

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Objection –introduced a new designation of strategic greenspace but there appears to be no formal definition of this term or its legal status in the context of a local plan. It is essential that the use of strategic greenspace be properly defined or it can have no real value in managing future development.	401/	York Ornithological Club
	Comment – call for joined up thinking. Parts of the city centre, Heworth, Huntington, New Earswick, Earswick, Haxby and Strensall lie along the River Foss and the river provides an outstanding amenity for a large number of York’s citizens. Recently the river banks have seen major developments. The River Foss Society believes that the value of the river should be fully recognised and that, in strategic as well as in local planning matters, its conservation should be a priority for the City of York. Further housing development along its length would increase the risks of pollution and flooding.	444/	The River Foss Society
	Comment - the Council does not provide a definition of strategic greenspace and how it will be protected from inappropriate development	550/	Peacock and Smith
	Objection – priority should be developing sites for the elderly who have contributed to the country and not just taken from it.	656/20499	
	Comment – for many, the addition of strategic greenspace to a number of the strategic sites within the Local Plan appears to be a positive, albeit very minor, improvement. However, many constituents feel that their calls for strategic site proposals to be removed as a whole have been ignored and the strategic greenspace is nothing more than a consolatory offering from the Council. Concerns that addition of strategic greenspace is at best a largely superficial amendment that goes no way to alleviating concerns expressed during land year’s consultation, and at worst suspects the Council of deceitful use of strategic greenspace to distract from major changes to the boundaries of some of the proposed sites, which have actually caused net increases in the amount of developable land within them in spite of the addition of greenspace.	1355/	Julian Sturdy MP
	Comment - the plan for some 20,000 new homes by 2030 will make a significant impact on local traffic. As the proposals develop, a clear impact assessment is undertaken and associated measures agreed through S106 agreements to apply counter measures.	1895/	
	Objection – the Plan fails to take account of and support the council's strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all; and fails to avoid noise from giving rise significant impacts on health and quality of life	3438/	Skelton Village Action Group
	Comment – building houses does not build communities. The villages which surround York are not small towns to be converted to soulless suburban dormitories of York to	5189/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	meet a housing requirement which is nowhere proved. They need their own plans for how they might expand.		
General (continued)	Objection – taking away any of the farmland away would mean less locally-grown food.	6502/	
	Objection – taking away any of the farmland away would mean less locally-grown food.	6503/	
	Objection - Haxby cannot sustain the amount of development being proposed.	9596/	
	Objection- Plan lacks adequate consideration of the detrimental effect this will have on the communities currently living in York.	10860/	
	Objection – there is no justification for the plan.	10875/25878	
	Objection – the only people who will benefit from this plan are land owners and the council themselves. It holds not benefit for the residents of York.	11415/25881	