
		3482/8993	
		3483/9002	
		3484/9013	
		3485/9022	
		3486/9032	
		3487/9042	
	Objection – see response 9. The infrastructure of Poppleton could not adequately support the proposals of the Local Plan.	3488/9051	
	Objection – see response 9	3490/9061	
		3491/9070	
		3492/9079	
		3493/9088	
		3494/9097	
		3495/9106	
	Objection – see response 9	3502/9115	
		3503/9125	
	Objection – see response 9	3504/9135	
		3505/9144	
		3506/9153	
3550/9165			
3554/9176			
3555/9186			
3556/9193			
3557/9204			
3559/9218			
3560/9227			
Objection – see response 9. Please leave Poppleton as a village.	3561/9235		
Objection – see response 9	3562/9242		

**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)
		3563/9251	
		3564/9260	
		3565/9268	
		3566/9277	
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9	3567/9286	
		3568/9296	
	Objection – see response 9. There is no need to extend Northminster Business Park as there is much vacant accommodation elsewhere in York.	3623/9307	
	Objection – see response 9	3634/9361	
	Objection – see response 9. Over development.	3637/9371	
	Objection – see response 9. Important to preserve the green areas.	3638/9379	
	Objection – see response 9.	3639/9387	
		3640/9395	
		3641/9403	
		3642/9412	
	Comment – will there be a Park & Ride if houses as put there. Hopes a hospital will be close at hand.	3677/9421	
	Objection – see response 9. More development will create more congestion and through traffic.	3728/10038	
	Objection – see response 9. Objection – see response 9	3730/10053	
		3731/10063	
		3738/10088	
		3741/10104	
	Objection – see response 9.	3742/10114	
		3743/10124	
		3745/5801	
		3746/10134	
3911/4601			
3942/4628			
3946/4637			
3947/4645			
Objection – impact on the greenbelt which is essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and character of the approach to York and would directly contravene	3966/10548		
	3976/10577		

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	Government Directives.		
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9. Need more information as to what is intended. Infrastructure has to be a priority or are we going to have many more vehicles in an area which is trying to cut down on vehicles?	4055/4681	
	Comment – see response 9. Seem 'least bad' options for transport.	4077/4714	
	Objection – see response 9. Proposals will attract further traffic without any form of amelioration which will significantly reduce safety and amenity in the local area.	4078/4723	
	Objection – see response 9. Of great concern as to pressure on Poppleton facilities.	4079/4732	
	Objection – see response 9. Cannot be accommodated on the road network and will reduce road safety and amenity.	4080/4741	
	Objection – see response 9.	4082/4750	
	Objection – see response 9. Roads cannot cope, the green belt corridor needs to be retained so that the villages remain villages and are not sucked into York City by urban sprawl.	4084/4760	
	Objection – see response 9. Over development, no consideration given to infrastructure , especially roads,	4085/5816	
	Objection – see response 9.	4087/4769	
	Objection – see response 9. Creeping urbanisation of an area which was always supposed to be separate from the main York City by a preserved green belt.	4088/4778	
	Objection – see response 9. Businesses on Northminster Business Park cannot plan future expansion because of the thread of the area being 'safeguarded for development'. What development?	4103/4800	
	Objection – see response 9.	4111/4820	
		4127/4842	
		4145/4860	
	Objection – see response 9. The fields surrounding Poppleton are already blighted by the new Park & Ride (highly unnecessary). To extend an industrial estate will further blot the landscape.	4191/4893	
	Objection – see response 9.	4386/11361	
	Objection – no reason given	4416/5056	
Objection – see response 9.	4425/5069		
	4431/5079		
	4435/5088		
Objection – see response 9.	4437/5097		

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	Objection – see response 9. The road infrastructure will not support increased volume of traffic, the rural environment will be further eroded, will add to the destruction of York’s essential character as a medium sized attractive city and there is no excuse for diminishing the green belt, should be safeguarding the environment.	4438/5106	
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – see response 9.	4440/5121	
	Objection – see response 9. The green belt should be preserved for future generations.	4441/5129	
	Objection – see response 9.	4442/5138	
		4443/5147	
		4445/5161	
		4446/5168	
		4447/5176	
		4462/5184	
		4463/5193	
		4650/5242	
	Objection – proposed removal of green belt land, introduction and expansion of “industrial” use to rural environment, destruction and disturbance of sites of historical interest, destruction of a significant aspect and landscape approach to the city of York.	4726/14261	
	Objection – see response 9.	4755/5291	
	Objection – see response 9. Suggest compromise – do not develop area to preserve for now the green area behind the Park & Ride site which may require future expansion anyway.	4756/5301	
	Objection – see response 9.	4759/5310	
		4767/5319	
Objection - Land is semi-rural in nature. There are other brownfield sites in York where such industrial development would be better suited.	4829/12149		
Comment – better used as a Showpeople site.	5192/12465		
Comment – the development of brownfield land should be prioritised to create businesses and jobs.	5282/14400		
Comment – the strategic employment site that is offset from the Northminster Business Park towards Burlands Lane but she incorporated in the Green Belt, this will allow strategic planting to be introduced to comply with Guideline 3 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement. In order to compensate for the loss of strategic employment the designated gaps between the two areas allocated to the south of Northminster Business Park should be designated as a strategic employment site to provide a more	5332/14997		

**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)
	cohesive employment zone.		
<b>Site ST19 Northminster Business Park Continued</b>	Objection – Poppleton has, over the years, expanded incrementally and by and large seems to have coped, even with the Poppleton Park development some years ago. General concerns relate to the size and scale of the expansion planned in York, how the infrastructure will cope and how the very special nature of York will be preserved.	5408/14677	
	Objection – traffic increase from development	5735/13508	
	Objection – destroy open space, trees and green space, impact on village character.	5817/13768	
	Objection – increased traffic, need for more school spaces.	5829/13803	
	Objection – see response 9.	5948/6247	
	Objection – place a huge strain on local services and a negative impact on traffic in Poppleton.	6038/15457	
	Objection – opposed to ST19	6131/15560	
	Objection – opposed to ST19	6133/15577	
	Objection – see response 9.	6190/6102	
	Objection – see response 9.	6191/6110	
		6203/6127	
		6206/6139	
	Objection – scale of proposed development is inappropriate on land which is semi-rural in nature. There are other brownfield sites where such industrial development would be better suited.	6360/16074	
	Objection – see response 9.	6413/6279	
	Support –believe the housing need of the city are good enough to warrant this development	6414/6288	
	Objection – see response 9.	6421/6304	
	Objection – see response 9.	6425/6315	
	Objection – create major traffic problems for those of us who live in Poppleton.	6438/6359	
	Objection – see response 9.	6483/6430	
		6518/16376	York Green Party
Objection – should be allocated for a freight transshipment centre in connection with the proposed Low Emission Zone for the city centre.			

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site ST20 Castle Piccadilly</b>	Objection – now that the major developer has withdrawn the boundaries of this site should be revised to omit land west of the River Foss and the area west of the Foss designated as public open space. Figure 6.1 should be amended accordingly and area west of the Foss designated as public open space which supports criterion x. Para 6.3 of the supporting text should be amended to exclude reference to ST20.	103/12859	York Tomorrow
	Objection – the potential (or otherwise) to develop the Castle-Piccadilly site with a very large amount of floorspace has always been debateable. Whether a very large building can be placed on this site without an unacceptable effect on the historic area. Planning refusals in 2000 and 2003 suggest that this would be very difficult. LaSalle Ltd – together with a related press release, states that they can no longer envisage a large retail development on the Castle Piccadilly site. Given this statement by the Council’s preferred developer, plus a history of design attempts stretching back more than 20 years, it is now clear that Castle Piccadilly should not be proposed for a large retail development. It follows that a responsible and realistic local plan ought to address alternative proposals for the car park and surrounding historic area. Object to the allocation of 25000 square metres of A1 space for Castle-Piccadilly and I believe that the plan should formulate an alternative version for the area around the Castle.	439/16597	
	Objection – a major retail development of this City Centre site is no longer deliverable – not now nor in the long term The continued allocation of the site for retail led development is wholly unsuitable and will prejudice the much needed sustainable regeneration of individual sites coming forward, as such the draft site allocation ST20 Castle-Piccadilly is objected to.	1785/9859	Jones Lang LaSalle (LaSalle UK Ventures Property)
	Objection – the area has been marked for retail again, despite public opposition. The best use for this area would be an attractive public space and the removal of the car park.	2675/7089	
	Support – Castle Piccadilly site should be developed for retail use.	4810/12121	
	Objection – should be reduced in size to exclude the area east of the river Foss which should be allocated primary for a mix of retail and, predominately, high density housing.	6508/17657	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Comment – should be reduced in size to exclude the area east of the river Foss which should be allocated primary for a mix of retail and, predominately, high density housing.	6519/16462	Cllr Jenny Brooks

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site ST21 Naburn Designer Outlet</b>	Comment – query the reasoning behind designating this for leisure development as it is a shopping centre not a leisure destination. Any development that increases this attractiveness of this out of centre location must be rigorously considered with more information to assess to potential strategic impact on Selby Town as a Principal Town. In a town centre hierarchy if there are no suitable sites in York City Centre it is considered that Selby should be the priority for development before the out of centre location.	9/11657	Selby District Council
	Comment – it is not clear as to what the need or justification is for Use Class D2 development at this location; what alternative locational options may be available; nor what its potential impact on the wider highways network or nearby settlements could be.	11/11679	North Yorkshire County Council
	Objection – opposed to removal from green belt and proposal to develop for leisure uses. Part of a wider swathe of green belt that fulfils important green belt purposes including preserving the setting and special character of York and maintaining the separation of Fulford from Naburn and Bishopthorpe. Major additional development would have serious adverse consequences for the local environment of Fulford with substantially more noise and pollution; areas of ecological value would be damaged; and significantly more traffic would be generated causing more congestion on the A19 through Fulford. Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, no exceptional circumstances have been given to justify development on land well outside any town centre and on green belt. Serious consequences on vitality and viability of the city centre. 16ha of safeguarded land is unnecessary as plan already makes unduly high provision for development beyond the plan period. Inspector previously concluded that land should remain washed over green belt.	62/12698	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – support recognition of Designer Outlet as a ‘strategic commercial location’ and strategic development site but consider the approach does not realise the site’s full economic potential in meeting overall plan objective for sustainable economic development. Plan should be amended to identify this as a ‘strategic economic development site’ rather than a ‘strategic leisure site’ to reflect the National Planning Policy Framework and include a further 5,000 – 9,300 sq. m of specialist outlet retail floorspace. Plan should more fully reflect the way in which the Designed Outlet supports and complements the tourism, economic and retail role of the city centre without competing with it.	244/14131	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Comment – parts of the site are just within the 400m proximity to Naburn Waste Water Treatment Works’ operational boundary. This should be considered as part of	295/14170	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	any development proposals.		
<b>Site ST21 Naburn Designer Outlet Continued</b>	Support – Naburn designer outlet is served by infrastructure that was designed to accommodate significant growth, there for is available, developable and deliverable. The Council should take advantage of this and see to allocate this land for employment and leisure development.	1736/9814	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – there should be clear policy against expansion of out of town retail.	5754/13591	
	Objection – proposed allocation of ST21 Naburn designer Outlet is not supported.	6364/17708	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – this is not a sustainable location and the traffic implications would have a further adverse impact on the city.	6518/16367	York Green Party

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E1 Hungate</b>	Objection – Hungate should be identified as a strategic site and given an ST reference number as opposed to its current E1 reference. The site should be identified as a strategic mixed use site for housing, commercial, retail, employment and leisure purposes given the planning permissions that are in place.	5167/12899	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E2 Land North Of Monks Cross Drive</b>	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 duel carriage way and also the A4 to Scarborough thee is congestion at peak times.	6025/15427	

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

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E3 Ford Garage, Jockey Lane</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E4 Land At Layerthorpe</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	nature reserve, part of the open aspect leading into the village, bring increased traffic nearer to the village.		
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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)
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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)
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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)
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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.		
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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.		
<b>Site E6 Common Lane, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E7 Wheldrake Industrial Estate</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E8 Wheldrake Industrial Estate</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E9 Elvington Industrial Estate</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington</b>	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.		
<b>Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued</b>	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	
	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	
	Comment – all sites require major investment for roads, water and sewerage beyond present capacity.	3610/9606	
	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	
	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	
	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	
	Support – the site is an eyesore and will be much better if tied up and built on.	3823/10295	
	Support – the site E10 should definitely be tidied up and used for further light industry/storage if required.	3829/6473	
	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	
	Support – This is a derelict piece of land which requires improvement.	4257/11043	
	Support – proposal is acceptable.	4261/11051	
	Support – agree to the proposal.	4270/11079	
	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	
	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E10 Chessingham Park, Dunnington Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E11 Annamine Nurseries, Jockey Lane</b>	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
	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E12 Land At York Business Park</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E13 End Of Great North Way</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Site E14 Site To The South Of York Business Park</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP3 Economic Growth In The Health And Social Care Sectors</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP4 Loss Of Employment Land</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	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.		
<b>Policy EMP4 Loss Of Employment Land Continued</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy EMP5 Business And Industrial Uses Within Residential Areas</b>	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
<b>Paragraph 8.04</b>	Comment – How many new graduates find jobs in York and ‘invest’ in the future.	2662/7052	
<b>Paragraph 8.05</b>	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**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Question 8.01</b>	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	